# High-Speed Rail – Negative Starter Pack – Hoya-Spartan 2012

## States/Federalism Section

### States/Delegation Cplan – 1NC

Text:

The United States federal government should narrowly delegate authority over national inter-city and inter-state high-speed passenger rail to state governments, appropriate territories, and multi-state compacts related to corridors and hub networks. The state governments, appropriate territories, and multi-state compacts related to corridors and hub networks should substantially increase investment in a national network of inter-city and inter-state high-speed passenger rail – including dedicated shared fund agreements that collectively matches the total of Affirmative allocations.

#### ( ) States solve best. They *can* coordinate and, once in charge, would improve HSR efficiency.

Chicago Tribune ‘1

(“Let states drive high-speed train,” Dec 24, http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2001-12-24/news/0112240192\_1\_high-speed-rail-investment-high-speed-train-high-speed-rail)

Amtrak--the money-losing operation that poses as a national passenger railroad in the U.S.--is taking the lead in the development of a high-speed train network in the Midwest, comparable to the European trains that zoom by at more than 150 m.p.h. High-speed rail service in the Midwest is an interesting prospect--the market, as well as environmental, energy conservation and other concerns, may justify it. But putting Amtrak in charge and expecting the feds to pay for most of it certainly is a recipe for waste and bad planning. For the Midwest, at least, a frequent, comfortable and reliable high-speed rail system would be a new concept. It ought to be designed and operated as such, according to market demand, with a rigorous bottom-line approach. In other words, everything Amtrak is not. According to plans being circulated in Congress and promoted by several local groups, Chicago would be the hub of a series of high-speed rail lines zipping out to Minneapolis-St. Paul, Detroit, Cincinnati, St. Louis, Cleveland and other major urban areas, with stops at some smaller cities like Springfield, Ill., and Madison, Wis. New trains would run on upgraded freight tracks at estimated speeds of 110 m.p.h. The initial phase would be funded by approximately $4 billion, the Midwest's share of the $12 billion High Speed Rail Investment initiative, under consideration by Congress. Individual states have pledged smaller amounts to the effort, including Illinois' $50 million. A reverse logic animates this project: Instead of determining there is urgent demand--and then seeking funding--Midwestern supporters seem to be saying, "The pot of money is there, so we might as well get our share." That's not the way to build a new railroad, but to extend Amtrak domain which, torn by the incompatible demands of politics, public service and profitability, has evolved into anything but an efficient train system. States ought to take the lead in the high-speed rail effort, and contribute a substantial amount of the money. Perhaps the federal government could pay for the start-up infrastructure improvements, as it did to build the original interstate highway system in the 1950s. Then an independent multi-state agency could purchase the trains and turn over operations to a private concern. Such high stakes and strong participation by the states would lead to a far tougher analysis of what service is needed than the pinata-style planning at play here. Built modestly and incrementally, high-speed rail could work and even make money, at which time full privatization would be the next step. A Chicago-to-St. Louis line, running on relatively underutilized freight tracks through Normal and Springfield, could be a key test. Run efficiently, it could compete favorably with airlines on speed of downtown-to-downtown service, and certainly on roominess and comfort. Regional high-speed service has caught on in California and in the Northwest, and it may well do so here. Although Amtrak's math is complicated, the agency projects that, when fully operational, its high-speed Acela line on the Northeast will make about $180 million in annual profit Are there enough commuters and are they willing to give up their cars or airline seats in favor of high-speed trains? If it's their own money on the line, state officials, planners--and taxpayers--would make sure the project makes sense before any money is invested. High-speed train service in the Midwest is a prospect worth investigating, on the right terms.

#### ( ) *Multi-State compacts* specifically solve for HSR.

OPA ‘3

(Office of Public Affairs – US Department of Transportation – FACT SHEET , The Passenger Rail Investment Reform Act of 2003 – http://www.dot.gov/affairs/Passenger%20Rail%20Fact%20Sheet.htm)

\* The Administration believes that states, not Amtrak, are best equipped to decide where rail service is important. States should be empowered to choose the rail service provider of their choice, whether it's Amtrak, a private company or a public transit agency. Following a transition, the Administration's proposal would allow states to submit proposals for passenger rail capital investment to the U.S. Department of Transportation, as they have successfully done for highway and transit capital investments. \* Amtrak would transition into three companies: \* A private passenger rail company that would operate trains under contract to states and multi-state compacts - just as the current Amtrak operates trains under contract to commuter rail agencies; \* A private rail infrastructure company that would maintain and operate the infrastructure on the Northeast Corridor under contract to a multi-state Northeast Corridor Compact. Title to Amtrak's current tracks, stations and other infrastructure on the Northeast Corridor will be held by the federal government and leased to the Northeast Corridor Compact; and \* The National Passenger Rail Corporation, which would continue as a government corporation that would retain Amtrak's current right to use the tracks of the freight railroads, and the Amtrak corporate name. Both the track-access rights and the Amtrak brand would be provided under contract to states and multi-state compacts for qualifying passenger rail service they sponsor. \* Separating train operations and infrastructure ownership is not a new concept. Train operations and infrastructure ownership have for decades been split in the United States. Amtrak operates trains over more than 22,000 miles of track in the United States, but owns only 730 miles of track (mostly on the Northeast Corridor between Washington, D.C. and Boston, and in Michigan). All other tracks are owned either by freight railroads or by the states. \* Multi-state compacts are not new. Multi-state coalitions are already operating intercity rail services, and some are planning for future high-speed rail operations. The Administration believes these cooperative partnerships between the states, the federal government and freight railroads, will improve the efficiency of intercity passenger rail service as a viable alternative to air and highway travel in some corridors.

( ) These Multi-State compacts *already exist* and *can create dedicated funding pools*.

Puentes ‘10

(Robert Puentes is a senior fellow with the Brookings Institution’s Metropolitan Policy Program where he also directs the Program's Metropolitan Infrastructure Initiative. “Intermetropolitan Passenger Rail: Considerations for State Legislatures” – April 9th – http://www.brookings.edu/research/speeches/2010/04/09-rail-transportation-puentes)

The next point is that if a particular corridor extends beyond individual state borders, close coordination—both formal and informal—with your neighbors is essential. More than just backroom deals, these are lengthy relationships that bear real fruit in the form of finalized plans, environmental reviews, and dedicated shared funding agreements. This appeared to have been a significant advantage for those who received ARRA funding and a hindrance for those who did not as, by design, several of the award-winning corridors involved multi-state compacts. For example, the eight-state Midwest Regional Rail Initiative was established as far back as the mid-1990s. In consultation with the federal government, the states worked to develop a rail plan that was released in 1998 and updated in 2004. Last summer, the eight governors, along with the mayor of Chicago, signed a Memorandum of Understanding in anticipation of joint applications for ARRA funding that laid out plans for collective high-speed rail priorities and planning. Partly as a result, the projects in and around the Chicago hub received nearly as much funding ($2.16 billion) as did California ($2.34 billion.) Similarly, the Virginia-North Carolina Interstate High-Speed Rail Commission, created in 2001, agreed to recommend to its respective parent legislatures the enactment of an interstate rail compact. Both state legislatures passed laws establishing the Compact in 2004. The North Carolina—Virginia corridor received a total of $620 million spread among three investments.

Note: “ARRA” stands for “American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009”. It was the initial wave of Obama’s “stimulus” package.

And – our internal net benefit:

#### First – Unique-link: High Speed Rail violates fiscal federalism – it coerces States Governments

Greve ‘12

Michael S. Greve is the John G. Searle Scholar at the American Enterprise Institute. “High-Speed “Federalism” Goes Off the Rails” – Jan 17th – http://libertylawsite.org/2012/01/17/high-speed-federalism-goes-off-the-rails/

The Washington Post reports that federal-state plans for a high-speed train connecting San Francisco with Los Angles and points in-between may never come off the ground. In the face of public resistance, the state may have to decline some $3.5 billion in federal “stimulus” funds dedicated to an initial segment of the line, connecting the thriving metropolises of Bakersfield and Merced. We may be witnessing an outbreak of fiscal and institutional sanity. Federal funding programs replicate, on a daily basis and an increasingly alarming scale, a debility that Alexander Hamilton identified as a constitutional problem. State officials, he wrote in Federalist 1, will seek to maximize to “the power, emolument, and consequence of the offices they hold under the state establishments.” Officials’ time horizon extends over their expected tenure (at most, their lifetimes); thus, they would never support a Constitution that is calculated to produce long-term collective gains. They would have to be beaten, as mercifully they were. Federal grants programs systematically exploit state officials’ constricted time horizon for the expansion of government at all levels. So long as federal grants promise immediate electoral gains, state officials will discount even ruinous long-term costs to zero: “Take the money and run” (often, for higher office) is the rational course of action. From the smallest earmark to the Medicaid monster (which consumes over 20 percent of states’ budgets), our entire fiscal federalism operates on this principle. California Governor Jerry Brown is still committed to the high-speed train fantasy. However, his failure to explain where the estimated $100 billion for the project might come from has generated public resistance. California seems bound to do what Ohio, Wisconsin, and Florida have already done: say “no” to the federal funds. This epidemic of good sense has an obvious source: unsustainable debt levels at all levels of government—in no small measure, a consequence and legacy cost of federal transfer programs—have produced a more realistic calculus. The issuance of yet more state debt tends to alarm voters, and assurances that the feds will agree to make up any future shortfalls or even make good on their commitment produces guffaws: they don’t have the money. Our officials have driven fiscal federalism into a wall. A few have begun to walk away from the wreck, and that’s a start. What the country needs is a stampede.

#### And, delegation to States key to reviving federalism. Transportation policy distinctly important to federalism’s return.

Horowitz ‘12

Daniel – Deputy Political Director at The Madison Project and Contributing Editor, Legislative Writer at Red State – Red state – Jan 19th – http://www.redstate.com/dhorowitz3/2012/01/19/devolve-transportation-spending-to-states/

One of the numerous legislative deadlines that Congress will be forced to confront this session is the expiration of the 8th short-term extension of the 2005 surface transportation authorization law (SAFETEA-LU). With federal transportation spending growing beyond its revenue source, an imbalance between donor and recipient states, inefficient and superfluous construction projects popping up all over the country, and burdensome mass transit mandates on states, it is time to inject some federalism into transportation spending. Throughout the presidential campaign, many of the candidates have expressed broad views of state’s rights, while decrying the expansion of the federal government. In doing so, some of the candidates have expressed the conviction that states have the right to implement tyranny or pick winners and losers, as long as the federal government stays out of it. Romneycare and state subsidies for green energy are good examples. The reality is that states don’t have rights; they certainly don’t have the power to impose tyranny on citizens by forcing them to buy health insurance or regulating the water in their toilet bowels – to name a few. They do, however, reserve powers under our federalist system of governance to implement legitimate functions of government. A quintessential example of such a legitimate power is control over transportation and infrastructure spending. The Highway Trust Fund was established in 1956 to fund the Interstate Highway System (IHS). The fund, which is administered by the DOT’s Federal Highway Administration, has been purveyed by the federal gasoline tax, which now stands at 18.4 cents per gallon (24.4 for diesel fuel). Beginning in 1983, Congress began siphoning off some of the gas tax revenue for the great liberal sacred cow; the urban mass transit system. Today, mass transit receives $10.2 billion in annual appropriations, accounting for a whopping 20% of transportation spending. Additionally, the DOT mandates that states use as much as 10% of their funding for all sorts of local pork projects, such as bike paths and roadside flowers. As a result of the inefficiencies and wasteful mandates of our top-down approach to transportation spending, trust fund outlays have exceeded its revenue source by an average of $12 billion per year, even though the IHS – the catalyst for the gasoline tax – has been completed for 20 years. In 2008, the phantom trust fund was bailed out with $35 billion in general revenue, and has been running a deficit for the past few years. Congress has not passed a 6-year reauthorization bill since 2005, relying on a slew of short-term extensions, the last of which is scheduled to expire on March 31. Short-term funding is no way to plan for long-term infrastructure projects. In their alacrity to gobble up the short-term money before it runs out, state and local governments tend to use the funds on small time and indivisible projects, such as incessant road repaving, instead of better planned long-term projects. It’s time for a long-term solution, one which will inject much-needed federalism and free-market solutions into our inefficient and expensive transportation policy. It is time to abolish the Highway Trust Fund and its accompanying federal gasoline tax. Twenty years after the completion of the IHS, we must devolve all transportation authority to the states, with the exception of projects that are national in scope. Each state should be responsible for its own projects, including maintenance for its share of the IHS. Free of the burden of shouldering special interest pork projects of other states, each state would levy its own state gas tax to purvey its own transportation needs. If a state wants a robust mass transit system or pervasive bike lanes, let the residents of that state decide whether they want to pay for it. That is true federalism in action.

#### Nations model US federalism decisions – demonstrates viability of dual sovereignty

Bogen ‘3

(David, Professor of Law and T. Carroll Brown Scholar, University of Maryland School of Law. Hastings Law Journal, 55 Hastings L.J. 333)

In short, Congress has sufficient power to deal directly or indirectly with every form of national problem. The decisions of the Court, however, demand that Congress demonstrate that the problem is a national one when its scope is not obvious. This demand, and the need to use less direct instruments such as the spending power, force Congress to confront the institutional issue as to which level of government can best deal with the problem. It also makes state sovereignty a practical reality, so that most problems will be understood as state responsibility. There are at least three advantages to maintaining federalism and not interpreting the privileges and immunities clause to confer a general congressional power to legislate on personal security and property rights: it maximizes popular satisfaction, it promotes experimentation, and it provides a model on the international level to reconcile national factions. The utilitarian argument for federalism is that it maximizes satisfaction. A rule that satisfies the majority in each of the fifty states will be a much larger number than a rule that satisfies the national majority but overrides local state majorities. The wrinkle is the weight to be assigned the desire of persons in one state to have their rule adopted in a neighboring state where there is no significant commercial effect on the first state from such an adoption. Congressional power should be sufficient to enable a national majority to overcome local majorities when that desire is at a high level, but the stumbling blocks that the Court has [\*397] raised to preserve federalism may help preserve local preferences where the national interest is low. The states have always been famed as the laboratories of experimentation. 332 With respect to individual rights, the slow expansion of laws prohibiting discrimination based on gender orientation suggests that states may be even more progressive than the national government, a government whose laws often preempt local attempts to grapple with issues. It may well be that the huge amounts of financing necessary to run for national office create a polarization that does not well reflect a majority. Raising money is easier for the more ideological candidates on each side, and this promotes more strife and less cooperation in the national legislature. 333 Local campaigns are cheaper and need not be as ideologically divisive. That creates the possibility of legislatures more amenable to working together on problems and creating new solutions. Finally, American federalism has been a model throughout the world for bringing together diverse peoples under a larger governmental structure. 334 The utility of a national economic policy and a national foreign policy is apparent, but the tug of different ethnic and cultural backgrounds makes this difficult. The breakaway republic of Chechnya in Russia and the fear of separate status for Kurds in Turkey suggest the problems nations may have with significant internal groups with different interests. The lack of autonomy for Tibet gives the Republic of China on Taiwan pause about uniting with the Peoples Republic on the Mainland. If the warning of the anti-federalists comes true, that states cannot maintain their separate sovereignty under a national government, the United States will no longer be the beacon on the hill that gives hope for resolving this kind of international problem. A viable federalism is therefore important, not just for the internal purposes of maximizing popular satisfaction and fostering experimentation, but to demonstrate to a fractious world that dual sovereignty is a viable form of government.

#### Only a U.S. model of federalism provides the dual sovereignty to check civil war in Iraq

Mihalakas ‘12

Nasos Mihalakas, LLM from University College London and a JD from the University of Pittsburgh, “Time for Iraq to Activate its Federation Council!”, April 30, https://mihalakas.wordpress.com/2012/04/30/time-for-iraq-to-activate-its-federation-council/

The political power struggle in Baghdad has significantly escalated since the last U.S. troops withdrew in December 2011, with Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki slowly abandoning the principle of a unity government that gives all stakeholders a share of power and instead trying to consolidate power in his own hands. The situation has deteriorated so much that in a recent interview with the Associated Press the president of Iraq’s self-rule Kurdish region (Massoud Barzani) demanded that Shiite leaders “agree on sharing power with their political opponents by September or else the Kurds could consider breaking away from Baghdad.” Tony Karon reports, that even the radical Shiite cleric Moqtada al-Sadr, whose support was critical to getting Maliki reelected, has taken to referring to the Prime Minister as “the dictator.” The most egregious case of power-grab by Maliki, was the ‘politically motivated’ prosecution of Iraqi Sunni leader and Vice-President of the government Tarek al-Hashemi, who was forced to flee Baghdad to escape criminal charges his supporters see as designed to hobble the Sunni political leadership. According to Mr. Karon, Hashemi fled first to Erbil, capital of Iraq’s Kurdistan Regional Government (KRG), whose terrain the Iraqi security forces are not authorized to enter, and is now in Turkey. Barzani’s ‘declaration of defiance’ against Maliki, is very much the result of Kurdistan’s long-held desire for independence as well as a consequence of Maliki’s recent attempt to consolidate power. Although unilateral secession by the Kurds (or the Sunnis) is somewhat unlikely, the escalation of political tensions by Maliki could lead to the eventual break-up of Iraq. Furthermore, according to the AP, Barzani also said he “wholeheartedly” supports Sunni desires to create their own self-rule regions in Iraq. Sunni lawmakers, whose Iraqiya political coalition won the most seats in 2010 parliamentary elections but were outmaneuvered by Maliki for the right to form the government, bitterly complain they have no say in Iraq’s power structure. Unless something is done to alleviate the concerns of Kurds and Sunnis about their place in the national government, Iraq might inevitable collapse. Salvation however might still lie within, courtesy of the federal elements of the Iraqi constitution. Iraq’s Ethnic Federalism Under Iraq’s current ‘ethnic/religious federalism’, major political powers are divided among people representing the three main religious/ethnic division: the Kurds who make up 20% of the population, and between the two Muslim faiths (65% Shia and 30% Sunni). Therefore, the convention that has emerged since 2005 (when the current constitution came to force) has been to elect a President of Kurdish background, while the Prime Minister has to come from the Shia community, and the Speaker of the Council of Representatives (parliament) from the Sunni community. In Iraq’s federal structure there are four different levels of government: the central government in Baghdad, the regions (currently only one – Iraqi Kurdistan), the provinces (eighteen) and the local administrations. The Iraqi constitution is very much typical federal constitution, in the way it distributes powers vertically. The federal/national government in Baghdad has limited enumerated powers, and the provinces are endowed with their own distinct political/legislative/judicial authorities. Therefore, the constitution provides that the regions enjoy a great amount of power under this structure, often at the expense of the central government in Baghdad. The constitutions federalism even grants provinces the power to join together and form ‘regions’ which will be semi-autonomous. Although Iraqi Kurdistan is the only legally defined region within Iraq, with its own government and quasi-official militia, other provinces can do the same through a referendum (See: Art. 115 of the Iraqi Constitution). Therefore, Article 115 applies to provinces joining together and forming a region. In fact, instead of blocking the creation of large and powerful administrative regions in the country that could confront central government or even each other, the constitution actually encourages it. This is particularly worrying considering that separatism is already a very powerful trend in Iraq. In Iraq, it was very much expected that the governorates will begin the process of grouping together immediately after the parliamentary elections of 2005. Political tensions between the three communities, could lead to further ethnic/religious divisions and the eventual ‘partition’ of Iraq. According to Zaid Al-Ali, “the result will most likely be that Iraq will eventually come to resemble Belgium, whose federal structure of government contains three states: Flanders (Flemish-speaking), Wallonia (French-speaking), and Brussels itself.” Similarly, Iraq is likely to be divided in three parts, with a Kurdish region in the north, a Shia-dominated south and a Sunni region in the center. Horizontal Federalism – the Iraqi Federation Council The only way to prevent this from happening is by strengthening ‘horizontal federalism’ within the Iraqi federal government. Under the Iraqi Constitution, there are to be two legislative houses, the Council of Representatives and the Federation Council. The Council of Representatives is directly elected by the people, “at a ratio of one representative per 100,000 Iraqi persons representing the entire Iraqi people.” The Council of Representatives has the power to enact all federal laws, including the approval and adjustment of the federal budget, conduct foreign policy and defense, and consent to a declaration of war or state of emergency. On the other hand, the Federation Council does not exist yet. The Federation Council is to be composed of representatives of regions and all governorates that have not joined a region. The Constitution does not enumerate the formation or functions of the Federation Council, but leaves those particulars to the Council of Representatives. (See: Article 62 of the Iraqi Constitution) There are plenty of available models for a second legislative chamber representing sub-national entities (like the German Bundesrat, or the South African National Council of Provinces), but of course the U.S. Senate could be the best model to protect the provinces and curb the federal government’s powers. A second legislative body, which represents all provinces equally, with a primary function of safeguarding the rights and privileges of the regions and provinces from excessive overreach by the federal government will go a long way in alleviating fears and concerns by the ethnic/religious minorities of Iraq – as well as strengthen federalism and prevent any further talk of secession of break-up.

#### Iraq civil war goes global

Ferguson ‘6

(Harvard Prof, 9/11, “The Next War of the World,” http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2006/09/the\_next\_war\_of\_the\_world.html)

What makes the escalating civil war in Iraq so disturbing is that it has the potential to spill over into neighboring countries. The Iranian government is already taking more than a casual interest in the politics of post-Saddam Iraq. And yet Iran, with its Sunni and Kurdish minorities, is no more homogeneous than Iraq. Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Syria cannot be expected to look on insouciantly if the Sunni minority in central Iraq begins to lose out to what may seem to be an Iranian-backed tyranny of the majority. The recent history of Lebanon offers a reminder that in the Middle East there is no such thing as a contained civil war. Neighbors are always likely to take an unhealthy interest in any country with fissiparous tendencies. The obvious conclusion is that a new "war of the world" may already be brewing in a region that, incredible though it may seem, has yet to sate its appetite for violence. And the ramifications of such a Middle Eastern conflagration would be truly global. Economically, the world would have to contend with oil at above $100 a barrel. Politically, those countries in western Europe with substantial Muslim populations might also find themselves affected as sectarian tensions radiated outward. Meanwhile, the ethnic war between Jews and Arabs in Israel, the Gaza Strip, and the West Bank shows no sign of abating. Is it credible that the United States will remain unscathed if the Middle East erupts? Although such an outcome may seem to be a low-probability, nightmare scenario, it is already more likely than the scenario of enduring peace in the region. If the history of the twentieth century is any guide, only economic stabilization and a credible reassertion of U.S. authority are likely to halt the drift toward chaos. Neither is a likely prospect. On the contrary, the speed with which responsibility for security in Iraq is being handed over to the predominantly Shiite and Kurdish security forces may accelerate the descent into internecine strife. Significantly, the audio statement released by Osama bin Laden in June excoriated not only the American-led "occupiers" of Iraq but also "certain sectors of the Iraqi people -- those who refused [neutrality] and stood to fight on the side of the crusaders." His allusions to "rejectionists," "traitors," and "agents of the Americans" were clearly intended to justify al Qaeda's policy of targeting Iraq's Shiites. The war of the worlds that H. G. Wells imagined never came to pass. But a war of the world did. The sobering possibility we urgently need to confront is that another global conflict is brewing today -- centered not on Poland or Manchuria, but more likely on Palestine and Mesopotamia.

### States solve best for HSR

#### ( ) States and Compacts solve best for HSR

Utah Foundation ‘10

The Utah Foundation is a private, non-profit public service agency established to study state and local government –“High-Speed Rail Around the World: A Survey and Comparison of Existing Systems” – Report Number 694, August 2010 – http://utahfoundation.org/img/pdfs/rr694.pdf

Ad hoc arrangements of states working together to build, fund and govern inter-state HSR are a possibility, assuming the states have the collective capital necessary to secure financing and the collective will to create inter-state compacts that regulate HSR and create governance structures that serve the interests of all those involved. If state transit authorities were able to get the funding necessary, they could effectively act as the national railway companies do in the cases of Eurostar and Thalys, with stakes in the ownership and governance of the system. Arrangements like this would also not preclude the ability to receive any federal funds that are directed towards HSR. In deed, among those HSR projects that have secured funding in the U.S., a few are such inter-state arrangements. In this way, coalitions of states could overcome some of the limitations of having a less-centralized national government compared to other HSR countries.

#### ( ) States can coordinate to develop national high speed rail

E.N.S. 9

(Environmental News Service, “Midwest Governors Coordinate to Seek High Speed Rail Funding,” July 27, http://www.ens-newswire.com/ens/jul2009/2009-07-27-095.html)

At the Midwest High Speed Rail Summit today in Chicago, an agreement was struck between eight states to work cooperatively to achieve Recovery Act funding to develop the Chicago Hub High Speed Rail Corridor - also called the Midwest corridor. Midwest governors and rail executives were hosted by Illinois Governor Pat Quinn, U.S. Senator Dick Durbin of Illinois and Chicago Mayor Richard Daley. "We are stronger working as a region than we are individually, and I want to thank the other Midwest governors for their cooperation and commitment," said Governor Quinn. "We are determined to take full advantage of federal recovery funds and bring high speed rail to Illinois and the Midwest. Today's agreement will help make our vision a reality." The governors envision a nationwide network including a Chicago hub that would connect trains traveling up to 110 miles per hour serving cities across the region, along with connections to adjoining regional corridors. This plan reflects the proposals advanced earlier this year by President Barack Obama and U.S. Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood. Under the Recovery Act, President Obama has made $8 billion available nationwide for high speed passenger rail, the largest investment that the federal government has made in over a decade. Five governors attended the summit - Iowa Governor Chet Culver; Wisconsin Governor Jim Doyle; Michigan Governor Jennifer Granholm and Ohio Governor Ted Strickland, as well as Illinois Governor Quinn. Eight Midwest states signed the Memorandum of Understanding including Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Ohio and Wisconsin. The agreement signed today establishes a Midwest steering group to provide a single voice in support of the region's collective high speed rail priorities. The steering group will coordinate each state's individual applications and advocacy to the Federal Railroad Administration for Recovery Act funding.

#### ( ) No logical solvency deficit – states have to do the construction anyway and states say no to the plan

Cooper ‘10

(Michael, writer for the New York Times, “Rail Service Expansion Imperiled at State Level,” Oct 4, http://www.nytimes.com/2010/10/05/us/05rail.html)

Republicans running for governor in a handful of states could block, or significantly delay, one of President Obama’s signature initiatives: his plan to expand the passenger rail system and to develop the nation’s first bullet-train service. Enlarge This Image In his State of the Union address this year, the president called for building high-speed rail, and backed up his words with $8 billion in stimulus money, distributed to various states, for rail projects. But Republican candidates for governor in some of the states that won the biggest stimulus rail awards are reaching for the emergency brake. In Wisconsin, which got more than $810 million in federal stimulus money to build a train line between Milwaukee and Madison, Scott Walker, the Milwaukee County executive and Republican candidate for governor, has made his opposition to the project central to his campaign. Mr. Walker, who worries that the state could be required to spend $7 million to $10 million a year to operate the trains once the line is built, started a Web site, NoTrain.com, and has run a television advertisement in which he calls the rail project a boondoggle. “I’m Scott Walker,” he says in the advertisement, “and if I’m elected as your next governor, we’ll stop this train.” Similar concerns are threatening to stall many of the nation’s biggest train projects. In Ohio, the Republican candidate for governor, John Kasich, is vowing to kill a $400 million federal stimulus project to link Cleveland, Columbus and Cincinnati by rail. In Florida, Rick Scott, the Republican candidate for governor, has questioned whether the state should invest in the planned rail line from Orlando to Tampa. The state got $1.25 billion in federal stimulus money for the project, but it will cost at least twice that much to complete. And the nation’s most ambitious high-speed rail project, California’s $45 billion plan to link Los Angeles and San Francisco with trains that would go up to 220 miles per hour, could be delayed if Meg Whitman, a Republican, is elected governor. “In the face of the state’s current fiscal crisis, Meg doesn’t believe we can afford the costs associated with new high-speed rail at this time,” said Tucker Bounds, a campaign spokesman. Ms. Whitman’s desire to delay the project, which has already received $2.25 billion in stimulus money, drew a rebuke from the administration of Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger, a Republican who champions high-speed rail. “To say ‘now is not the time’ shows a very narrow vision,” said Matt David, the governor’s communications director. The state-level opposition is a reminder of the challenge of building a national transportation project in the United States: while the federal government can set priorities, the construction is up to the states. With recent polls showing all of the anti-rail Republican candidates leading or within striking distance of their pro-rail Democratic rivals, it is possible they could be elected and try to stop the train projects. Federal officials, meanwhile, are incredulous that candidates are threatening to spurn stimulus money that their states competed ferociously to win just a year ago. “The bottom line is that high-speed rail is a national program that will connect the country, spur economic development and bring manufacturing jobs to the U.S.,” Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood, a former Republican congressman, said in a statement. “It will also transform transportation in America, much like the Interstate highway system did under President Eisenhower. It’s hard to imagine what would have happened to states like Ohio and Wisconsin if their leaders had decided they didn’t want to be connected to the rest of the country back then.” Several candidates said they wanted to spend the stimulus rail money on roads and bridges, but it is unlikely they would be able to do so without changing the law: the stimulus, which included $28 billion for roads and bridges, required that the $8 billion for rail projects be spent on rail projects. Federal officials declined to speculate on what would happen if anti-rail candidates were to win. But states that turn down rail money would probably have to return it to the federal government, which could then award it to states that want it. Building a real high-speed rail network, like the ones expanding in Europe and Asia, is costly.

### Neg – Feds fails, States solve better

#### ( ) Federal actions fails – State remedies solve better

A.G.C. ‘11

(“THE CASE FOR INFRASTRUCTURE & REFORM: Why and How the Federal Government Should Continue to Fund Vital Infrastructure in the New Age of Public Austerity” – THE ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA – AGC’s Case for Infrastructure & Reform in based in large part on comments from leaders, including those who participated in a March 2, 2011 panel discussion hosted by the association and The Weekly Standard, including Reason Foundation’s Robert Poole, Virginia Secretary of Transportation Sean Connaughton, Oklahoma Congressman James Lankford and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce’s Bruce Josten. May 19th – http://www.agc.org/galleries/news/Case-for-Infrastructure-Reform.pdf)

Give State and Local Officials More Flexibility Federal infrastructure programs have become overly prescriptive and insistent on one-size fits-all solutions. This limits the ability of state and local officials to create projects that meet federal needs while accommodating often unique situations. Aside from setting minimum safety standards and ensuring high levels of design and construction quality, federal infrastructure programs should eliminate the high cost of accepting federal funds by eliminating uniform requirements, including Buy America provisions, and the tremendous amount of paperwork that comes with those requirements.

### Defending Compacts

This solves 100% of the Aff – State compacts for corridors and hub networks were set-up for the 11 major HSR lines envisioned by the White House. They can solve.

B.L.E.T. ‘9

Policy Position Paper – “High Speed Rail” – Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and Trainmen – http://www.ble-t.org/pr/pdf/RAIL\_BLETProposal\_2C.pdf

Current Projects The funding in both the stimulus and the FY09 omnibus bill has enabled municipalities, states and multistate compacts to apply for funding for commuter and high speed rail projects. Among the projects in the development stages are the California high speed rail projects which will run north and south through the state. Voters in the state voted for a $9 billion bond measure in November 2008 to develop the corridor. Also under consideration is a high speed rail line from Las Vegas to Los Angeles. Another corridor that is receiving state funding is the 3 C (Cleveland, Columbus and Cincinnati) corridor in Ohio which received funds in the most recent Ohio Department of Transportation budget. The State of Florida hopes to use stimulus funds to develop a high speed line between Walt Disney World and Orlando International Airport. Many other states hope to use funding to create or improve commuter rail lines, including New Jersey, Minnesota and Illinois. There are 11 federally designated high speed rail corridors: • the Northeast Corridor (Boston to Washington, D.C.); • the California Corridor (Bay Area–Los Angeles– San Diego); • the Empire Corridor (NYC to Buffalo); • the Pacific Northwest Corridor (Vancouver, B.C. to Eugene, OR); • the South Central Corridor(San Antonio, Austin, Dallas, Little Rock, Oklahoma City, Tulsa); • the Gulf Coast Corridor (Houston, New Orleans, Mobile, Meridian, Birmingham); • the Chicago Hub Network (Chicago, Twin Cities, St. Louis, Kansas City, Detroit, Cleveland, Columbus, Cincinnati, Louisville, Indianapolis); • the Florida Corridor (Orlando, Tampa, Miami); • the Keystone Corridor (Philadelphia, Harrisburg, Pittsburgh); • the Northern New England Corridor (Portland, Boston, Montreal); • the Southeast Corridor (Washington, Richmond, Raleigh, Charlotte, Atlanta, Columbia, Macon, Savannah, Birmingham, Jacksonville).

### A-to “Delegation Fiat = not real world”

#### ( ) Yes, our fiat is real-world. Delegation to States is advocated in best survey of policy-literature.

A.G.C. ‘11

(“THE CASE FOR INFRASTRUCTURE & REFORM: Why and How the Federal Government Should Continue to Fund Vital Infrastructure in the New Age of Public Austerity” – THE ASSOCIATED GENERAL CONTRACTORS OF AMERICA – AGC’s Case for Infrastructure & Reform in based in large part on comments from leaders, including those who participated in a March 2, 2011 panel discussion hosted by the association and The Weekly Standard, including Reason Foundation’s Robert Poole, Virginia Secretary of Transportation Sean Connaughton, Oklahoma Congressman James Lankford and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce’s Bruce Josten. May 19th – http://www.agc.org/galleries/news/Case-for-Infrastructure-Reform.pdf)

Given the essential role the federal government clearly must play in investing in the nation’s infrastructure, as well as the significant problems with our current approach, it is clear that we need to rethink and reform virtually every aspect of our approach to infrastructure. That is why the Associated General Contractors of America has undertaken an exhaustive review of the many ideas currently being offered for reforming infrastructure. We’ve met with leading policy thinkers and former members of the President’s Council of Economic Advisors, reviewed reports from two Congressionally-chartered study commissions, and even convened, in cooperation with The Weekly Standard, our own policy panel to discuss the best way to reform our approach to infrastructure. The association compiled those many reform proposals and has selected many of the most promising ones. In addition, we crafted new proposals based on many of the insights and observations others have made about our current infrastructure approach. In assembling and crafting these recommendations, we wanted to make sure that our proposed changes also help refocus the federal role exclusively on areas and projects that are clearly in the federal interest, and get the federal government out of other potentially worthwhile undertakings that should more suitably be handled at the state or local levels. Our recommendations include: Eliminate Transportation Spending Programs that Are Not Truly Federal Since the completion of much of the Interstate Highway System in the 1980’s, the federal surface transportation program has lost focus. Too many politicians have diverted gas tax revenue away from highway maintenance and expansions and instead use them to fund personal priorities. As a result, gas tax payers are being forced to fund programs designed to encourage children to walk to school, to preserve covered bridges that handle little to no interstate commerce, and to finance fitness and recreational facilities. As a result, less than 70 percent of Highway Trust Fund dollars go to road maintenance or capacity projects of any kind. Congress and the Administration should either eliminate these programs that are not truly federal and/or devolve them to state and local governments where they would be more appropriate.

### A-to “Feds have better coordination”

####  ( ) No *long-term* Federal Solvency – lack of maintenance and organization.

Puentes ‘10

(Robert Puentes – Senior Fellow @ Brooking’s Metropolitan Policy Program – Congressional Testimony – Hearing on Infrastructure Banks – May 13, 2010 – http://www.brookings.edu/research/testimony/2010/05/13-infrastructure-puentes)

The federal government spends about $65 billion each year on infrastructure—transportation, energy, water and environmental protection [1]. While the figure is not negligible, the investment in infrastructure is only 2.2 percent of total federal spending. More than three-quarters of this spending consists of transportation grants to state and local governments ($50.4 billion) [2]. While most of the attention has been on increasing funding for projects, there are also renewed calls to improve the way the federal government invests in infrastructure. Today, the federal government generally does not select projects on a merit basis, is biased against maintenance, and involves little long term planning. In this context, there is interest in a new federal entity for funding and financing infrastructure projects through a national infrastructure bank.

### A-to “States can’t afford to do HSR”

#### First – their arg assumes States run an expensive system. Our 1NC Chicago Tribune ev changes the would expensive infrastructure. Once authority was delegated, States would have an incentive to build cost-effective projects.

#### Second – Fiat solves. They can run a State budget tradeoff disad, but we fiated that States would fund the project

#### And, States will find creative funding schemes.

Puentes ‘9

(et al, Robert Puentes – Senior Fellow @ Brooking’s Metropolitan Policy Program – Innovative State Transportation:

Funding and Financing Policy Options for States – – January 05, 2009 – http://www.nga.org/files/live/sites/NGA/files/pdf/0901TRANSPORTATIONFUNDING.PDF)

Each state is facing the challenges of rising demand and inadequate revenue to some degree. However, they each have unique needs and strategic goals and objectives. In states with less population and traffic density, certain user-fee solutions may not be as feasible as they would be in more densely populated states and regions. Governors are pursuing varied options to address these challenges, and states are pioneering new means of planning for and funding and financing transportation. Some states have worked to increase or index their motor fuel taxes to overcome purchasing power declines and to increase revenue for transportation projects. Some states also are increasing vehicle registration fees and looking to general fund revenues to fund transportation. More broadly, states are pursuing a number of innovative funding and financing options that also can help to reduce demand. Options that are discussed in this report include: • Debt financing strategies, including state infrastructure banks; • Tolling, vehicle miles traveled fees, congestion pricing, and other user fees; • Public-private partnerships that leverage private capital and expertise; and • Freight-specific strategies.

#### ( ) States can attract private partners – gaining huge short-term revenue boosts

Puentes ‘9

(et al, Robert Puentes – Senior Fellow @ Brooking’s Metropolitan Policy Program – Innovative State Transportation:

Funding and Financing Policy Options for States – – January 05, 2009 – http://www.nga.org/files/live/sites/NGA/files/pdf/0901TRANSPORTATIONFUNDING.PDF)

Next, states can seek to increase investment in the system in the near-term. States and the federal government have long-relied on the motor fuel tax, and are likely to continue to do so. However, states have several options to supplement motor fuel tax revenue. Some states have looked to public-private partnerships to attract private sector capital and project expertise in order to move forward on priority projects. One type of public-private partnership, an asset lease, has the potential to provide states with significant upfront capital which can be used to fund a number of transportation priorities. However, these partnerships often require either new user fees or private collection of existing user fees (such as tolls), that provide a return on investment to the private partner. A public-private partnership strategy alone will not solve all of a state’s transportation challenges, but carefully managed partnerships can complement existing revenue, accelerate project delivery, and attract private capital and expertise.

#### ( ) Plan triggers state spending disad too – only a chance the counterplan develops a *cost effective* rail system

Goff 12

(Emily, writer for Heritage, “The California Conundrum: New, Costly High-Speed Rail vs. Massive Budget Deficit,” May 23, http://blog.heritage.org/2012/05/23/the-california-conundrum-new-costly-high-speed-rail-vs-massive-budget-deficit/)

The federal-state transit courtship ritual is by now a well-rehearsed dance. Washington’s alluring checkbook tempts states enough that they commit matching funds to projects they otherwise would not even dream of pursuing on their own. Take high-speed rail and other passenger rail projects—they are expensive to build and maintain, and states are faced with many other pressing infrastructure needs but limited resources to pay for them. So, “free” money from Washington seems too good to be true. Then come project delays and construction cost overruns. Federal grants also have strings attached, such as union wage requirements, which send costs skyward. Soon, the price tag of an HSR project is substantially more than what states signed up for. Once the HSR line is built, another pesky fact materializes: Actual rail ridership rates do not necessarily equal capacity estimates. Poor ridership translates into large funding gaps, and befuddled states then have trouble covering operating expenses, let alone capital costs. Taxpayers are on the hook subsidizing the rail line long after the federal money train has left the station.

#### ( ) High-Speed Rail boosts *local property value* – meaning local government will help fund projects

Puentes ‘9

(et al, Robert Puentes – Senior Fellow @ Brooking’s Metropolitan Policy Program – Innovative State Transportation:

Funding and Financing Policy Options for States – – January 05, 2009 – http://www.nga.org/files/live/sites/NGA/files/pdf/0901TRANSPORTATIONFUNDING.PDF)

The idea is that rail systems, by improving accessibility, will increase land values. The increment over any pre-existing property value can then be taxed, thereby “capturing” the benefit that accrues to private landowners by virtue of the public rail investment and helping to defray rail construction or operating costs. Although the idea of value capture has been discussed in policy circles for years, it is employed in relatively few places and most prominently in the form of benefit assessment districts in metropolitan areas like Miami, Florida; Los Angeles, California; and Denver, Colorado.103 For example, construction of a transit station is likely to increase land values in the walking radius near the area. The local government could choose to dedicate the taxes from the incremental increase in property values to repaying bonds issued for its construction, an approach known as tax increment financing (TIF). Alternatively, private property owners could choose to create a special tax district that would allocate costs of the project to beneficiaries. In most states, a vote of the affected landowners is required. The general principle at work here is known as value capture financing, where non-transportation users, primarily adjacent property owners who benefit from transportation projects, contribute to the costs of such projects. It should be noted that the revenues generated by value capture financing schemes generally do not flow directly to the state. However, they are becoming an increasingly important source of local match revenues to state projects, as such contributions grow as a percentage of total state project costs. In 2004, it is estimated that such specialized taxes and contributions amounted to $15.4 billion for highway projects ($3.8 billion federal and state, $11.6 billion local) and $9.5 billion for transit projects ($3.6 billion state, $6.1 billion local), for a total of $24.9 billion.104 Table 4 details the role that specialized taxes, such as TIF or special tax districts, play in funding highways and transit.

### A-to States can’t solve Private Investors

#### ( ) States won’t *need* as much private investment – our Chicago Tribune and Horowitz ev proves Feds make projects more expensive. States would run more efficient systems and not need private investors to foot the bill

#### ( ) The *Aff* can’t solve private investment, either. Too many roadblocks for *significant* private investment in HSR.

Dutton ‘10

(Audrey Dutton is a reporter for The Gazette; The Bond Buyer – April 28th – http://www.bondbuyer.com/issues/119\_329/rail\_transportation\_bill\_high\_speed-1011398-1.html)

The momentum building behind high-speed rail in the past couple of years has encouraged rail proponents. Nevertheless, ambitious plans to link major cities and give commuters and leisure travelers a reasonable alternative to flying and driving may hit some roadblocks. One of the largest hurdles is how to pay for a sustained investment in rail, a range of sources said in interviews. A DROP IN THE BUCKET The $10 billion that Congress and the administration have provided thus far is a pittance compared to the overall sum that is needed. A new fast-rail system will be expensive — about $65 million per mile, according to the National Conference of State Legislatures, or $600 billion for a complete, 17,000-mile national network, according to the U.S. High Speed Rail Association. Funding from private investors or governments is hard to come by for even the most commonplace infrastructure, much less one that aims to fundamentally change how Americans get from place to place and whose public benefits are, according to the NCSL, “difficult to predict.”

#### ( ) States *can* attract private investment in HSR

Freemark ‘11

(Yonah – Master of Science in Transportation from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Bachelor of Arts in Architecture, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Yale University with Distinction. Also a freelance journalist who has been published in Planning Magazine; Next American City Magazine; Dissent; The Atlantic Cities; Next American City Online; and The Infrastructurist – He created and continues to write for the website The Transport Politic – The Transport Politic – “Doing Right by the Public: PPPs in High-Speed Rail” – August 27th – http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2011/08/27/doing-right-by-the-public-ppps-in-high-speed-rail/)

But because of more detailed projections, the 178-mile first phase of the project is now expected to cost far more than initially envisioned — $10 to $13.9 billion instead of $7.1 billion — and it will need an injection of funds from another source to be constructed. With a promise to the state’s citizens that another demand for California-wide funds will be avoided, few local dollars to contribute, and an utter inability to rely on Washington for practically anything, that means the system will have to find private investors to join in. Whatever the relative merits of allowing private companies to invest in what is fundamentally public infrastructure, California has no other place to turn for the successful completion of its system. California is not alone; with a depressed economy and few public sector funds available, there is increasing recognition of the importance of engaging private-sector funds in the creation of infrastructure. Illinois Governor Pat Quinn signed a bill this week authorizing public-private partnerships (PPPs) to be used for the creation of infrastructure in his state. Critics of the California High-Speed Rail Authority have repeatedly argued that the agency would be unable to locate businesses that might be willing to contribute to the system, but international examples suggest that there is significant private sector interest in infrastructure construction. The Authority will release a request for qualifications soon and select a winning bidder in early 2012. But it has yet to clarify the manner in which it would structure its relationship with private companies in terms of financing, construction, and operations. For precedents, the state should to look at France, which has recently signed two very large deals with private financing and construction conglomerates for the completion of two new extensions of its already large high-speed rail network. They provide two different models for engaging PPPs.

#### ( ) Empirically, States *can* attract Public-Private partnerships for investment.

Puentes ‘9

(et al, Robert Puentes – Senior Fellow @ Brooking’s Metropolitan Policy Program – Innovative State Transportation:

Funding and Financing Policy Options for States – – January 05, 2009 – http://www.nga.org/files/live/sites/NGA/files/pdf/0901TRANSPORTATIONFUNDING.PDF)

Next, states can seek to increase investment in the system in the near-term. States and the federal government have long-relied on the motor fuel tax, and are likely to continue to do so. However, states have several options to supplement motor fuel tax revenue. Some states have looked to public-private partnerships to attract private sector capital and project expertise in order to move forward on priority projects. One type of public-private partnership, an asset lease, has the potential to provide states with significant upfront capital which can be used to fund a number of transportation priorities. However, these partnerships often require either new user fees or private collection of existing user fees (such as tolls), that provide a return on investment to the private partner. A public-private partnership strategy alone will not solve all of a state’s transportation challenges, but carefully managed partnerships can complement existing revenue, accelerate project delivery, and attract private capital and expertise.

### A-to States Can’t solve “Grade Separation”

#### ( ) This makes no sense – grade separation is just building rail line that avoids other transportation lines – all of our ev that “States can solve” speaks to their ability to plan for items like grade separations.

#### ( ) States and locals *can* solve grade separation – Illinois proves.

I.D.O.T. ‘11

(Illinois Dept of Transportation – “Governor Pat Quinn FY 2012-2016, Proposed Rail Improvement Program” – Summer – http://www.dot.state.il.us/prip2012/2012program.pdf)

The Fiscal Year 2012-2016 Proposed Rail Improvement Program provides funding for rail freight, rail passenger and high-speed rail capital projects, as well as state operating assistance for supplemental Amtrak service. The capital program elements over the five years are summarized below. Rail Freight Program. The purpose of the Rail Freight Program is to provide capital assistance to communities, railroads and shippers to preserve and improve rail freight service in Illinois. For Fiscal Years 2012-2016, the program proposes S16 million from current federal and state revenues for rail freight improvements. Rail Passenger Program. Illinois supports a National Passenger railroad system that not only serves the residents of Illinois but also plays an integral part of a balanced transportation system. The Fiscal Year 2012-2016 program proposes S235 million for capital projects to facilitate passenger service expansion. Chicago Region Environmental Transportation and Efficiency Program The CREATE program is a multi-billion dollar effort to improve Chicago's extensive rail system by modernizing connections and grade separating highway and rail traffic. Because Chicago is the nation's transportation hub, this program will increase the efficiency and reliability of much of the nation's rail service. This public-private partnership will be funded through state and federal sources, along with the freight railroads. The five-year program provides S300 million from the State Capital Bill for TIGER grant funding and $100 million from the Illinois Jobs Now program.High-Speed Rail. The five-year program provides S400 million in addition to federal dollars from American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funds for improving the signal system, track and equipment along the Chicago-St. Louis corridor to allow trains to travel at speeds of 110 miles-per-hour (mph). For Fiscal Year 2012 the capital program allocates a total of $159.2 million in current state and federal revenues for improving passenger service and for freight improvement projects. In addition to the program for capital improvements, the state provides operating subsidies for state-supported trains between Chicago and Carbondale, Quincy, St. Louis and Milwaukee. For Fiscal Year 2012 these subsidies will total $26 million.

### A-to “States can’t solve high-tech signaling”

#### This makes no sense – high-tech signaling is not a form of expertise, it’s just technology that helps trains operate safely during fog. There’s no real Fed key warrant here other than money.

#### ( ) And, high-tech signaling can be purchased – States have already done it.

#### National Conference of State Legislatures ‘11

(“Transport Report” – Volume 2, Issue 7 – August/Sept. 2011 – http://www.ncsl.org/documents/transportation/trn-augsept2011.pdf)

On Aug. 3, U.S. Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood announced that California, Illinois, Iowa, Michigan and Missouri would collectively receive $336.2 million to purchase next-generation, American-made trains. According to a further release on Aug. 8, California’s share is part of a $179 million total award to the state to continue building a statewide passenger rail network with both high-speed and intercity service. These dollars will also be used for new track construction and installation of high-tech signaling. Despite recent critiques and pending reform legislation, California is continuing to lay the groundwork for the nation’s first 220-mph, “true” high-speed rail system. In total, $10.1 billion in federal funds have been provided so far to 32 states and D.C. for high-speed and intercity passenger rail projects; of that, $7.3 billion has been obligated.

## Federalism backlines

### Uniqueness for Iraq scenario

\*\*\*Note: talk with your lab leaders about how “advantages to cplans” sometimes have tricky uniqueness args – this is one such example\*\*

#### ( ) Al-Maliki’s power grab will lead to civil war now

Parker 12 (Press Fellow-CFR & Former Iraq Correspondent for LA Times, Foreign Affairs, March/April, “The Iraq We Left Behind”)

Nine years after U.S. troops toppled Saddam Hussein and just a few months after the last U.S. soldier left Iraq, the country has become something close to a failed state. Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki presides over a system rife with corruption and brutality, in which political leaders use security forces and militias to repress enemies and intimidate the general population. The law exists as a weapon to be wielded against rivals and to hide the misdeeds of allies. The dream of an Iraq governed by elected leaders answerable to the people is rapidly fading away. The Iraqi state cannot provide basic services, including regular electricity in summer, clean water, and decent health care; meanwhile, unemployment among young men hovers close to 30 percent, making them easy recruits for criminal gangs and militant factions. Although the level of violence is down from the worst days of the civil war in 2006 and 2007, the current pace of bombings and shootings is more than enough to leave most Iraqis on edge and deeply uncertain about their futures. They have lost any hope that the bloodshed will go away and simply live with their dread. Acrimony in the political realm and the violence in the cities create a destabilizing feedback loop, whereby the bloodshed sows mistrust in the halls of power and politicians are inclined to settle scores with their proxies in the streets. Both Maliki and his rivals are responsible for the slow slide toward chaos, prisoners of their own history under Saddam. Iraq today is divided between once-persecuted Shiite religious parties, such as Maliki’s Dawa Party, still hungry for revenge, and secular and Sunni parties that long for a less bloody version of Saddam’s Baath Party, with its nationalist ideology and intolerance of religious and ethnic politics. Meanwhile, the Kurds maneuver gingerly around the divisions in Baghdad. Their priority is to preserve their near autonomy in northern Iraq and ward off the resurrection of a powerful central government that could one day besiege their cities and bombard their villages, as Baghdad did throughout the twentieth century. All sides hold the others responsible for all the friends and family killed during the Saddam era and the civil war that followed the U.S. invasion. All of Iraq’s political leaders seem to live by the maxim that no enemy can become a partner, just a temporary ally; betrayal lurks around every corner. Each politician grabs as much power as he can, and unchecked ambition, ego, and historical grudges lead them all to ignore the consequences of their behavior for Iraq’s new institutions and its society. Maliki’s tactics closely echo the pattern laid down by his predecessors, from Iraq’s post-Ottoman monarchs to its ﬁrst prime minister, Abdul Karim Kassem, to Saddam himself: put yourself ﬁrst, and guard power with a ruthless security apparatus. Maliki’s opponents, including his secular rival Ayad Allawi, the head of the Iraqiya Party, have given no indication they would act any differently. In the last year, Maliki has chipped away at safeguards for democracy, stocking the country’s Human Rights Ministry with loyalists and using the state’s anticorruption offices to target political enemies. Maliki’s harassment and persecution of anyone deemed a threat to himself or his party has dramatically reduced freedom throughout Iraq. Most ominously for his country, and himself, Maliki, through his bullying and nepotistic rule, threatens to cause his own undoing and push Iraq back into civil war. ABSENTEE WASHINGTON This was not the Iraq the United States envisioned as it planned its invasion less than a decade ago. After toppling Saddam in 2003, U.S. policy aimed to create a democratic state that enshrined civil liberties; national reconciliation; a fair, apolitical judiciary; and freedom of speech. However, this goal was jeopardized from day one of the U.S. occupation by a series of debilitating blunders: not sending enough U.S. forces to secure the country, dissolving the old Iraqi military, and allowing a draconian purge of Baath Party members from civilian ministries. It was only belatedly, in Iraq’s darkest hour, that the Bush administration sent thousands more troops to stop the civil war that had erupted. During the “surge,” in 2007, the United States forced the ruling Shiite religious parties to take steps toward making peace with the Sunnis, blocked blatantly political arrests, and worked to marginalize, if not jail, officials implicated in violence. The hope was that improved security would allow Iraq to reach stability and acquire the trappings of liberal governance. Maliki and his colleagues are not the only ones to blame for the dashing of these hopes and the slide away from democracy. Since the last months of the Bush administration and the beginning of the Obama presidency, rather than concentrate on shoring up democratic principles, as it had during the surge, Washington has instead focused on securing its long-term strategic relationship with Baghdad, especially with the prime minister, so that it could more easily withdraw U.S. forces. In the process, the United States failed to capitalize on the gains of the U.S. troop surge — the Iraqi people’s renunciation of religious extremists and desire for normalcy — thereby damaging the chances that a uniﬁed, nonsectarian government could emerge. Washington’s biggest mistake of recent years came in the summer of 2010, when the United States dropped the pretense of neutrality by backing Maliki for the post of prime minister over Allawi — even though Allawi’s party list had received more votes in the national elections held in March. U.S. officials argued that only a Shiite Islamist had the credibility and legitimacy to serve as prime minister and disparaged any alternative to Maliki. But by anointing Maliki, a devout Shiite who already had Iran’s endorsement, the United States gave him the conﬁdence to avoid serious compromises with Allawi, a secular Shiite supported by the country’s Sunnis. In November 2010, Maliki and Allawi reached a power-sharing agreement, sponsored by the Kurdish government in Erbil and Washington, in which Maliki was supposed to relinquish his direct command of the security forces and his tight grip on the cabinet and most ministries. The agreement awarded the Defense Ministry to Iraqiya and appointed Allawi to head a new consultative policy body. U.S. officials bragged that they had outmaneuvered Iran and midwifed a nonsectarian government in Baghdad. But Washington quickly disengaged from actually ensuring that the provisions of the deal were implemented. U.S. Vice President Joseph Biden, the Obama administration’s leading ﬁgure on Iraq policy, was largely absent from Iraq for nearly a year as the power-sharing arrangement unraveled. At the U.S. embassy in Baghdad, officials complained in private about Maliki’s refusal to share power as he had promised, but they kept quiet in public, even as Maliki’s military command stepped up its campaign of harassment and arrests of those considered rivals. When I was in Baghdad last June, I asked a U.S. diplomat why the embassy had said nothing about an ongoing crackdown against pro-democracy activists, including an incident in which Iraqi security agents had beaten protesters in broad daylight. He said that although U.S. officials had a “regular” dialogue with Maliki about human rights, Washington’s “overriding focus and concern” was building a security relationship with the Iraqi government. But by turning a blind eye to Maliki’s encroaching authoritarianism, U.S. officials allowed Iraq’s political culture to disintegrate. (It was this disarray that also made it impossible for U.S. officials to get Iraq’s leaders to push an immunity agreement through parliament so that a small number of U.S. troops could stay on after 2011.) Rather than help Iraq move forward, the United States allowed the country to drift back toward sectarianism and authoritarian rule. The political situation in Baghdad hit a new low last December. The day after the last U.S. soldier left the country, Maliki suddenly called for the arrest of Iraq’s Sunni vice president, Tariq al-Hashimi, on charges of running death squads. With this move, Maliki abandoned any lingering pretense that he was interested in national reconciliation and undermined the promises that he and U.S. President Barack Obama had made just days before in Washington, when they declared Iraq a stable democracy. Hashimi ﬂed to Kurdistan, and the country’s political process was plunged into limbo. The crisis exposed the artiﬁcial, Potemkin-village-like nature of Iraq’s democratic system and how swiftly the feuds among Iraq’s national leaders could endanger the state. No political ﬁgure, no matter how high ranking, now doubts Maliki’s ability to harness the law and the state to his ambitions. Still, Maliki lacks the authority to eliminate all his enemies, by virtue of being enmeshed in a parliament-based system, which was imposed by the United States after 2003. But he will keep striving for absolute power, using fear, intimidation, and cronyism. The opposition will conspire against him and attempt to sabotage his policies, positive or negative, out of the desire to see him fail. But handicapped by their own divisions, they will never succeed in ousting him. This corrosive deadlock will only fan further disillusionment with the current order, sending the political system hurtling toward implosion. One of three outcomes — all dangerous — will likely result. First, some speciﬁc event or series of events — for example, the local and national elections expected in 2013 and 2014, respectively, or an escalation of the campaign of arrests against Maliki’s foes — could trigger violence involving Iraq’s tribes, sects, ethnicities, and parties. Second, the ineffectual rule of the central government could lead Sunni and Shiite regional leaders to carve out their own autonomous zones, leaving Iraq a state in name only, a prospect that could also ignite bloodshed if Baghdad refuses to recognize those boundaries or the provinces begin to ﬁght over territory. Third, Shiite political ﬁgures and military officers could mount a coup, claiming the current government was endangering the country and declaring special rule for an emergency period. Repressive crackdowns would follow, triggering a cycle of retributive violence.

#### The al-Maliki government will inevitably collapse

Pollack 11 (11/15, Director-Saban Center at Brookings, Prospects for Increased Iranian Influence in Iraq, http://www.brookings.edu/testimony/2011/1115\_iran\_iraq\_pollack.aspx)

Unfortunately, this is precisely the pattern that is manifesting itself in Iraq once again. The United States is disengaging from Iraq prematurely. Iraq shows no signs of being able to handle its security, its political differences, and its economic challenges by itself. Far from seeing the American departure as a clarion call to set aside their differences and make hard compromises to avoid the abyss, Iraq’s political leaders are doing the exact opposite. So far, they have refused to compromise, dug-in their heels, employed every advantage to undercut their rivals, employed violence and engaged in graft whenever they could, and generally put the interests of their narrow power base ahead of the common good of all Iraqis. This, of course, is the path back to civil war. It is also the path toward ever greater Iranian influence in Iraq. As before, Iran has exploited the fissures, played divide and conquer, used its limited conventional and unconventional capabilities to exacerbate fear and mistrust and create an expectation of greater violence in the future which has prompted Iraqis to make short-term moves designed to protect themselves at the expense of a better future for the entire country. It is too soon and too glib to argue that Iran has “won” in Iraq and we have “lost,” but it is undeniable that our influence in Iraq is waning quickly, while that of Iran is growing at a similar pace. What’s more, it is going to be very difficult—albeit not impossible—for the United States to change this dynamic. Indeed, it is probably more likely that the Iraqis may do so on their own with only modest help from the United States, although this scenario is probably the least likely of the range of plausible futures one can imagine for Iraq in the near-term. This is more a statement about how little ability the United States has to fundamentally affect Iraq’s political development at this point than it is about the likelihood that Iraqis will spontaneously start doing the right things, the things that they have been doing the opposite of over the past two years. Scenarios for the Future of Iraq It is not hard to discern that Iraq today is not headed in a positive direction. The government remains utterly paralyzed by the country's divisions, and by leaders absolutely unwilling to make compromises of any kind to break the logjam. Efforts to fight corruption, nepotism, and politicization of the military and bureaucracy have been discarded and all of these problems are running rampant. Indeed, corruption currently appears to be the only engine of government activity. Were there no corruption, the government might not be doing anything at all. Violence has re-emerged as a tool of various groups—including the governing coalition—seeking to advance their political agendas. This in turn is pushing other groups in the direction of taking up arms again if only to defend themselves against other groups using violence since the government is unwilling to apolitically enforce the rule of law. Looking forward from this state of affairs, it is possible to imagine four broad, plausible directions in which Iraq might move. None would be worth celebrating, although some would be much worse than others. Unfortunately, in every one of these scenarios, Iran's influence in Iraq seems likely to grow, at least in the short term, which is both part of the reason that the scenarios are pessimistic (since Iran has an interest in seeing Iraq weak and divided) and part of where the pessimism derives from (since greater Iranian influence in Iraq, given the goals and composition of the current Iranian regime, is invariably problematic for American interests in Iraq). A new dictatorship. Many Iraqis and many observers of Iraq, believe that the most likely future for Iraq is a new dictatorship, this time by the Shi'a. Although Prime Minister Maliki almost certainly is not consciously seeking such a position, his approach to Iraq's problems is nonetheless taking him that way all the same. Maliki evinces considerable paranoia, something entirely understandable from someone who was a member of a small, revolutionary party relentlessly chased by Saddam's security services for almost 30 years. This makes him prone to see conspiracies, especially among Sunnis. He is often impatient with Iraq's democratic politics, and he just as frequently acts arbitrarily, extra-constitutionally, even unconstitutionally to root out a suspected conspiracy or overcome political opposition. He is consolidating power within Iraq, and even within the Iraqi government, in a tight circle of people around himself. He is purging large numbers of people from other parties, groups, sects and ethnicities and rapidly politicizing Iraq's relatively professional armed forces. If Maliki, or another Shi'a were to emerge as a new dictator, he would inevitably be pushed into Iran's arms. A Shi'a dictator of Iraq would axiomatically be rejected and ostracized by the majority Sunni states of the Arab world. The only ally he would have would be Iran—and perhaps Syria, if the Asads can hold power (and indeed, Maliki's government has come out publicly in support of the Asad regime in Syria's own civil war). Moreover, a Shi'i dictator would face tremendous opposition from Iraq's Sunni community, particularly the tribes of Anbar, Salah ad-Din and Ninevah, all of whom would be supported by the Sunni regimes. Again, an Iraqi Shi'a dictator's only source of succor would be Iran. Renewed civil war. Historically, this may actually be Iraq's most likely future. Although academic studies of intercommunal civil war show some variance, a considerable body of work—including the best and most recent studies—indicate that states that have undergone one such round of conflict (as Iraq did in 2005-2007) have anywhere from a 1-in-3 to a 1-in-2 likelihood of sliding back into civil war within about five years of a ceasefire (which in Iraq came in 2008). Since the U.S. invasion in 2003, Iraq has followed the quintessential pattern for how states descend into civil war, how they emerge from it, and now how they fall back into it. Everything that is going on in Iraq today as American peacekeepers prepare to leave—the resumption of violence, the rapid deterioration of trust, the expectation that things are going to get more violent and corrupt, the unwillingness of leaders to compromise, the determination of actors across the spectrum to take short-sighted actions to protect themselves at the expense of others' trust and security—shows that Iraq continues to hew closely to these awful patterns. Indeed, even Maliki's unconscious bid for dictatorship is probably more likely to produce civil war than a return to centralized autocracy. If he keeps pushing in this direction, the Sunnis and Kurds will likely revolt, the military will fragment (a la Lebanon) and the result will be civil war, not a stable tyranny. Civil war would be bad for Iran. Indeed, it might actually be the worst scenario for Iran in that it would likely produce very significant spillover into Iran. It could easily radicalize large segments of Iranian society, perhaps prompting the Kurds and Arabs of Iran to revolt, or convincing Iran's dominant Shi’ah to become more actively anti-Sunni. It would doubtless encourage Iran to intervene heavily in Iraq, which would stress Iran's limited resources and provoke a counter intervention by Iraq's Sunni neighbors. Given the high degrees of popular antipathy toward the regime, and the willingness of Iranians to risk physical harm by the regime to voice their grievances, spillover from civil war in Iraq could generate new popular protests or even renewed rebellion in Iran (especially if intervention in Iraq taxed the Iranian state and its military the way that the First World War did Tsarist Russia, or the wars against England taxed Bourbon France). It could also bring Iran into covert or even overt conflict with Iraq's Sunni neighbors as the Congolese civil war turned into "Africa's world war" and the Lebanese civil war sparked conflict between Israel and Syria. Nevertheless, civil war in Iraq would also be disastrous for the United States for a variety of reasons. One of them would be that in the short term, Iran would likely find itself able to dominate significant areas of Iraq by backing Shi'a militias in the fighting—militias that would have no one to turn to except Iran, as was the case in 2005-2007. Moreover, the radicalization of Iraq's Shi'a would likely spillover into Kuwait, Bahrain and even Saudi Arabia, creating new opportunities for Iran to stoke unrest in those states, possibly with disastrous results. A failing state. Another plausible outcome of Iraq's current state of affairs would be a weak, fragmented, or even a failed state. The central government has a certain amount of power, but it is not efficient and Iraq's provinces have a certain ability to resist. Moreover, as Maliki attempts to centralize power, so other groups are pushing in the opposite direction. Thus, while one set of scenarios would have to envision Maliki (or some other Shi'a leader) prevailing in this contest and establishing a new dictatorship, so another set of scenarios would have to imagine him failing because the provinces/regions/ethno-sectarian communities were successfully able to resist and to pull away from the central government. Indeed, Salah ad-Din province recently declared its autonomy, and there is widespread talk of Anbar and Nineveh joining it in a Sunni region akin to the Kurdistan Regional Government. Likewise, numerous groups and influential figures in oil-rich Basra are talking about doing the same. If they were to succeed, they would cripple the Iraqi central government. Because Iraq actually requires a fair degree of integration for economic reasons, such a centrifugal trend would likely result in an across the board breakdown in public services, economic affairs and security. Local groups (militias, but likely operating in the name of provincial governments) would fill the vacuums as best they could, but their efforts would be uneven at best, and at worst—and probably far more likely—would be corrupt, incompetent and prone to violence. Iraq might not quite look like Somalia, but it could end up bearing more than a passing resemblance to it, with all of the terrible implications for terrorism and instability in the wider region that implies.

#### The brink is now – regions will succeed absent reform

Reidar Visser 11, senior research fellow at the Norwegian Institute of International Affairs, “Iraq's federalist project reflects a resurgent sectarian conflict”, November 11, <http://www.thenational.ae/thenationalconversation/comment/iraqs-federalist-project-reflects-a-resurgent-sectarian-conflict#page2>

The recent pro-federal current in Sunni majority-areas of Iraq is not a reflection of any positive political trend in the country. Rather than representing a linear trend of progress since 2007, it is testimony to how politics have retrogressed since 2009 after having first recovered from the sectarian strife of the preceding years. In 2009, Mr Al Maliki championed a return to more centralist policies that was hailed by Sunnis and Shiites alike as a sign of Iraq bouncing back from the sectarian strife that had almost created a civil war between 2005 and 2007. In 2009, non-sectarianism and anti-federalism went hand in hand. Rather, it is the rapid downwards trend in Iraq since the parliamentary elections in 2010 that has prompted some Sunnis to think in terms they themselves swore they would never employ just a few years ago. The secular Iraqiyya party - which enjoys a particularly solid support base in Sunni-majority areas - came first in those elections, but has been unhappy with the way the post-election process has distributed power in the new Iraqi government. In the broad "Arbil framework" that led to the formation of the second Maliki government in December 2010, Iraqiyya accepted many promises from Mr Al Maliki that were bound to be problematic because they were in conflict with the Iraqi constitution - this included the notion of a so-called national council for high policies to be chaired by Ayad Allawi, Iraqiyya's leader, as a consolation prize in lieu of the premiership. To date, the strategic council has yet to be implemented (or, for that matter, legislated), and the key defence ministry that was similarly promised to Iraqiyya remains in the hand of a Maliki ally. To some extent, the latest pro-federal developments in Salahaddin probably reflect opportunism among local politicians similar to that elsewhere in Iraq. But they are also an expression of sheer exasperation with the political process in Sunni-majority areas. Mr Al Maliki may have one last chance to win significant Sunni support by settling the question of the security ministries including the defence portfolio in a timely fashion, but time is running out. His initial response has been dangerously reminiscent of the vaguely camouflaged anti-Sunni political rhetoric used by Shiite hardliners prior to the last parliamentary elections. Unless Mr Al Maliki can stand up against such tendencies, he cannot be prime minister for all of Iraq.

### Federalism Link Wall – 2NC-1NR

#### Extend our Federal Funding Link.

#### Our Greve ev proves that Federal Funding coerces the states, jacking federalism.

#### Here’s more ev that HSR places functional mandates on the States – hurting federalism.

Motherway ‘10

Tom Motherway – Before starting a business career he was engaged in the trial and appellate practice of law. He was a Municipal Judge in Bridgeton, Missouri. He retired as general partner of Montrose & Co. in Reno Nevada. He is currently an Advisory member of the Board of Directors and Advisors, Nevadans 4 Carbon Free Energy. Tom received his JD and BS from St. Louis University. He was licensed to practice law in Missouri and California. Reno Hayek Symposium Blog – November 12, 2010 – http://renohayek.com/category/federalism/page/3/

Thank God, we have leaders, in the states mind you, that can say no to the drug pushers, Obama, Pelosi, Reid and the Democrats. These state leaders, the incoming Wisconsin and Ohio Governors are refusing federal stimulus money for hight speed rails. High speed rail is another example of a federal boondoggle that is uneconomic. Reid wanted a maglev from Vegas to LA until he needed some political power in his recent race and cut a deal with turncoat Republican Sig Rogich. Reid’s maglev got dropped, Reid got endorsed, and Sig got Reid’s backing and your tax dollars for what? Desert Express a slower train between Vegas and LA! Hopefully Brian Sandoval, the newly elected Republican Governor of Nevada will have the same intelligence and spine that Ohio’s John Kasich and Wisconsin’s Scott Walker had in turning down the federal dollars. What we really need in this country is for more governors to show that governments can be run effectively for the people. Federalism will work and the states should have more not less authority to govern. The corollary is that the federal government should have less. There are simply too many unfunded federal mandates from Washington to the states. Kasich and Walker realize that the high-speed rail projects are nothing more than another form of federal burden on the states. No wonder state budgets are under stress. See Mike Tobin’s Fox News item. The last thing this country needs is another blood-sucking AmTrack!

#### Link # 2 – transferring tax funds from one State to another.

#### HSR is a textbook violation of state rights – forces one State to fund another.

DeHaven ‘10

(Tad, budget analyst for CATO, “High-Speed Federalism Fight” – November 26th – http://www.cato-at-liberty.org/high-speed-federalism-fight/)

LaHood’s message was targeted specifically to incoming governors John Kasich in Ohio and Scott Walker in Wisconsin, who argued that HSR doesn’t make any economic or practical sense for their states. LaHood said that states rejecting federal HSR subsidies won’t be able to reroute the money to other uses, such as roads. Instead, LaHood said the rejected money will redistributed “in a professional way in places where the money can be well spent” — i.e., other states. And sure enough, other governors were quick to belly up to the Department of Transportation’s bar in order to grab Ohio and Wisconsin’s share. From the Columbus-Dispatch: New York Gov.-elect Andrew Cuomo has said he would be happy to take Ohio’s money. Last week, California Democratic Sens. Barbara Boxer and Dianne Feinstein wrote LaHood saying that California stands ready to take some, too, noting that several states that elected GOP governors this month have said they no longer want to use the rail money for that purpose. “It has come to our attention that several states plan to cancel their high-speed rail projects. We ask that you withdraw the federal grants to these states and award the funds to states that have made a strong financial commitment to these very important infrastructure projects,” Boxer and Feinstein said in their letter to LaHood. This is a textbook example of why the Department of Transportation should be eliminated and responsibility for transportation infrastructure returned to state and local governments. If California wishes to pursue a high-speed rail boondoggle, it should do so with its own state taxpayers’ money. Instead, Ohio and Wisconsin taxpayers now face the prospect of being taxed to fund high-speed rail projects in other states. If California’s beleaguered taxpayers were asked to bear the full cost of financing HSR in their state, they would likely reject it. High-speed rail proponents know this, which is why they agitate to foist a big chunk of the burden onto federal taxpayers. The proponents pretend that HSR is in “the national interest,” but as a Cato essay on high-speed rail explains, “high-speed rail would not likely capture more than about 1 percent of the nation’s market for passenger travel.”

#### And, HSR shifts tax burdens – wrecking federalism

DeHaven ‘11

(Tad, budget analyst for CATO, “High-Speed Rail and Federalism,” May 11, http://www.cato-at-liberty.org/high-speed-rail-and-federalism/)

Florida Governor Rick Scott deserves a big round of applause for dealing a major setback to the Obama administration’s costly plan for a national system of high-speed rail. As Randal O’Toole explains, the administration needed Florida to keep the $2.4 billion it was awarded to build a high-speed Orlando-to-Tampa line in order to build “momentum” for its plan. Instead, Scott put the interests of his taxpayers first and told the administration “no thanks.” That’s the good news. The bad news is that the administration is going to dole the money back out to 22 passenger-rail projects in other states. Florida taxpayers were spared their state’s share of maintaining the line, but they’re still going to be forced to help foot the bill for passenger-rail projects in other states. Here’s Randal’s summary: Instead, the Department of Transportation gave nearly $1 billion of the $2.4 billion to Amtrak and states in the Northeast Corridor to replace worn out infrastructure and slightly speed up trains in that corridor, as well as connecting routes such as New Haven to Hartford and New York to Albany. Most of the rest of the money went to Midwestern states—Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Michigan, and Missouri—to buy new trains, improve stations, and do engineering studies of a few corridors such as the vital Minneapolis-to-Duluth corridor. Trains going an average of 57 mph instead of 52 mph are not going to inspire the public to spend $53 billion more on high-speed rail. The administration did give California $300 million for its high-speed rail program. But, with that grant, the state still has only about 10 percent of the $65 billion estimated cost of a San Francisco-to-Los Angeles line, and there is no more money in the till. If the $300 million is ever spent, it will be for a 220-mph train to nowhere in California’s Central Valley. Why should Floridians be taxed by the federal government to pay for passenger-rail in the northeast? If the states in the Northeast Corridor want to pick up the subsidy tab from the federal government, go for it. (I argue in a Cato essay on Amtrak that if the Northeast Corridor possesses the population density to support passenger-rail then it should just be privatized.) I don’t know if taxpayers in Northeast Corridor would want to pick up the federal government’s share of the subsidies, but I’m pretty sure California taxpayers wouldn’t be interested in footing the entire $65 billion for their state’s high-speed boondoggle-in-the-works. As I’ve discussed before, the agitators for a national system of high-speed rail know this: If California’s beleaguered taxpayers were asked to bear the full cost of financing HSR in their state, they would likely reject it. High-speed rail proponents know this, which is why they agitate to foist a big chunk of the burden onto federal taxpayers. The proponents pretend that HSR rail is in “the national interest,” but as a Cato essay on high-speed rail explains, “high-speed rail would not likely capture more than about 1 percent of the nation’s market for passenger travel.” According to the Wall Street Journal, congressional Republicans aren’t happy that the administration is taking Florida’s money and spreading it around the country: Monday’s announcement drew criticism from House Republican leaders, who questioned both the decision to divide the money into nearly two-dozen grants around the country—instead of concentrating it into fewer major projects—and the fact that many of the projects will benefit Amtrak, the federally subsidized passenger-rail operator. I heartily agree with the Amtrak complaint, but I’m not sure why as a federal taxpayer I should feel better about instead “concentrating [the money] into fewer major projects.” Subsidizing passenger-rail is no more a proper role of the federal government than education or housing. Unfortunately, for all the criticisms of the Obama administrations and the constant talk about spending cuts, Republicans don’t appear to possess much more desire to limit the scope of the federal government’s activities than the Democrats.

### Transportation key to Federalism

#### ( ) State Action on transportation is especially important.

Horowitz ‘12

Daniel – Deputy Political Director at The Madison Project and Contributing Editor, Legislative Writer at Red State – Red state – Jan 19th – http://www.redstate.com/dhorowitz3/2012/01/19/devolve-transportation-spending-to-states/

The most prudent legislation that would transition responsibility for transportation spending back to the states is Rep. Scott Garrett’s STATE Act (HR 1737). Under this legislation, all states would have the option to opt out of the federal transportation system and keep 16.4 cents of their federal gasoline tax contribution. States would have the ability to use that money to raise their state gasoline tax and direct those funds more efficiently for their own needs. States would be free to use the funds for vital needs, instead of incessant repaving projects that are engendered by short-term federal stimulus grants, and which cause unnecessary traffic juggernauts. States could then experiment with new innovations and free-market solutions that open up infrastructure projects to the private sector. The Tenth Amendment is not just a flag-waving principle; it works in the real world. It takes a lot of impudence on the part of the President to blame Republicans for crumbling infrastructure. It is his support for a failed central government system that is stifling the requisite innovations that are needed to deal with state and local problems. There is no issue that is more appropriate for state solutions than transportation spending. Every Republican member should co-sponsor the STATE ACT so we can put an end to three decades of flushing transportation down the toilet. Also, with the news that Rick Perry will head up Newt Gingrich’s Tenth Amendment initiatives, this might be a good time to advocate for federalist solutions in transportation and infrastructure. When Obama starts ascribing blame for our “crumbling infrastructure” during his State of the Union Address, Perry and Gingrich should use their megaphone to pin the blame on the donkey’s stranglehold over the transportation needs of states.

### Yes Model – Generic

#### Domestic policy sends a key signal

Steven G. Calabresi 95, Associate Professor, Northwestern University School of Law. “A Government of Limited and Enumerated Powers,” Michigan Law Review, December

We have seen that a desire for both international and devolutionary federalism has swept across the world in recent years. To a significant extent, this is due to global fascination with and emulation of our own American federalism success story. The global trend toward federalism is an enormously positive development that greatly increases the likelihood of future peace, free trade, economic growth, respect for social and cultural diversity, and protection of individual human rights. It depends for its success on the willingness of sovereign nations to strike federalism deals in the belief that those deals will be kept. 233 The U.S. Supreme Court can do its part to encourage the future striking of such deals by enforcing vigorously our own American federalism deal. Lopez could be a first step in that process, if only the Justices and the legal academy would wake up to the importance of what is at stake.

#### Empirically true for every region

Will Kymlicka 2k, July (The Canadian Journal of Law & Jurisprudence, 13 Can. J.L. & Juris. 207, ARTICLE: Federalism and Secession: At Home and Abroad, p. Lexis)

Can the Model be Exported? Given this success in the West, one might expect that there would be great interest in multination federalism in other countries around the world, from Eastern Europe to Asia and Africa, most of which contain territorially-concentrated national minorities. The phenomenon of minority nationalism, including the demand for [\*217] territorial autonomy, is a truly universal one. The countries affected by it are to be found in Africa (for example, Ethiopia), Asia (Sri Lanka), Eastern Europe (Romania), Western Europe (France), North America (Guatemala), South America (Guyana), and Oceania (New Zealand). The list includes countries that are old (United Kingdom) as well as new (Bangladesh), large (Indonesia) as well as small (Fiji), rich (Canada) as well as poor (Pakistan), authoritarian (Sudan) as well as democratic (Belgium), Marxist-Leninist (China) as well as militantly anti-Marxist (Turkey). The list also includes countries which are Buddhist (Burma), Christian (Spain), Moslem (Iran), Hindu (India), and Judaic (Israel)." 12 Indeed, some commentators describe the conflict between states and national minorities as an ever-growing "third world war", encompassing an ever-increasing number of groups and states. 13. We need to think creatively about how to respond to these conflicts, which will continue to plague efforts at democratization, and to cause violence, around the world.

### Yes Model – Iraq

#### The U.S. is key

#### -Diplomatic leverage

Ivan Eland 12, senior fellow at the Independent Institute, “How to Avoid a Return to Iraq”, January 3, <http://original.antiwar.com/eland/2012/01/02/how-to-avoid-a-return-to-iraq/>

After its forces have withdrawn, why should the United States be concerned with the devolution of power in Iraq? Because if power is not decentralized, Iraq is liable to degenerate into a civil war that will make the conflict in 2006 and 2007 look mild. Sectarian violence is already increasing. And of course, the United States, which is responsible for the current mess, may be pressured by the Iraqi central government, other Iraqis, or the international community to return its forces to the internecine bloodletting to stanch the carnage. Although President Obama maintains that U.S. troops will not return to Iraq even if the civil war resumes, pledges of nonintervention have been later broken by previous presidents, especially after elections. That doesn’t mean that the United States should tell the Iraqis how to organize themselves, but it could mediate any Iraqi-initiated peacefully negotiated devolution. Such mediation at least would be a constructive role for some of the 16,000 U.S. embassy personnel left in the country and might forestall future demands for a return of U.S. forces to Iraq under dire and dangerous circumstances.

#### -Experience with states’ rights

Chandrasekaran 7 – Rajiv, former Baghdad bureau chief at the Washington Post.) Could American-Style Federalism Stabilize Iraq?, 10/26/07 http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=15673575

What is it? Call it states' rights — in the model of our American Founding Fathers. And proponents say it may well be the best option to keep Iraq together. Back in 2003, the American occupation administrators who set up shop in the Green Zone wanted to fashion a new nation that would have a strong central government. They thought that handing authority to local leaders would result in the breakup of Iraq. But now, four-and-a-half years later, violence has hardened ethnic and sectarian identities. Genuine nationalism hasn't emerged. That's why local sectarian militias are more powerful than the army. The militiamen are committed to fight for their religious brethren. Soldiers in Iraq's army aren't sure what they're fighting for. Proponents of states' rights say accepting the reality of Iraq's sectarian differences presents the best hope of saving Iraq. The goal, they say, isn't to chop Iraq into three separate countries. Instead, it is to provide genuine authority and resources to Iraq's provinces. Think of how the Republican Party in the United States has traditionally viewed the issue of states' rights, and apply it to Iraq. Allow each province to have its own National Guard. To spend its share of the national budget. To effectively govern itself. Certain functions, like the printing of money, would still remain in the hands of the national government. But most day-to-day responsibilities would be given to local leaders. Consider the success we've had in combating al Qaida in Anbar province. Instead of asking Iraq's ragtag army to take on the terrorists, we're working with local Sunni tribesmen. They're fighting with loyalty and dedication. That's because they're fighting for their fellow Sunni leaders, not the Shiite-dominated government back in Baghdad. Sure, this strategy has no shortage of challenges. There would have to be a fair way to distribute Iraq's oil revenue, for instance. Local officials would have to learn how to run their own budgets. Iraq's constitution already enshrines federalism. But proponents say the United States needs to do more to encourage the Iraqis to embrace it. People have criticized the effort to impose American-style democracy on Iraq. But supporters of states' rights say it is one element of our democracy that we really do need to share with the Iraqis.

#### -Only the U.S. can facilitate implementation of a deal

Gelb 6 (Leslie, president Council on Foreign Relations, “What to Do in Iraq: A Roundtable” Foreign Affairs http://www.foreignaffairs.org/20060701faresponse85412/larry-diamond-james-dobbins-chaim-kaufmann-leslie-h-gelb-stephen-biddle/what-to-do-in-iraq-a-roundtable.html?mode=print)

Keeping Iraq united in this manner would be in the interest of all parties. Key oil pipelines run through the country, north to south, and Baghdad remains the only possible business hub for the country. Most Iraqis also share a powerful interest in seeing that their regions and their country do not get picked apart by greedy neighbors. Divided, Iraq would be an irresistible target for outside meddling; united, the country would stand a chance of survival. More and more leaders -- among the Kurds, the Shiites, and, increasingly, the Sunnis as well -- are favoring negotiated regionalism and moving toward a federal system over civil war. (The existing constitution provides for federalism by allowing provinces to unite with each other and form a regional government.) Nonetheless, Washington would have to play a pivotal role in helping the Iraqis secure this agreement. Big cities with highly mixed sectarian populations, such as Baghdad, Kirkuk, and Mosul, pose a huge problem now and would continue to do so under a federal solution -- or any other solution. To fix this, the Iraqis will have to make special security arrangements, such as ensuring that the police forces in these cities are composed of members from all the sectarian groups and backed by international police. The factor that will most determine the fate of these cities, however, will be whether the sectarian groups find the overall political settlement fair and viable. And as painful as it may be, the United States will have to assist those Iraqis who wish to relocate to safer terrain, temporarily or permanently. It is essential to realize that this proposal will not cause ethnic cleansing or the country's breakup. These terrible things are already happening. Regionalism may be the only option left to stop them. The second element of this policy is to bring the Sunnis on board with regionalism with an offer they cannot reasonably refuse. The carrot will have to be very sweet, namely, control of their own region in the center of the country and a constitutionally guaranteed share of oil revenues. Until recently, most Sunni leaders flatly opposed controlling their own region because they fully expected to be running the whole country again. They still saw themselves as masters of their universe and wanted Iraq to remain intact and ready for them to reassume the power they held for hundreds of years. And they pressed for the strongest possible central government.

### Federalism solves Iraq Civil War

#### Civil war’s inevitably now – the U.S. needs to encourage power-sharing

Leslie H Gelb 12, president emeritus of CFR, “Leslie H. Gelb on How to Save Iraq”, January 1, <http://www.thedailybeast.com/newsweek/2012/01/01/leslie-h-gelb-on-how-to-save-iraq.html>

In early 2006, then-senator Joe Biden and I discussed Iraq for three unbothered hours while our shuttle to Washington idled on the LaGuardia tarmac. We agreed that without an internal political solution, Iraq would sooner or later tumble into bloody civil war. Too many Shiites, Sunnis, and Kurds just simply hated each other. And we agreed that only one political plan stood a chance of working—federalism. Federalism is not partition. It is the tried and true means of allowing peoples who don’t trust each other to live together in one country by decentralizing power. Today federalism remains Iraq’s only hope for peace. Shiites, Sunnis, and Kurds have been at each other’s throats for centuries. Under Saddam Hussein, Sunnis brutally ran the show in Iraq, though they were a minority and Shiites the majority. After the U.S. invasion, Shiites won nationwide elections and have since attempted to impose their rule nationwide. What’s absolutely clear is that Kurds, in their largely autonomous northern region, and Sunni Arabs, in Iraq’s center, flat out won’t accept Shiite domination. As Shiite Prime Minister Nuri al-Maliki began to tighten his control over the country some months ago, the killings mounted—and would have regardless of whether American troops remained in country. The idea behind federalism is to keep Iraq united by decentralizing power on a regional basis. This would provide each ethno-religious group the authority to run its own regional affairs, while the central government tends to national interests. The first step would be to establish semiautonomous regions or states with power to make and administer their own laws and provide for internal security. Thereby, Kurds and Sunnis would be protected from Shiite-imposed rule. Cities with mixed religious populations could be governed as federal cities under international protection. The central government would conduct foreign affairs, create a national army to guard borders, and manage oil production and revenues. Revenues would be distributed according to each group’s percentage of the total population. Thus Sunni Arabs would be guaranteed 20 percent of revenues even though their region has far less than 20 percent of the country’s oil. Of course, whether and how to advance the federal formula would be left up to Iraqis. To those who see this as a radical approach: look at Iraq’s Constitution. It provides for such a federal structure, but requires some spelling out of details. The main sticking point at present is the Shiite insistence of running the whole country from Baghdad. Shiites are right about one thing—it is critical to keep Iraq whole. Otherwise it would become prey to neighbors like Iran or the scene of endless civil war. But the Shiites are dead wrong about being able to achieve unity by centralized “power sharing” in Baghdad. That’s been the approach since Americans took charge, and it hasn’t worked for two reasons: Shiites never really share power. And power remains concentrated in Baghdad. Federalism preserved the peace for Bosnia reached at Dayton. Serbs, Muslims, and Croats were allowed mostly to run their own affairs, and even, until a few years ago, keep their own armies. Switzerland, Belgium, Spain, and the United Arab Emirates have remained whole and peaceful by the same means. And don’t forget that our own United States could have been created only on this basis. The 13 original states joined the union only on the constitutional guarantee that they could run most of their own affairs. Washington didn’t take on its present powers until Franklin Roosevelt’s presidency, 150 years later. Instead of helping Iraqis implement federalism and save themselves, Republicans attack President Obama for a “premature” withdrawal of U.S. troops from Iraq. Never mind that it was President George W. Bush who first agreed to total troop withdrawal by 2012. Now it’s past time to put this political nonsense aside and encourage Iraq to federalize and stay whole—and thus both peaceful and able to resist Iran. Such an Iraq would give Americans something to be proud of, whatever our differences over the invasion.

### A-to “domestic disputes won’t escalate”

#### Federalism disputes are uniquely escalatory – spreads throughout the region

Fahim 5 (8/20, Middle East Columnist-Asia Times, “Iraq at the gates of hell,” http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Middle\_East/GH20Ak01.html)

In retrospect, of course, it was nothing if not prescient. The invasion unleashed unspeakable horrors - cities bombed to ruin, gritty urban combat, gruesome beheadings, apocalyptic car bombings. Civil war, however, would truly complete Moussa's prophecy. It would be a tragedy to dwarf Iraq's current blood-soaked chaos, ushering in not only a paroxysm of internecine killing, but perhaps a regional conflagration that would send ripples of instability far beyond. Iraqi nationalism now appears to be dissolving as fearful Iraqis seek safety in confessional bonds. Patrick Cockburn has written vividly in the London Review of Books of Sunni neighborhoods in Baghdad living in terror of Shi'ite death squads that operate with apparent government sanction, and of Shi'ite neighborhoods traumatized by the unending wave of suicide bombers. "The bodies of Sunnis are being found in rubbish dumps across Baghdad," wrote Cockburn, "... the commandos rarely try to conceal their responsibility for killings. They arrive in full uniform, a garish green and yellow camouflage, at the homes of former Sunni officials and arrest them. A few days later the bodies - sometimes savagely tortured, with eyes gouged out and legs broken - turn up in the morgue." One of the more recent suicide bombings in Baghdad killed 43 people on August 17; the targets were Shi'ite travelers headed to the southern cities of Najaf and Basra. Laith Kubba, a spokesman for Interim Iraqi Prime Minister Ibrahim Jaafari, speculated about the agenda behind such apparently arbitrary slaughter. "They want a reaction against Sunnis to therefore deepen the sectarian crisis in the country," he said. There are also reports of Sunnis trying to drive Shi'ites from Ramadi (and Baghdad, according to Kubba), allegedly in retaliation for similar Shi'ite actions against Sunnis in the south. With the future of Iraqi Kurdistan up for grabs in the current effort to draft a permanent constitution, the always tense relationship between Kurds and Arabs is nearing its moment of truth. Veteran Kurdish leader Masud Barzani nearly set fire to straw when he said on August 4 that "the Kurdish people have the right to secede". Barzani may well have been angling for concessions on the status of Kirkuk, the oil-rich northern city that is caught in a deadly tug-of-war between Sunni Arabs, Kurds and Turkmen. "We are encouraging our people to claim their rights peacefully," a Turmken leader told the media. "But if talks with the Kurds break down, that will be the beginning of the civil war." It is telling that even the new US ambassador to Iraq, Zalmay Khalilzad, who is paid to be optimistic, recently broke a self-imposed American taboo by speaking openly of the possibility of civil war. But Joost Hiltermann, Middle East project director for the International Crisis Group, emphasizes that the die is not yet cast. "There are the signs of civil war, but it's not inevitable that civil war will come," Hiltermann told Asia Times Online. "Steps can still be taken to prevent it." Hiltermann stressed the importance of training the Iraqi security forces and bringing Sunni Arabs fully into the political process. "If things get out of control here it's going to be a bloodbath that will be something we cannot imagine, of a scale we cannot imagine," he said. The deepening tensions between Iraq's basic communities are being played out in the constitutional deliberations. The divisive debate about federalism is perhaps most troubling. With the Supreme Council for Islamic Revolution in Iraq (SCIRI), Iraq's most powerful Shi'ite political party, now demanding an autonomous Shi'ite region in the south to mirror the Kurdish region in the north, the battle lines for a civil war may literally have been drawn. SCIRI's demand constitutes the sum of all Sunni Arab fears - the threat of exclusion from Iraq's oil wealth (which is buried in the north and south) and the possibility that perceived Western plots to divide Iraq will succeed. "We hoped this day would never come," said Sunni negotiator Saleh al-Mutlak on learning of SCIRI's demands. With heavy US pressure being exerted on the constitution negotiators, there may well be an agreement on at least the framework for a charter. But major disputes - over federalism, what role Islam should play in shaping Iraq's laws, how oil wealth will be distributed - are profound, and a document that papers over these questions could be worse than none at all. Iraq's descent into zero-sum sectarianism has increased fears in the Arab world that it will become another Lebanon, where a gruesome 15-year civil war tore that country's intricate sectarian mosaic asunder. The denominational map in Iraq is not as maddening as it is in Lebanon, but the grievances of Iraq's three major communities are becoming ever more intractable. And Iraq's population of 25 million, 10 times larger than Lebanon's, clearly has a stellar per capita rate of martial acumen to go with an apparently endless reservoir of arms. An all-out conflict in Iraq would therefore make Lebanon seem quaint. It is a pretense of many in Lebanon that their civil war was actually a proxy war fought on Lebanese soil. In reality the war had its roots deep in Lebanese domestic politics and history. But to some degree Lebanon did eventually become a battleground for competing regional interests. Unfortunately, there is vastly more at stake in Iraq, the most blessed Arab country in terms of natural resources and strategic geography. Iraq shares long borders with Turkey, Iran, Syria, Jordan, Kuwait and Saudi Arabia, all of whom it has had at least contentious relations with previously. In a civil war, the temptation for Iraq's neighbors to forcefully assert their interests would be irresistible. Given all this grist, how might the dark mill of civil war begin turning in Iraq? It might simply develop out of a continuing, steady rise in the vicious cycle of revenge killings. Alternatively, a sudden breakdown of the political process could lead each sect to quickly assert its interests by force: the Kurds attempting to seize Kirkuk, for example, or Arab Sunnis and Shi'ites fighting for control of the mixed Sunni-Shi'ite towns south of Baghdad - all of which would entail ethnic cleansing. Further ideological and interdenominational divisions would also arise. Inter-Shi'ite rivalries were recently on display in the southern town of Samawa, where supporters of SCIRI and influential cleric Muqtada al-Sadr clashed. Muqtada espouses a brand of Iraqi and Islamic nationalism that could lead his Mehdi Army to side with those opposed to federalism if civil war did erupt. And then there are the neighbors. As professor Juan Cole, an expert in Iraq and Shi'ism, recently wrote in the Nation: "If Iraq fell into civil war between Sunnis and Shi'ites, the Saudis and Jordanians would certainly take the side of the Sunnis, while Iran would support the Shi'ites." In essence, a civil war would see the eight-year Iran-Iraq war of the 1980s replayed on Iraqi territory. To complicate matters, any Kurdish success would draw in Turkey. Beyond Iraq, a civil war could destabilize the Gulf, and thereby the world economy. Sunni-Shi'ite tensions could be kindled in states like Bahrain, Kuwait and most importantly, Saudi Arabia , where an occasionally restive Shi'ite population forms a majority in the eastern part of the country (where all the oil is).

#### Turkey will intervene against the Kurds – bypasses their defense

McGregor 7 (12/12, Retired Army Colonel & Consultant at the Center for Defense Information, “The "Surge" Is Precursor to What,” http://www.cdi.org/program/document.cfm?DocumentID=4159&from\_page=../index.cfm)

This brings us to the big concern: The unresolved (if not heightened) instability within Iraq could lead to unforeseen consequences of a strategic nature—say, a war between Turkey and the Kurds. Inside Turkey, the United States is viewed as a false friend, and as having betrayed the interests of its steadfast Turkish ally. Not only has Washington failed to end Kurdish support in Iraq for the Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK), which advocates independence for Kurds inside Turkey, but the United States also occupied Iraq over Ankara's strong objections. These points of friction coincide with an Islamic revival and a growing desire within Turkey for an assertion of national power. Like the Orthodox Church and Russian nationalism, Islam is inextricably intertwined with Turkish identity, culture, and history. According to the Pew Research Center, only 9 percent of Turks still hold a favorable view of the United States, a figure that places Turkey last of 46 countries surveyed. Turks now see America as a threat to Turkish national security. The anti-American attitude has been reinforced in the past few years within popular culture. In the Turkish blockbuster Valley of the Wolves Iraq, a small Turkish force heroically battles an evil U.S. military commander and his troops. In Metal Storm, a recent best-selling work of fiction, an all-out war between Ankara and Washington in 2007 is described, a war Turkey wins with the aid of Russian and European support. Iran suspects it is a matter of when, not if, the Turks intervene in northern Iraq. Turkey, which boasts the largest army in NATO, is the 500-pound gorilla of the Muslim world and Iran knows it. And anti-Kurdish sentiment is leading to an alliance between Iran, Turkey, and Syria, each of which fear growing Kurdish independence. It's hard to imagine a worse outcome for the United States than the sudden intervention of 100,000 Turkish troops in northern Iraq. Turkish intervention would rob the United States of the support of Kurdish troops that are now policing northern Iraq against Al Qaeda and containing the Sunni insurgency. And the Iranians, who are the real power behind the Shiite-dominated Baghdad government, would support a Turkish military intervention. (Russia and China might support the anti-Kurdish alliance, too.) All this could well embolden the Sunni Arab insurgents to renew their war against the U.S. military. In the midst of this, the Saudis, Egyptians, and Gulf oil protectorates might even turn to the Turks, the natural leaders of the Sunni Muslim world, as a preferable alternative to their ties with the West and Israel. And add to this mix the instability within nuclear-armed Pakistan. This could all lead to a dreaded situation in which the United States finds itself stuck in the middle of a regional war, with the potential for chaos in Iraq on the rise and Iran's influence in Iraq growing.

### Indo-Pak impact module

#### Iraq war triggers Pakistan collapse and global nuclear war

Morgan 7 (Former member of the British Labour Party Executive Committee, 3/4, "Better another Taliban Afghanistan, than a Taliban NUCLEAR Pakistan!?" http://www.electricarticles.com/display.aspx?id=639)

The nightmare that is now Iraq would take on gothic proportions across the continent. The prophesy of an arc of civil war over Lebanon, Palestine and Iraq would spread to south Asia, stretching from Pakistan to Palestine, through Afghanistan into Iraq and up to the Mediterranean coast. Undoubtedly, this would also spill over into India both with regards to the Muslim community and Kashmir. Border clashes, terrorist attacks, sectarian pogroms and insurgency would break out. A new war, and possibly nuclear war, between Pakistan and India could not be ruled out. Atomic Al Qaeda Should Pakistan break down completely, a Taliban-style government with strong Al Qaeda influence is a real possibility. Such deep chaos would, of course, open a “Pandora's box” for the region and the world. With the possibility of unstable clerical and military fundamentalist elements being in control of the Pakistan nuclear arsenal, not only their use against India, but Israel becomes a possibility, as well as the acquisition of nuclear and other deadly weapons secrets by Al Qaeda. Invading Pakistan would not be an option for America. Therefore a nuclear war would now again become a real strategic possibility. This would bring a shift in the tectonic plates of global relations. It could usher in a new Cold War with China and Russia pitted against the US.

### A-to “Federalism = Sectarianism”

#### Sub-regions solve ethnic conflict – studies prove

Ivan Eland 12, senior fellow at the Independent Institute, “How to Avoid a Return to Iraq”, January 3, <http://original.antiwar.com/eland/2012/01/02/how-to-avoid-a-return-to-iraq/>

But some argue that because the ethno-sectarian lines in Iraq are not always clear cut, devolving the country into a loose confederation of three autonomous regions could still leave subunits with a mixed population. For example, Diyala province is 60 percent Sunni, 20 percent Shi’ite, and 20 percent Kurdish. Fair enough, but in my book Partitioning for Peace: An Exit Strategy for Iraq, I noted that the actual partitioning should be left up to Iraqis themselves and that many more regions than three could be created. Academic research shows that the regional boundaries don’t need to perfectly divide ethno-sectarian groups (and those that did might run afoul of tribes that have more than one ethno-sectarian group in them), but they can’t leave a large minority inside a boundary line that will threaten the majority within. Only small minorities, say 10 percent or less, can be left “stranded” without inviting repression by the majority.

### A-to “Federalism = Revenue Fights”

#### Regional taxation solves, just like with states in the U.S.

Niqash 11, Iraqi political news, “Sharing the Oil Money: How Federalism Could Save Iraq”, November 4, <http://www.iraq-businessnews.com/2011/11/04/sharing-the-oil-money-how-federalism-could-save-iraq/>

Provincial authorities should also be given the power to come up with their own special, regional tax laws so that they can supplement their budgets – although these should not be out of line with Iraq’s national fiscal policies. All of these measures would ease the political, ethnic, sectarian and territorial conflicts in which Iraq is currently engaged. They would establish fair principles on an ongoing basis and promote competition between the various states. And in the end, they will best serve the interests of all parties in a nation characterized by ethnic and religious pluralism.

### A-to “Federalism = Oil Fragmentation”

#### Non-unique – Kurdistan’s managing their own oil now

Ivan Eland 12, senior fellow at the Independent Institute, “How to Avoid a Return to Iraq”, January 3, <http://original.antiwar.com/eland/2012/01/02/how-to-avoid-a-return-to-iraq/>

The inclination toward autonomy or separation in Iraq comes from having a government too centralized for a country fractured among Shi’ite, Sunni, and Kurdish ethno-sectarian groups and numerous tribes. Although the constitution allows decentralization through the creation of autonomous regional governments, the United States and now the Shi’ite-controlled central government have discouraged such devolution. Despite Vice President Joseph Biden’s advocacy, when he was chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the U.S. Senate during the Iraqi civil war of 2006 and 2007, of splitting Iraq up into three federal states to quell violence, the U.S. governments of George W. Bush and Barack Obama have discouraged this idea. The United States, as a status quo power, presumably believed, as did the British before them, that control of oil could be best achieved through dealing with a strong central government in Baghdad. Yet Kurdistan is already cutting oil deals with foreign companies without checking in with the Oil Ministry in Baghdad.

### A-to “Federalism = Kurdish Backlash”

#### Federalism’s better for Kurds – resource control and autonomy

Harem Karem 12, The Kurdistan Tribune, “What solution to Iraq’s crisis: Centralism or Federalism?”, June 3, <http://kurdistantribune.com/2012/solution-iraqs-crisis-centralism-or-federalism/>

Dismounting Maliki under the current circumstances and replacing him with another rider won’t change the fact that the camel is still limping. It will only add to the chaos and deficiency of action by the Kurdish president, deputy prime minister, deputy speaker and other officials in Baghdad. Enough time, energy and resources have been devoted to the failure of centralism and the concentration of power in Baghdad. The time is just right to look into an alternative that’s neither Barzani’s fairy-tale nor Maliki’s dictatorship. It has become apparent that the only viable solution to this ever-deepening crisis is federalism and, inevitably, all parties will have to accept this. With federalism comes the golden opportunity for Kurdistan to reclaim its territories that provide a lifeline to Iraq – the oil reserves, rivers and Khanaqin port. Instead of rhetoric and false promises, it’s time for Barzani to start accepting his responsibility for the failure of the Hawler coalition agreement with Maliki and end his devotion to centralism.

### A-to “Federalism = Sunni Backlash”

#### Sunnis want federalism – their ev is out-dated

Ranj Alaaldin 11, The Guardian, “Iraq must divide to survive”, December 22, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2011/dec/22/iraq-divide-survive-baghdad-explosions>

But where now for Iraq? Sectarian politics, the lack of reconciliation, persisting terrorist attacks, outstanding issues related to oil and territory and a general inability to cater for the needs of the Iraqi population is evidence that the current Iraqi model is failing. To move on and remedy its problems, Iraq needs to turn to the federalism entrenched so heavily within its constitution, one that provides for a functioning Iraq that accepts the country for what it is and allows different groups and communities to live and govern the way they want. As the group most fiercely against federalism, the Sunnis are now starting to accept realities and embrace the concept. Three Sunni-dominated provinces have already sought to emulate the autonomy enjoyed by the Kurdistan region, which goes from strength to strength as Baghdad rots. With the move against Hashimi and Mutlaq coming at this time, those efforts may be hastened. The attractions, particularly in the existing environment, are obvious: a powerful means of containing and competing with Baghdad and the Shia-led government, the consolidation of power in Sunni regions and, in the long term, an alliance with a potential Sunni-governed Syria which borders the very provinces in Iraq that would be part of any Sunni region in the north of the country. As further explained by constitutional expert Professor Brendan O'Leary in his book, How to Get Out of Iraq with Integrity, self-government allows the Sunnis to control their own resources, manage their own security and determine their own ways of life. Centralism and the concentration of power in Baghdad has been a failed exercise, despite the ample time devoted to it. Those within and beyond Iraq who oppose federalism and the disintegration of Iraq to make way for functionality and the protection of human lives should provide a viable alternative, one that is realistic and accommodates the realities on the ground.

#### The public wants local governance

Ivan Eland 12, senior fellow at the Independent Institute, “How to Avoid a Return to Iraq”, January 3, <http://original.antiwar.com/eland/2012/01/02/how-to-avoid-a-return-to-iraq/>

Although the increased sectarian violence in a post-U.S. Iraq has gotten most of the publicity from the international media, there are other telling signs that a bloody civil war there may be in the offing. Much sentiment exists in Sunni majority areas — distrustful of the increasingly autocratic and uncompromising Shi’ite-run regime of Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki — to form regional governments with more autonomy from the central government. In fact, a majority of the provincial council of the Sunni-dominated Diyala province requested that the central government hold a referendum on whether the province should form a semi-autonomous region.

### A-to “Federalism = hurts Econ”

#### Federalism won’t collapse the economy

Ivan Eland 12, senior fellow at the Independent Institute, “How to Avoid a Return to Iraq”, January 3, <http://original.antiwar.com/eland/2012/01/02/how-to-avoid-a-return-to-iraq/>

What about creating subunits too small to be economically viable? Academic research shows that this possibility is a myth. Besides, any confederation government in Baghdad could be in charge only of maintaining a free-trade area and perhaps a common currency.

### A-to “Federalism = Terrorism”

#### Decentralized security solves terrorism better

Ivan Eland 12, senior fellow at the Independent Institute, “How to Avoid a Return to Iraq”, January 3, <http://original.antiwar.com/eland/2012/01/02/how-to-avoid-a-return-to-iraq/>

But if local governments were given control over their own security forces, judiciary, and finances, wouldn’t this provide a haven for al-Qaeda and other militant groups, as Maliki’s supporters argue? No, the violence in Iraq was attenuated after 2007 by a Sunni Awakening movement becoming fed up with the excessive violence of their fellow Sunnis in al-Qaeda and working against the group. The local fighters of the Sunni Awakening had better intelligence on the group and how it could be decimated than the faraway Iraqi central government or U.S. forces.

### A-to “Federalism = Secession”

#### Iraqi federalism is written into the Constitution – they don’t secede, they vote

Reidar Visser 11, senior research fellow at the Norwegian Institute of International Affairs, “More Federalism Chaos”, November 7, <http://www.iraq-businessnews.com/2011/11/07/more-federalism-chaos/>

Maybe a suitable vantage point is nomenclature: Can the Iraqi press please understand that no one can “declare” themselves a federal region in the way Salahaddin tried to do? Iraqi media keep talking about the “declaration” of federal regions, ignoring the fact that the most the governorate council can do is to ask the government to conduct a referendum. Other oddities can be found in the arguments for and against the emerging federalism bid. One Iraqiyya figure claims that “everyone” supports the Salahaddin bid, including all the districts. Again, this is irrelevant. Sub-entities may count in Spanish federalism but they don’t count in Iraqi federalism. The referendum will be a straightforward majority vote counted at the governorate level.

## Elections Section

### 1NC Link

#### ( ) Our Florida Independent voters link.

#### They’re key to Obama’s re-election, they’re undecided, and they hate anti-High Speed Rail policy.

Smith ‘11

ADAM C. SMITH, Times Political Editor St. Petersburg Times (Florida) – March 27, 2011 – lexis

A common myth about Florida's 2008 results is that Obama won mainly by firing up the Democratic base. He did that, but Republicans still had stronger turnout than Democrats, who turned out at about the same rate as in 2000. More than anything, Obama won by winning moderate and independent voters who invariably decide Florida races. The TV ad he ran over and over again was about cutting taxes for the middle class. Exit polls in 2008 found that Obama beat McCain by 7 percentage points among independent voters and 16 points among self-described moderates. "He won the state because he had a great ground game, which I think we will again, and because he appealed to the broad middle,'' said Steve Schale of Tallahassee, who ran Obama's Florida campaign. "If it's a neutral or decent electorate for us, there's no reason to think Barack Obama won't be plenty competitive." The last credible Florida poll was taken in January by Quinnipiac University. It found voters overall, and specifically independent voters, gave the president a split job approval rating, with 47 percent approving of his performance and 49 percent disapproving. Forty-eight percent said the president did not deserve another term, and 45 percent said he did. "He's been coming to the middle lately because he realizes the way he started out it would be tough for him to get re-elected,'' said Florida GOP chairman David Bitner. "The independent vote in Florida will be the one that determines Obama will not be serving another four years." Democrats can win the White House without Florida's electoral votes, but it's virtually impossible for Republicans. That's part of the reason why many pundits already are speculating about the Republican nominee tapping Rubio or Jeb Bush as his running mate, and why the nominating convention will be in Tampa. - - By some estimates, the election of Rick Scott may prove to be the best thing to happen to Obama in Florida. "Gov. Scott's early performance is such that Florida's very much in play,'' said Florida Democratic chairman Rod Smith, arguing that Scott's rejection of high-speed rail antagonized voters in the crucial I-4 corridor and that the arch-conservative agenda under way in Tallahassee is antagonizing even many Republicans. "Most people in Florida are kind of down the middle and if you swing too far one way or another you pay a price for it,'' said Smith. "This tea party iteration of the Republican Party is not Florida and it's not going to be successful in the long run."

#### I-4 corridor voters are independents and love High-Speed Rail

Chicago Daily Herald ‘11

April 1, 2011 – lexis

But this is Florida, where the recently elected Gov. Rick Scott has rejected $2.4 billion in federal money for a $2.7 billion high-speed train connecting Tampa and Orlando. Scott offers several reasons for this move, though not necessarily the real one. The Republican insists that Florida taxpayers would have to subsidize the line's operations, even though a state-sponsored study says otherwise. He notes that Tampa-Orlando is a relatively short 84-mile trip, and because the train would make stops, the trip would take almost as long as driving. This is true, assuming Interstate 4 isn't clogged with traffic, which it often is. But the Tampa-Orlando run was to be just a first leg on a more ambitious bullet-train system. The bigger vision has trains turning right at Orlando and zooming down the crowded east coast to Miami. Tampa to Miami is 281 often tough road miles. This piecemeal thinking is indeed problematic, says Rush Loving, a railroad expert and author of "The Man Who Loved Trains.""The real market for the Tampa-Orlando run would have been from the airport to Disney World," he told me. That's not why you build bullet trains. "But there is a market from the Miami and Fort Lauderdale airports to Disney World." Consider my recent conversation with a helpful Thrifty car rental guy. Do you wish to buy a SunPass for the toll roads? he asked. No, I responded, I'll be driving on non-toll Interstate 95. Any other reason why I might need a SunPass? Well, he said, many drivers headed south to Miami on I-95 encounter such congestion that they switch to Florida's Turnpike, which is a toll road. Florida has been getting rid of humans who make change, so you need a SunPass at unmanned exits. OR you can go through the TOLL-BY-PLATE collection system, where a photo is taken of the license plate and a bill for that sum plus an administrative charge is sent to the rental company and added to your final tab. Suppose I were a jet-lagged tourist from Poland (or Portland). I'd think: What on earth is he talking about? I could visit the turnpike website and its "frequently asked questions," of which there are 26. One tells car renters who miss a toll, "Please contact the rental car company directly to report the missed toll and to learn their policy on toll violations." Is it now clear? OK, so why didn't Scott lunge for money that could have launched America's first bullet train and employed a bunch of jobless Floridians? Politics. Fast trains were to be President Obama's moon shot. Work on the Tampa-Orlando link was already so far along that it could have debuted in time for the 2012 election. The project is wildly popular in the independent-voter-rich I-4 corridor. Giving the people what they want might help Obama win Florida, so you can't do that. Meanwhile, the California High-Speed Rail Authority meets this week to pick projects on which to spend the $2.4 billion that Florida turned down. Scott's snub of this grant wrapped in golden ribbons has angered Floridians of all political persuasions. Just wait until the bullet trains start streaking across California.

#### (Or, read this card in the 1NC – which is only in this file and not the Neg Jackson-Vanik File, but is very strong:)

#### ( ) \*\*\*\*HSR helps Obama win Florida

Garrett ‘11

Garrett, Sierra. This thesis was mentored and overseen by Dr. R. Mark Isaac, Institute for Energy Systems, Economics and Sustainability at Florida State University –"Florida High-Speed Rail: An Economic Policy Analysis" (2011). Honors Theses. Paper 13. – available at: http://diginole.lib.fsu.edu/uhm/13

Infrastructure projects are also important to politicians as political capital. As John Bartle writes about transportation infrastructure, a completed project is “a classic political photo opportunity and a tangible symbol politicians can point to of their work on behalf of their constituents.”51 If the project is presented by a local official, but paid for by the federal government instead of the state, the deal seems even sweeter. Plus, local industry, from engineers to bankers and construction workers are employed, lending even more support to the incumbent politician. The increase in these types of projects may even create the need for specialized attorneys and investment professionals to work specifically with the financial instruments and tax codes created for these projects. The resulting political capital from transportation projects can also be focused for specific areas or groups of constituents. The location of the project and its related economic stimulus can bring greater support to a politician even if the money used for the project may have been equally or more beneficial if spent somewhere else. Infrastructure projects are also used nominally to aid low-income areas or groups of people, under the premise that development and investment will spur economic growth. Economists such as Bartle, however, believe direct subsidy to these individuals (rather than in the form of capital investment) is more effective and efficient.52 In the case of FHSR, there are clear political motivations. The location of the line is planned for the median of Interstate 4 from Tampa to Orlando, which is home to some of the most important independent voter blocs in the state. With Florida’s status as a swing state in national elections, a positive legacy in this corridor would drive support for Democrats in subsequent elections.53 The line is also slated to bring jobs back in the construction industry in the wake of a recession whose main symptom was housing foreclosure, thus severely impacting the booming construction industry in South Florida.

### Florida Neg link – High-Speed Rail = popular there

#### ( ) Florida voters support Federal funding of HSR

Schultz ‘11

(Linda Schulz, Vice President, Public Affairs, Harris Interactive – Harris Interactive is a market research firm, known for the Harris Poll. Harris works in a wide range of industries, across countries and territories through North America, Europe, and Asia. The company is a member of several research organizations, including the US National Council of Public Polls, the British Polling Council , the Council of American Survey Research Organizations, the US Council for Marketing and Opinion Research, and the UK Market Research Society. February 24, 2011 – http://www.harrisinteractive.com/NewsRoom/HarrisPolls/tabid/447/mid/1508/articleId/700/ctl/ReadCustom%20Default/Default.aspx)

A very public issue surrounding high-speed rail today is funding. Several states have declined the use of federal funds including Ohio, Wisconsin and most recently Florida (this survey was conducted before Florida declined funding). However, almost two thirds of Americans (64%) say they somewhat or strongly support using state funding for HSR and a similar number (62%) support using federal funds. The areas with the greatest support for high-speed rail funding include the California corridor where 70% support state funding being used and 73% support federal funding. 70% of both the Pacific North West and Gulf corridor residents also support state funding with more than 60% each also supporting federal funding. Additionally, more than two thirds of Florida residents support state and federal funding of high-speed rail, "a particularly poignant point", notes Schulz, as Florida recently declined federal HSR funding the state had actively sought. While those in states without a high-speed rail project still support state funding (61%), they are more likely to oppose federal funding for these projects (32%).

### Florida Neg link – High-Speed Rail = visible there

#### ( ) HSR is a highly-visible project in Florida.

Schultz ‘11

(Linda Schulz, Vice President, Public Affairs, Harris Interactive – Harris Interactive is a market research firm, known for the Harris Poll. Harris works in a wide range of industries, across countries and territories through North America, Europe, and Asia. The company is a member of several research organizations, including the US National Council of Public Polls, the British Polling Council , the Council of American Survey Research Organizations, the US Council for Marketing and Opinion Research, and the UK Market Research Society. February 24, 2011 – http://www.harrisinteractive.com/NewsRoom/HarrisPolls/tabid/447/mid/1508/articleId/700/ctl/ReadCustom%20Default/Default.aspx)

President Obama announced in April 2009, and reconfirmed during his recent State of the Union address, his commitment to develop high-speed intercity passenger rail across the United States. 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. It is designed to provide fast, reliable, and convenient service, operates using electric power and often includes onboard amenities such as food and beverage service and Wi-fi access. The Harris Poll conducted an online survey among 2,566 adults between January 17 and 24, 2011 to gauge awareness, intention to use and position on funding for high-speed rail. At the time of the survey, there were ten proposed high-speed rail corridors across the United Statesª. To-date, projects in California and Florida have been the most visible.

### I-4 corridor key to the election

#### ( ) I-4 corridor key to the election

Fox News ‘11

Fox News Radio November 22, 2011 – http://m.radio.foxnews.com/2011/11/22/aehq-florida-highway-of-voters/

It’s in the largest swing state in Presidential elections, and it may be the most important road in U.S. politics. It’s the I-4 highway across central Florida, from Tampa to Daytona Beach. 132 miles of all kinds of voters; old, young, rural, urban, but above all, independent voters who tend to vote for winners. And, the I-4 corridor helps determine which way Florida votes as a whole in those Presidential elections.

#### ( ) I-4 corridor key to the election

Schale ‘10

Steve Schale, Florida-based political strategist, Political Director, Florida Justice Association, January 23, 2010 – http://www.stevenschale.com/blog/2010/1/23/welcome-back-mr-president.html

So if Florida is the epicenter of Presidential politics, what is the epicenter of Florida? Simple: Tampa, the place where the President will pay a visit on Thursday. According to the Division of Elections, since 1948, the winner of Hillsborough County has won Florida all but one time (1960---that year, it voted for Kennedy, but Nixon won the state). And since 1992 (the point where POTUS elections in FL became reliably competitive), the Tampa media market as a whole has selected the winner. Certainly in 2008, the importance of the market wasn't lost on either the Obama or McCain campaigns. We stuck our campaign state headquarters right smack in the heart of the market and made St. Petersburg the first public Florida stop of then Senator Obama's general election effort. In fact, McCain and Obama both made four visits (and even more 'stops') to the market between August and Election Day, and sent their ticket-mate's there three times each. So what is it about this market? First, in terms of vote share, no market is bigger in Florida. Nearly a quarter of all votes cast in a Presidential election will come from the Tampa market. When you add the 20% that comes from the Orlando market, the importance of the I-4 corridor becomes obvious.

### I-4 corridor is up for grabs

#### ( ) I-4 corridor is key and could swing in either direction

Florida News Journal ‘11

October 10, 2011 – http://www.thefloridanewsjournal.com/2011/10/10/mel-martinez-endorses-mitt-romney-republican-nomination-presidential-elections-helps-flor

Only three other states have more electoral votes which makes Florida a must win for any candidate. As usual, the "I-4 Corridor" is a battle ground for democratic and republic candidates alike, because it is a swing vote area filled with a large amount of independent voters. Tampa and Orlando have already played a large role in the 2012 race, with most candidates having already made several appearances in Orlando, and the Republican National Convention being held in Tampa in 2012. Without the I-4 Corridor, Florida tends to vote roughly half Republican and half Democrat.

### Florida key to the election

#### ( ) Florida is key to the election

Falconer ‘11

(Matthew Falconer is a member of the statewide Workforce Florida board of directors. The Workforce Florida Board seeks to improve workforce issues – Florida Political Press – http://www.floridapoliticalpress.com/2011/08/21/election-2012-and-the-swing-states/)

Many Democrats feel Obama is a lock to win reelection. History has shown most incumbent presidents win reelection. The economy and the 2010 election suggest a Republican victory. But the presidential election of 2012 will come down to “swing states.” It is a numbers game. The winner of the United States presidency needs 270 “electoral votes.” The number of votes each state receives is based on population. Because of the large populations in coastal cities the Democrats have a “base” of approximately 215 electoral votes. In that group are Wisconsin and Minnesota that can go Republican. The Republicans have a “base” of 155 electoral votes. This means they need to win most of the swing states to take back the White House. These swing states include; Florida (29), Ohio (18), Pennsylvania (20), Iowa (6), Virginia (13), North Carolina (15), Georgia (16), Oregon (7), Nevada (6), Arizona (11), New Mexico (5) and Colorado (9). This group represents 155 electoral votes. Obama needs just 55 and the Republicans need 115. For the sake of this analysis let’s assume the parties split Pennsylvania and Ohio, and Virginia and North Carolina. Nevada and Colorado lean left so these four victories give the Democrats 50 electoral votes. We know anything can happen because Reagan won 49 states. With the economy on the brink and “hope” is becoming “despair” the Democrat base is in jeopardy. But given the electoral math it is difficult to see the Republicans winning back the White House without a victory in Florida. The biggest swing state is the biggest prize in 2012 and will decide the fate of our nation.

### A-to “Funding/tea party means HSR = unpopular”

#### ( ) Public supports Federal funding of HSR

Schultz ‘11

(Linda Schulz, Vice President, Public Affairs, Harris Interactive – Harris Interactive is a market research firm, known for the Harris Poll. Harris works in a wide range of industries, across countries and territories through North America, Europe, and Asia. The company is a member of several research organizations, including the US National Council of Public Polls, the British Polling Council , the Council of American Survey Research Organizations, the US Council for Marketing and Opinion Research, and the UK Market Research Society. February 24, 2011 – http://www.harrisinteractive.com/NewsRoom/HarrisPolls/tabid/447/mid/1508/articleId/700/ctl/ReadCustom%20Default/Default.aspx)

A very public issue surrounding high-speed rail today is funding. Several states have declined the use of federal funds including Ohio, Wisconsin and most recently Florida (this survey was conducted before Florida declined funding). However, almost two thirds of Americans (64%) say they somewhat or strongly support using state funding for HSR and a similar number (62%) support using federal funds. The areas with the greatest support for high-speed rail funding include the California corridor where 70% support state funding being used and 73% support federal funding. 70% of both the Pacific North West and Gulf corridor residents also support state funding with more than 60% each also supporting federal funding. Additionally, more than two thirds of Florida residents support state and federal funding of high-speed rail, "a particularly poignant point", notes Schulz, as Florida recently declined federal HSR funding the state had actively sought. While those in states without a high-speed rail project still support state funding (61%), they are more likely to oppose federal funding for these projects (32%).

### A-to “Rubio locks-up Florida for the GOP”

#### ( ) Rubio doesn’t make Florida a lock for the GOP – still up for grabs

McManus ‘12

Doyle McManus is a columnist for the Los Angeles Times, who appears often on Public Broadcasting Service's Washington Week. He earned an A.B. in history at Stanford University in 1974, and was a Fulbright scholar at the University of Brussels. LA Times – April 26, 2012 – http://articles.latimes.com/2012/apr/26/news/la-ol-vice-president-rubio-20120426

And Rubio might not even help Romney carry his home state. In Florida, the tea party senator is something of a polarizing figure. A Rasmussen Poll last month found that 48% of Floridians have a favorable view of Rubio, not an overwhelming number for a well-known senator. Fox News found that Rubio’s name on the ticket didn’t help Romney in a head-to-head poll: When vice presidential nominees were mentioned, the outcome was still a dead heat, 45% for Obama-Biden to 44% for Romney-Rubio.

#### ( ) Rubio does not make Florida a lock for the GOP

March ‘11

William March is a political reporter at the Tampa Tribune. Tampa Tribune. October 22, 2011

election2010.illumen.org/latest-news/appeal-of-rubio-on-ticket-not-clear

But some political experts, and not just Democrats, raise questions about how much Rubio would help the GOP 2012 ticket. Most agree his charisma would energize a ticket that could be plagued by lack of fervor and that he would appeal to Hispanics. But Rubio’s own electoral record and job approval ratings don’t suggest he could single-handedly swing Florida and create a national GOP Hispanic win. And drawn rightward by the tea party, Rubio has taken stances on some immigration-related issues that don’t please some of his own Hispanic constituents. His appeal may have taken a hit this week with revelations that Rubio has not been completely accurate in his frequent, dramatic descriptions of his family’s history as exiles from Castro’s Cuba. His parents left Cuba before Castro took power.

### Rubio won’t get the nomination

#### ( ) Romney won’t choose Rubio

Fiscal Times ‘12

(June 1, 2012 – http://www.thefiscaltimes.com/Articles/2012/06/01/Can-Romney-Resist-Marco-Rubio-As-Running-Mate.aspx#page1)

But Romney’s choice of Rubio over other suitors – including GOP governors Chris Christie of New Jersey and Bobby Jindal of Louisiana, Rep. Paul Ryan of Wisconsin and Sen. Rob Portman of Ohio – is far from a slam dunk. For one thing, there have been allegations of fund-raising irregularities in his 2010 Senate race. And according to some experts, Rubio’s appeal to Latinos is largely limited to Florida’s huge Cuban-American, anti-Castro community.

#### ( ) Rubio won’t be selected as the VP.

Adams ‘12

(David C Adams – Bureau Chief for South-East US and Caribbean at Thomson Reuters – Reuter’s – Jan 26th – http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/01/26/us-usa-campaign-florida-rubio-idUSTRE80P09620120126)

But Rubio may not be as coveted as Gingrich or Romney would have it appear as they press for votes in Florida, where more than 450,000 Hispanics identify themselves as Republicans. Despite his reputation as a watchdog over federal spending, Rubio, 40, has had significant financial problems that could keep him from passing any vetting process as a potential vice presidential choice, Republican and Democratic strategists say. In some ways, the story of Rubio's finances is similar to those of hundreds of thousands of his constituents in a state where more than 40 percent of homeowners are "underwater," owing more on their homes than the homes are worth. It is a crisis driven by falling property values and ill-advised home equity loans that drove up homeowners' debts. Rubio owes far more on his $384,000 Miami home than it is worth, and at times has had difficulty paying his mortgage. He bought the home in 2005 for $550,000 with a $495,000 mortgage. He soon had it appraised for $735,000 and took out a home equity line of credit for $135,000. In 2008, despite earning a declared $400,000 - including his $300,000 salary from the Miami law firm Broad and Cassel - Rubio failed to pay down the principal on his home for several months, according to Florida campaign finance disclosures. During the same period he did not make payments on a $100,000-plus student loan from his days at the University of Miami, the disclosures said. Rubio's spending habits also have gotten attention in Florida. Before joining the Senate last year, he was caught up in an Internal Revenue Service investigation of the Florida Republican Party's use of party-issued credit cards. He frequently had used his party credit card for personal use, and later reimbursed the card company for about $16,000. Rubio's handling of his personal finances contrasts sharply with the image of him on his Senate website, which highlights Rubio's efforts to prevent Washington from "piling up debt." "We need a government that stops spending more money than it takes in," the website says. Rubio's financial issues have led Florida Democrats to cast him as a hypocrite. "Rubio campaigned on reining in government spending, but his own personal spending is out control," said Brannon Jordan of the Florida Democratic Party. "He says one thing but is doing another." Rubio's office declined to discuss his mortgage issues in detail.

## Politics/Agenda Section

### Neg Links – High-Speed Rail = Hurts Agenda

#### ( ) High Speed Rail policy would suck-in the White House and drain capital.

Freemark ‘11

(Yonah – Master of Science in Transportation from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Bachelor of Arts in Architecture, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Yale University with Distinction. Also a freelance journalist who has been published in Planning Magazine; Next American City Magazine; Dissent; The Atlantic Cities; Next American City Online; and The Infrastructurist – He created and continues to write for the website The Transport Politic – The Transport Politic – February 8th, 2011 – http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2011/02/08/the-white-house-stakes-its-political-capital-on-a-massive-intercity-rail-plan/)

The White House Stakes Its Political Capital on a Massive Intercity Rail Plan $53 billion proposed for investments over the next six years. The President wants to “Win the Future,” but will his Republican opponents relax their opposition to rail spending? Vice President Joe Biden spoke in Philadelphia this morning to announce that the Obama Administration intends to request from Congress $8 billion in federal funds for the advancement of a national high-speed rail system as part of a six-year transportation reauthorization bill. The White House’s commitment to fast trains has been evident throughout the Administration’s two-year lifespan, beginning with the addition of $8 billion for the mode in the 2009 stimulus bill and continued with $2.5 billion included in the Fiscal Year 2010 budget. Yet this new funding, which would add up to $53 billion over the six-year period, is remarkable for its ambition. It is clear that President Obama’s 2012 re-election campaign, already being framed in terms of “winning the future,” will hinge partially on whether voters agree with his assessment of the importance of investing in the nation’s rail transport infrastructure. In his speech, Mr. Biden argued that American wealth was founded on “out-building” the competition. Infrastructure, he noted, is the “veins and the arteries of commerce.” The President and his team will be making this case to the American people the next two years, hoping that the public comes to endorse this message of national advancement through construction. Whether the proposal — to be laid out in more detail with next week’s introduction the President’s full proposed FY 2012 budget — has any chance of success is undoubtedly worth questioning. Republicans have campaigned wholeheartedly against rail improvement projects in Iowa, Ohio, and Wisconsin; even Florida’s project, which would require no operating subsidies once in service, hangs in the balance. But as part of the larger transportation reauthorization legislation, which is apparently slated to move forward by this summer, a real expansion in high-speed rail funding seems possible, especially if Mr. Obama pressures the Democratic-controlled Senate to push hard for it.

#### ( ) Supporting High=Seed Rail drains capital – Election demographics prove

Freemark ‘12

(Yonah – Master of Science in Transportation from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Bachelor of Arts in Architecture, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Yale University with Distinction. Also a freelance journalist who has been published in Planning Magazine; Next American City Magazine; Dissent; The Atlantic Cities; Next American City Online; and The Infrastructurist – He created and continues to write for the website The Transport Politic – The Transport Politic – February 6th, 2012 – http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2012/02/06/time-to-fight/)

With a House like this, what advances can American transportation policy make? Actions by members of the U.S. House over the past week suggest that Republican opposition to the funding of alternative transportation has developed into an all-out ideological battle. Though their efforts are unlikely to advance much past the doors of their chamber, the policy recklessness they have displayed speaks truly poorly of the future of the nation’s mobility systems. By Friday last week, the following measures were brought to the attention of the GOP-led body: The Ways and Means Committee acted to eliminate the Mass Transit Account of the Highway Trust Fund, destroying public transportation’s source of steady federal financing for capital projects, first established in the 1980s. The members of the committee determined that to remedy the fact that gas taxes have not been increased since 1993,\* the most appropriate course was not to raise the tax (as would make sense considering inflation, more efficient vehicles, and the negative environmental and congestion-related effects of gas consumption) but rather to transfer all of its revenues to the construction of highways. Public transit, on the other hand, would have to fight for an appropriation from the general fund, losing its traditional guarantee of funding and forcing any spending on it to be offset by reductions in other government programs.\*\* This as the GOP has made evident its intention to reduce funding for that same general fund through a continued push for income tax reductions, even for the highest earners. The House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee approved a transportation reauthorization bill on partisan lines (with the exception of one Republican who voted against it, Tom Petri of Wisconsin) that would do nothing to increase funding for transportation infrastructure in the United States over the next five years despite the fact that there is considerable demand for a large improvement in the nation’s road, rail, and transit networks just to keep them in a state of good repair, let alone expand them to meet the needs of a growing population. The committee voted to eliminate all federal requirements that states and localities spend 10% of their highway funding on alternative transportation projects (CMAQ), such as Safe Routes to School, sidewalks, or cycling infrastructure, despite the fact the those mandated investments are often the only ones of their sort that are actually made by many states. The committee eliminated the Obama Administration’s trademark TIGER program, which has funded dozens of medium-scale projects throughout the country with a innovative merit-based approach. Instead, virtually all decisions on project funding would be made by state DOTs, which not unjustly have acquired a reputation as only interested in highways. Meanwhile, members couldn’t resist suggesting that only “true” high-speed rail projects (over 150 mph top speed) be financed by the government — even as they conveniently defunded the only such scheme in the country, the California High-Speed Rail program. The same committee added provisions to federal law that would provide special incentives for privatization of new transportation projects — despite the fact that there is no overwhelming evidence that such mechanisms save the public any money at all. And under the committee’s legislation, the government would provide extra money to localities that contract out their transit services to private operators, simply as a reward for being profit-motivated. Meanwhile, House leadership recommended funding any gaps in highway spending not covered by the Trust Fund through a massive expansion in domestic energy production that would destroy thousands of acres of pristine wilderness, do little for decreasing the American reliance on foreign oil, and reaffirm the nation’s addiction to carbon-heavy energy sources and ecological devastation. New energy production of this sort is highly speculative in nature and would produce very few revenues in the first years of implementation. As a special treat, the same leadership proposed overruling President Obama’s decision to cancel the Keystone XL pipeline by bundling an approval for it into the transportation bill. This litany of disastrous policies were endorsed by the large majority of Republicans on each committee, with the exception of two GOP members in House Ways and Means\*\*\* and one in the Transportation Committee who voted against the bill, though the vote was entirely along party lines for an amendment attempting to reverse course on the elimination of the Mass Transit Account. Fortunately, these ideas are unlikely to make it into the code thanks to the Senate, whose members, both Democratic and Republican, have different ideas about what makes an acceptable transportation bill. I’ll get back to that in a bit. The House’s effort to move forward on a new multiyear federal transportation bill — eagerly awaited by policy wonks for three years — follows intense and repeated Republican obstructions of the Obama Administration’s most pioneering efforts to alter the nation’s transportation policy in favor of investments that improve daily life for inhabitants of American metropolitan areas. As part of that process, federally funded high-speed rail, streetcar, and transit center projects have been shot down by local politicians as a waste of money, even as road construction has continued apace. The Tea Party’s zany obsession with the supposed U.N. plot to take over American land use decisions through Agenda 21 seems to have infected GOP House members and even presidential contenders. Michele Bachmann’s claim in 2008 that Democrats are attempting to force people onto light rail lines to travel between their housing “tenements” and government jobs may have made it into the mind of Newt Gingrich, who recently made the claim that the “elite” in New York City who ride the subway and live in high-rise condos don’t understand “normal” Americans. What kind of language is this? In the Senate, there is clear evidence that the hard-core proposals of the House will not become law. The upper body’s Environment and Public Works Committee unanimously endorsed a different type of transportation reauthorization, one that would last only two years but that would reform and simplify the grants provided by the Department of Transportation so that they are more based on merit in such matters as ecological sensitivity and the creation of livable communities. Similarly, in the Senate Banking Committee, the transit portion of the proposed bill (approved unanimously) would maintain funding guarantees and allow transit agencies to use federal dollars for operations spending during periods of high unemployment, which would be an excellent policy if pushed into law. How the Senate will be able to compromise with the House in time for the March 31st deadline set by the current legislation is up in the air. The strange and laudable part of the Senate side of the story — at least as compared to the House — is the bipartisan nature of decision-making there. Why are Republicans in the Senate promoting a transportation bill that explicitly would promote multimodalism as a goal, in a contrast to the highway focus of their peers in the House? Why are they accepting environmental criteria as appropriate measures of quality in transportation policy? Perhaps the Democratic Party’s control of the Senate makes fighting such ideas a waste of time. Or perhaps longer Senate terms in office allow clearer, more reasonable thinking. Whatever the reason, in the long-term, it is hard to envision reversing the continued growth of the GOP’s strident opposition to sustainable transportation investments in the House. As I have documented, density of population correlates strongly and positively with the Democratic Party vote share in Congressional elections; the result has been that the House Republicans have few electoral reasons to articulate policies that benefit cities. Those who believe in the importance of a sane transportation policy need to make more of an effort to advance a sane transportation politics to residents of suburban and rural areas, who also benefit from efforts to improve environmental quality, mobility alternatives, and congestion relief, but perhaps are not yet convinced of that fact. Doing so would encourage politicians hoping for votes outside of the city core — Democratic or Republican — to promote alternatives to the all-highways meme that currently rules the GOP in the House.

#### ( ) High Speed Rail policy ensures loss of political capital – party demographics prove

Freemark ‘11

(Yonah – Master of Science in Transportation from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Bachelor of Arts in Architecture, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Yale University with Distinction. Also a freelance journalist who has been published in Planning Magazine; Next American City Magazine; Dissent; The Atlantic Cities; Next American City Online; and The Infrastructurist – He created and continues to write for the website The Transport Politic – The Transport Politic – “Understanding the Republican Party’s Reluctance to Invest in Transit Infrastructure”

January 25th, 2011 – http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2011/01/25/understanding-the-republican-partys-reluctance-to-invest-in-transit-infrastructure/)

Conservatives in Congress threaten to shut down funding for transit construction projects and investments in intercity rail. One doesn’t have to look far to see why these programs aren’t priorities for them. Late last week, a group of more than 165 of the most conservative members of the House of Representatives, the Republican Study Committee, released a report that detailed an agenda to reduce federal spending by $2.5 trillion over ten years. Spurred on by increasing public concern about the mounting national debt, the group argues that the only choice is to make huge, painful cuts in government programs. With the House now in the hands of the Republican Party, these suggestions are likely to be seriously considered. Transportation policy is prominent on the group’s list, no matter President Obama’s call for investments in the nation’s transportation infrastructure, expected to be put forward in tonight’s state of the union address. Not only would all funding for Amtrak be cut, representing about $1.5 billion a year, but the Obama Administration’s nascent high-speed rail program would be stopped in its tracks. A $150 million commitment to Washington’s Metro system would evaporate. Even more dramatically, the New Starts program, which funds new rail and bus capital projects at a cost of $2 billion a year, would simply disappear. In other words, the Republican group suggests that all national government aid for the construction of new rail or bus lines, intercity and intra-city, be eliminated. These cuts are extreme, and they’re not likely to make it to the President’s desk, not only because of the Democratic Party’s continued control over the Senate but also because some powerful Republicans in the House remain committed to supporting public transportation and rail programs. But how can we explain the open hostility of so many members of the GOP to any federal spending at all for non-automobile transportation? Why does a transfer of power from the Democratic Party to the Republicans engender such political problems for urban transit? We can find clues in considering the districts from which members of the House of Representatives of each party are elected. As shown in the chart above (in Log scale), there was a relatively strong positive correlation between density of congressional districts and the vote share of the Democratic candidate in the 2010 elections. Of densest quartile of districts with a race between a Democrat and a Republican — 105 of them, with a density of 1,935 people per square miles or more — the Democratic candidate won 89. Of the quartile of districts with the lowest densities — 98 people per square mile and below — Democratic candidates only won 23 races. As the chart below demonstrates (in regular scale), this pattern is most obvious in the nation’s big cities, where Democratic Party vote shares are huge when densities are very high. This pattern is not a coincidence. The Democratic Party holds most of its power in the nation’s cities, whereas the GOP retains greater strength in the exurbs and rural areas. The two parties generally fight it out over the suburbs. In essence, the base of the two parties is becoming increasingly split in spatial terms: The Democrats’ most vocal constituents live in cities, whereas the Republicans’ power brokers would never agree to what some frame as a nightmare of tenements and light rail. What does this mean? When there is a change in political power in Washington, the differences on transportation policy and other urban issues between the parties reveal themselves as very stark. Republicans in the House of Representatives know that very few of their constituents would benefit directly from increased spending on transit, for instance, so they propose gutting the nation’s commitment to new public transportation lines when they enter office. Starting two years ago, Democrats pushed the opposite agenda, devoting billions to urban-level projects that would have been impossible under the Bush Administration. Highway funding, on the other hand, has remained relatively stable throughout, and that’s no surprise, either: The middle 50% of congressional districts, representing about half of the American population, features populations that live in neighborhoods of low to moderate densities, fully reliant on cars to get around. It is only in the densest sections of the country that transit (or affordable housing, for instance) is even an issue — which is why it appears to be mostly of concern to the Democratic Party. Republicans in the House for the most part do not have to answer to voters who are interested in improved public transportation. This situation, of course, should be of significant concern to those who would advocate for better transit. To put matters simply, few House Republicans have any electoral reason to promote such projects, and thus, for the most part they don’t. But that produces a self-reinforcing loop; noting the lack of GOP support for urban needs, city voters push further towards the Democrats. And sensing that the Democratic Party is a collection of urbanites, those from elsewhere push away. It’s hard to know how to reverse this problem. Many Republicans, of course, represent urban areas at various levels of government. No Democrat, for instance, has won the race for New York’s mayoralty since 1989. And the Senate is a wholly different ballgame, since most states have a variety of habitation types. As Bruce McFarling wrote this week, there are plenty of reasons for Republicans even in places of moderate density to support such investments as intercity rail. But the peculiar dynamics of U.S. House members’ relatively small constituent groups, in combination with the predilection of state legislatures to produce gerrymandered districts designed specifically to ensure the reelection of incumbents, has resulted in a situation in which there is only one Republican-controlled congressional district with a population density of over 7,000 people per square mile. And that’s in Staten Island, hardly a bastion of urbanism. With such little representation for urban issues in today’s House leadership, real advances on transport issues seem likely to have to wait.

#### ( ) Oil lobby link:

#### They strongly-oppose HSR

RePass ‘11

(James P. RePass - Principal Executive of the National Corridors Initiative, a bi-partisan business and environmental transportation advocacy group. Primarily engaged in operating the non-profit National Corridors Initiative since its founding in 1989, he has a private-sector background and broad private-sector experience. Providence Journal – June 9, 2011 – lexis)

Recently, word began to dribble out of the Midwest that a game-changing event regarding the future of America s high-speed-rail program might be afoot. Since the election of Barack Obama, pro-rail stories have made the national news more than at any time in decades; keeping his campaign promise, the new president committed $8 billion in stimulus funds in his April 2009 high-speed-rail plan, which identified 10 initial corridors ranging from 100 to 600 miles long. Another $5 billion in federal capital for new rail programs was also created that year. That $13 billion is kick-starting high-speed rail as the first Interstate Highway System construction programs did: States that organized and asked, got the money, and built their segments first. That s the technique President Eisenhower used, pitting one region against another in a competition to get superhighways built. There is, however, a big difference between rail now and highways then: Rail has a well-funded enemy, the oil lobby. It pays experts to issue reports that debunk rail, loudly and dishonestly. Still, America is going forward with high-speed rail, just as we did with the Interstate Highway System a half century ago, and the competition to be first is starting to get hot.

#### Oil lobby key to agenda and causes vote-switching

Stein ‘11

Sam Stein is a Political Reporter at the Huffington Post, based in Washington, D.C. Previously he has worked for Newsweek magazine, the New York Daily News and the investigative journalism group Center for Public Integrity. He has a masters from the Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism and is a graduate of Dartmouth College. Huffington Post – May 19, 2011 – http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/05/19/oil-lobbying\_n\_864270.html

In the month leading up to an early May vote over whether to expand oil drilling in the Gulf of Mexico and open the coastal waters of Virginia for exploration, three of the nation's top oil companies made donations through their political action committees to 26 House lawmakers. All but one of those lawmakers, including five Democrats, ended up supporting the oil-industry-backed bill. The 26th lawmaker, Rep. Sam Johnson (R-Tex.), abstained from voting, according to data compiled for The Huffington Post by the good government group Public Campaign. The House of Representatives ultimately passed the Restarting American Offshore Leasing Now Act by a 266 to 149 margin, meaning that even if these 26 lawmakers had flipped their votes, the measure would have passed anyway. The amount donated by Exxon, Chevron and ConocoPhillips -- information for other oil company PACs has not yet been made public -- was a relative pittance: Just $40,000 in total was distributed among the 26 House members in the month leading up to the vote. By contrast, the 67 co-sponsors of the Restarting American Offshore Leasing Now Act have received a combined total of $8.8 million in campaign contributions from the oil and gas industry over the course of their careers. That said, the last minute tending the oil industry paid to House members is emblematic of how invested it was in the outcome of that particular legislation and its ability to quickly flex its political clout. "The pattern doesn't get more clear than this -- those who sided with Big Oil received campaign contributions," said David Donnelly, National Campaigns Director for Public Campaign Action Fund. "Those who didn't got nothing. Oil companies walk away with record profits while sticking it to Americans at the pump. But it's really these politicians who are in the tank."

#### ( ) Fossil Fuel lobby has enormous influence on Congress

Cobb ‘11

(Kurt Cobb is a columnist who writes frequently on energy and the environment. His column appears on the Paris-based science news site Scitizen and his work has been featured on Energy Bulletin, Common Dreams, Le Monde Diplomatique, and many other sites. He is a founding member of the Association for the Study of Peak Oil and Gas — and serves on the board of the Arthur Morgan Institute for Community Solutions. Economic Forecasts & Opinions – August 13, 2011 – lexis)

And so, I do agree with my economist acquaintance that taxation could be an elegant method for facilitating an energy transition. But is such taxation practical and even adequate? One might point to Europe where extremely high fuel taxes have been part of the reason that the average European uses one-half the amount of energy of the average American. Whether high fuel taxes could become a reality in the United States is an open question. So far no American politician has dared to propose a level of taxation comparable to Europe. The main reason for this is that the United States still has enormous fossil fuel reserves and as a consequence a well-funded fossil fuel lobby that has a stranglehold on the U.S. Congress. Europe is now largely bereft of fossil fuels and therefore has a fossil fuel lobby without the necessary influence to prevent high energy taxes and heavy expenditures on public transportation.

####  ( ) GOP opposes ANY support for High-Speed Rail

Freemark ‘11

(Yonah – Master of Science in Transportation from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Bachelor of Arts in Architecture, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Yale University with Distinction. Also a freelance journalist who has been published in Planning Magazine; Next American City Magazine; Dissent; The Atlantic Cities; Next American City Online; and The Infrastructurist – He created and continues to write for the website The Transport Politic – The Transport Politic – “With Diminished Expectations, President Obama Renews Attempt to Expand Transportation Financing” – September 9th, 2011 – http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2011/09/09/with-diminished-expectations-president-obama-renews-attempt-to-expand-transportation-financing/)

A year and two months away from the United States’ next big election, politics in Washington are at a virtual standstill, with Democrats and Republicans completely at odds with one another when it comes to government policies. The situation has aggravated an already difficult funding situation for the nation’s transportation, which lacks an adequate funding source and faces a murky future. Meanwhile, the unemployment situation worsens. President Obama’s speech tonight, in which he introduced a proposed American Jobs Act, was designed to stake a strong ground in opposition to the anti-investment GOP. In addition to a number of other policies, it promoted transportation investment as a great opportunity for reducing the rate of joblessness and improving the sometimes miserable condition of the country’s highways, rail, and transit. While the speech is unlikely to result in much Congressional action — Republicans do not seem inclined to support any of the President’s initiatives — it came across as thoughtful and in line with the nation’s great economic needs of the moment. For transportation, the bill would direct $50 billion to the construction of highways, transit, rail, and aviation. Another measure would deposit $10 billion into an infrastructure bank. Both funds would identify and sponsor the projects most likely to spur job growth as quickly as possible. Though the proposal was not laid out in further detail tonight, it represented another variation of the ramp-up in investments in transportation the Obama Administration has been attempting to promote for several years now. Even so, the project was a clear step back from the far more ambitious proposals Mr. Obama made at the beginning of the year, when he suggested directing $70.4 billion to highways, $18.5 billion to transit grants, and $8.0 billion to high-speed rail in 2012 alone. In response to the President’s new plans, House Majority Leader Eric Cantor (R-VA) criticized him for being unwilling to describe how the investments would be paid for, evidently unwilling to accept the Keynesian evidence that in difficult economic periods it is a good idea for governments to use deficit funding to support the economy. Chair of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee John Mica (R-FL) immediately articulated a position against the plans for the infrastructure bank, arguing that states should take on the responsibility. Just yesterday, the Republican leaders of the House Appropriations Committee unveiled their proposals for massive reductions in spending at the U.S. Department of Transportation, reducing highway expenditures to $27.7 billion in 2012 (from $41.8 billion in 2011) and transit formula spending to $5.2 billion (from $8.3 billion). No new New Start or Small Start transit capital grants would be funded. The high-speed rail program, which had once been one of Mr. Obama’s signature policies, would be entirely cut. These are austerity measures completely out of step with an economy desperately in need of stimulus, job creation, and infrastructure improvements.

#### ( ) Endorsing High Speed rail would drain White House capital

Freemark ‘10

(Yonah – Master of Science in Transportation from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Bachelor of Arts in Architecture, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Yale University with Distinction. Also a freelance journalist who has been published in Planning Magazine; Next American City Magazine; Dissent; The Atlantic Cities; Next American City Online; and The Infrastructurist – He created and continues to write for the website The Transport Politic – The Transport Politic – “For Advocates of Alternative Transportation, A Difficult Election Day” – November 3rd, 2010 – http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2010/11/03/for-advocates-of-alternative-transportation-a-difficult-election-day/)

With major exception of California, high-speed rail projects put in limbo nationwide after Republican gubernatorial wins. GOP takeover of the U.S. House is likely to result in continued difficulties passing a transportation bill, let alone a progressive one. The 2010 midterm election wasn’t about transportation. But the takeover of several governorships, many Senate seats, and the U.S. House of Representatives in general by the Republican Party portends difficult times ahead for both the Obama Administration’s agenda and the Democratic Party in general. For advocates who hope for the creation of a major high-speed rail system connecting the country’s largest cities, a Republican-led House is not good news: The party’s chosen spokesmen have been criticizing President Obama’s fast train initiative since it was announced in early 2009 and their rhetoric has been mostly unchanged. In general, Republican senators have been unwilling to vote for bills that have aided in the production of alternative infrastructure. The Bush Administration, the most recent example of Republican sentiment, was anti-rail and in favor of decreased funding for agencies like the Federal Transit Administration. There are, of course, some GOP members who haven’t been enemies of the program, notably likely new House Transportation and Infrastructure Chairman John Mica of Florida; it is possible that he and people like him will play a more prominent role over the next two years. Yet the more problematic aspect of the GOP’s new power is the party’s unity around the issue of fiscal austerity. Whatever one’s personal thinking about the importance of reducing budget deficits, the fact remains that transportation is largely funded by the government, so a decrease in public expenditures in general likely means fewer funds for highway and transit projects. There is little hope for exceptionalism in transportation: Considering their votes on the 2009 Stimulus bill and their complete opposition to increasing taxes (which will be necessary for any transportation program), Republicans appear not to share the philosophy of the Conservative Party in the United Kingdom, for instance, whose leaders have cut back massively on social programs even as infrastructure spending has been maintained.

#### ( ) High-Speed Rail legislation drains capital – angers GOP

Freemark ‘10

(Yonah – Master of Science in Transportation from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Bachelor of Arts in Architecture, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Yale University with Distinction. Also a freelance journalist who has been published in Planning Magazine; Next American City Magazine; Dissent; The Atlantic Cities; Next American City Online; and The Infrastructurist – He created and continues to write for the website The Transport Politic – The Transport Politic – “Growing Conservative Strength Puts Transit Improvements in Doubt” – December 1st, 2010 – http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2010/12/01/growing-conservative-strength-puts-transit-improvements-in-doubt/)

The next few years are likely to be difficult for advocates of public transportation because of increased hostility to government investment. 1987, 1991, 1995, 1998, and 2005 share a significant feature: In each of those years, members of Congress were able to come together to pass a multi-year bill that codified how the U.S. government was to collect revenues for and allocate expenditures on transportation. Not coincidentally, in each of those years, one political party controlled both the House and Senate. In the 112th Congress, set to enter office in just one month, Democrats will run the Senate and Republicans the House. This split control will make passing any legislation difficult. Unlike in those aforementioned years, there is little chance that this group of legislators will be able to pass a multi-year transportation bill either in 2011 or 2012. These circumstances, combined with increasingly strident conservative rhetoric about the need to reduce government expenditures, may fundamentally challenge the advances the Obama Administration and the Democratic Congress have been able to make over the past two years in expanding the nation’s intercity rail network, promoting a vision for livable communities, and reinforcing funding for urban transit. Continuing those efforts would require identifying sources of increased revenue and a steadfast commitment to reducing the role of the automobile in American society. But there is little support for increased taxes from any side of the political table and there is a fundamental aversion from the mainstream Republican Party to the investments that have defined the government’s recent transportation strategy. Meanwhile, declining power of the purse resulting from a fuel tax last increased in 1993 means that the existing situation is unacceptable, at least if there is any sense that something must be done to expand investment in transportation infrastructure. Gridlock — and myopic thinking about how to improve mobility in the United States — will ensue.

#### ( ) Their link turns are dated. HSR no longer builds capital.

St. Petersburg Times ‘11

(April 3, 2011 – lexis)

Rod Diridon, executive director of the Mineta Transportation Institute, says high-speed rail was a bipartisan issue before Obama's election, but now, "the policy of the Republican Party is to undermine any successes Obama might have." The exception: California, where former Republican Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger advocated for high-speed rail. Ironically, California's high-speed environment is brighter because of money from projects cancelled in other states. Other factors play major roles in America's failure to embrace high-speed rail, Diridon says. "The automobile and petroleum industries have fought any kind of non-petroleum transportation," he says.

#### ( ) HSR drains capital – California HSR scandals.

Doyle ‘12

(Michael Doyle is a reporter based in Washington, D.C. He covers California issues for the Modesto Bee and Fresno Bee and legal affairs for the McClatchy's Washington Bureau. McClatchy Washington Bureau – March 8, 2012 – lexis)

Federal auditors are now scrutinizing California's politically embattled high-speed rail program, in a search for facts that could turn up the heat. Prompted by Republican congressional skeptics, the non-partisan Government Accountability Office has started examining some of the most crucial questions surrounding the California project, including cost, ridership and potential ticket prices. "The fact that they are looking at it is good news for the taxpayer, and it's good news for the high-speed rail authority itself," Rep. Jeff Denham, R-Turlock, Calif., said in an interview Thursday. "We shouldn't just go out and waste money." The government watchdog agency confirmed Thursday that it is undertaking the California high-speed rail study in response to a congressional request made last December. A dozen House members, including Denham, House Majority Whip Kevin McCarthy, R-Bakersfield, and eight others from California, made the original request. With the help of some $3.6 billion in federal funds, combined with state dollars, the California High-Speed Rail Authority intends to start construction on an initial route connecting Bakersfield to Merced. Ultimately, the state plan calls for high-speed rail lines connecting Los Angeles with San Francisco, at a currently estimated price tag of some $98 billion. The federal auditors are supposed to probe some of the plan's most sensitive aspects, including: -- The amount of state and federal money that will be needed both to complete the project and to operate it annually. --The accuracy of the ridership projections relied upon by state officials in determining cost-effectiveness. The California High-Speed Rail Authority has projected attracting between 88 million and 117 million passengers annually by the year 2030. -- The price of tickets necessary to keep the rail project self-sustaining without continued reliance on government subsidies. For its own studies, the rail authority pegged ticket costs at half the average airfare between Los Angeles and San Francisco.

### President Gets Involved – High Speed Rail-Specific

#### ( ) White House would have to get involved in High-Speed Rail policy

Freemark ‘10

(Yonah – Master of Science in Transportation from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Bachelor of Arts in Architecture, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Yale University with Distinction. Also a freelance journalist who has been published in Planning Magazine; Next American City Magazine; Dissent; The Atlantic Cities; Next American City Online; and The Infrastructurist – He created and continues to write for the website The Transport Politic – The Transport Politic – “After Two Years of Democratic Control in Washington, A Transportation Roundup” –

December 29th, 2010 -- http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2010/12/29/after-two-years-of-democratic-control-in-washington-a-transportation-roundup/)

Two years of Democratic Party power in Washington, then, meant quite a few improvements to the nation’s transportation policy-making, bringing to the fore projects that have been largely ignored by the government for decades. The Obama Administration and its allies in Congress have made clear their collective interest in funding projects that are founded on the idea that transportation can be an important element in the creation of livable cities. This represents a significant and positive change from past federal policy. But there is more work to be done. Republican control of the House of Representatives is unlikely to simplify the extension of many of the new programs undertaken over the past two years — from high-speed rail to TIGER. Though these programs have faced some controversy and should be made more transparent, they have been well-managed, largely fair in their distribution of grants, and, crucially, have spread funding to cities across the country, in both Red and Blue states. In order to assure their future, President Obama will have to articulate their positive effects nationwide and advance ways to fund them that appear bipartisan and consensus-worthy. Will he make the effort to do so when the nation has so many other pressing needs? Is there enough political support on either side of the aisle to maintain a major federal commitment to transport policies that do not revolve around the construction of highways?

#### Obama will push High Speed Rail irrespective of GOP opposition.

Laing ‘12

Keith Laing is a national political journalist who works for The Hill newspaper in Washington, D.C. At The Hill, Keith covers transportation policy in Congress and manages the paper’s Transportation Report blog. Prior to coming to The Hill, Keith worked for the News Service of Florida, where he tracked the Florida state legislature with a focus on transportation and energy issues. The Hill – May 30th – http://thehill.com/blogs/transportation-report/railroads/230145-obama-administration-officials-to-speak-at-high-speed-rail-conference

The Obama administration has maintained its push for high-speed rail in the face of staunch opposition from Republicans in Congress and in state governments. The president called early in the first half of his tenure in office for a nationwide network of high-speed railways that he said would rival the reach of the interstate highway system, and he included $8 billion for construction in the 2009 economic stimulus.

## Spending Links

### Spending Links

#### Federal government funding for HSR wrecks the perception of deficit reduction

Samuelson 11(Robert, writer for Newsweek and Washington Post, “High-Speed Rail Is a Fast Track to Government Waste,” Daily Beast, Feb 16, http://www.thedailybeast.com/newsweek/2011/02/16/high-speed-rail-is-a-fast-track-to-government-waste.html)

There's something wildly irresponsible about the national government undermining states' already poor long-term budget prospects by plying them with grants that provide short-term jobs. Worse, the rail proposal casts doubt on the administration's commitment to reducing huge budget deficits. How can it subdue deficits if it keeps proposing big spending programs? High-speed rail would definitely be big. Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood has estimated the administration's ultimate goal—bringing high-speed rail to 80 percent of the population—could cost $500 billion over 25 years. For this stupendous sum, there would be scant public benefits. Precisely the opposite. Rail subsidies would threaten funding for more pressing public needs: schools, police, defense. How can we know this? History, for starters. Passenger rail service inspires wishful thinking. In 1970, when Congress created Amtrak to preserve intercity passenger trains, the idea was that the system would become profitable and self-sustaining after an initial infusion of federal money. This never happened. Amtrak has swallowed $35 billion in subsidies, and they're increasing by more than $1 billion annually.

#### Plan costs at least a trillion plus operating costs and future railroads

O’Toole 10(Randal, Senior Fellow at Cato Institute, “High Speed Rail,” June, http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/high-speed-rail)

Adding new federal subsidies at a time of massive federal budget deficits is not a good idea, and it could lead to the reregulation of the freight railroads, which were deregulated in 1979.8 Even though moderate-speed passenger trains are less expensive than true high-speed trains, they are still very expensive. Upgrading the 12,800 miles of track in the administration's plan to moderate-speed rail standards would cost far more than the $14.5 billion the president has proposed to spend so far. The entire 12,800-mile Obama-FRA system would cost at least $50 billion.9 Rather than build the entire system, Obama's plan really just invited states to apply for funds to pay for small portions of the system. For example, the administration granted close to $1 billion to Wisconsin to upgrade existing tracks from Milwaukee to Madison to 110-mph standards. This 85-mile line is only a tiny portion of the eventual planned route from Chicago to Minneapolis, and no one knows who will pay the billions necessary to complete that route. One cautionary note on high-speed rail costs comes from California. In November 2008, California voters agreed that the state should sell nearly $10 billion worth of bonds to start constructing a 220-mile-per-hour high-speed rail line from San Francisco to Los Angeles. The state's estimated cost for the entire system jumped from $25 billion in 2000 to $45 billion by 2008.10 However, one independent analysis concluded that the rail line would cost up to $81 billion.11 Thus, the costs of a true high-speed rail system would be far higher than the costs of a medium-speed system on existing tracks, as envisioned by the Obama administration. To build a 12,800-mile system of high-speed trains would cost close to $1 trillion, based on the costs estimates of the California system.12 It is unlikely that the nation could afford such a vast expense, particularly since our state and federal governments are already in huge fiscal trouble. Also, consider how the costs would rise even higher once a new rail system gets underway. The 12,800-mile FRA network reaches only 42 states and only a handful of cities in those states. Every excluded state and city is represented by senators and representatives who will wonder why their constituents have to pay for a rail system that only serves other areas. And even in the 42 states in the plan, routes are discontinuous, with no high-speed links between many pairs of major cities such as New York and Chicago. Groups representing all the excluded routes would lobby for rail lines, and overall costs would balloon over time. And the costs mentioned are only the capital costs. Most high-speed rail lines wouldn't cover their operating costs, so there would have to be billions of dollars in ongoing subsidies to the system. If the ridership on an expensive new rail system was very large, the high costs would seem more reasonable. But, unlike the interstate highway system, which is heavily used by almost all Americans, only a small elite would use high-speed rail. In 2007, the average American traveled 4,000 miles and shipped 2,000 ton-miles of freight over the interstate highways.13 By comparison, total annual use of a high-speed rail system would not likely be much more than 100 miles per person. And considering the premium fares charged to ride high-speed rail, most users would likely be higher-income white-collar workers.

# Case Frontlines

## A-to “Great Reset” Advantage

### Great Reset 1nc

#### No major economic boom – only benefits from freight not passenger

Staley 9(Sam, director of urban growth and land use policy for Reason Foundation, “Why High-Speed Rail Fails as a Jobs Program,” August 18 ,http://reason.com/archives/2009/08/18/why-high-speed-rail-fails-as-a)

Of course, rail proponents argue that spending money now on high-speed rail is a long-term investment that will pay off in higher economic productivity over the long-haul. But these job creation and income estimates they use are based on spending for freight rail, not passenger rail. Freight rail in America is a crucial part of our transportation infrastructure, accounting for 43 percent of the shipment of goods and services from one city to the other. Thus, investments in freight rail have a direct impact on the bottom line for American businesses, increasing the speed and reliability of goods shipment and improving productivity. Passenger rail in the U.S. is a different story. Passenger rail currently carries a very small portion of city-to-city travel—the market targeted by high-speed rail—and it's likely to remain modest well into the future. In 2008, Amtrak carried 28.7 million passengers. By comparison, there were 687 million airline passengers in 2008, in part because air service provides frequent high-speed travel to geographically distant cities. Then there's our well-developed highway network that makes automobiles very competitive with rail for distances under 200 miles. In most cases, once travel and wait times to train stations are factored in, travelers will spend as much time in route on the train as they will in a car. Consider a trip from Los Angeles to San Francisco, or Chicago to St. Louis, for a typical high-speed train traveler. You'll likely have to drive to the train station and pay to park. Once arriving in downtown St. Louis or San Francisco, you will likely have to take a taxi or rent a car to get to your hotel or meeting place (which is likely to be outside the central business district). The reliable, diverse, and nimble transit system that many advocates envision surrounding high-speed rail stations simply doesn't exist in most cities today, limiting the appeal of trains. To compensate for these disadvantages, taxpayers will have to steeply subsidize train ticket prices for the business travelers and tourists that are most likely to use them. Ultimately, high-speed rail's impacts on American travel patterns and employment productivity are going to be negligible, and the actual job creation potential for high speed rail is much more modest than proponents admit. Take, for example, the Ohio Hub corridor linking Cincinnati, Cleveland, Columbus, and Toledo to regional destinations such as Chicago and Toronto. Ohio is one of the nation's largest state economies, employing 5.3 million people. As an old-line manufacturing state, Ohio has lost 300,000 jobs just in the past year. Needless to say, Ohioans will be attracted to the optimistic rhetoric of rail's job creation potential. Moreover, preliminary estimates by independent consultants suggest the Ohio Hub may actually cover its annual operating costs (although supporters are counting on the federal government covering 80 percent of capital costs of the $3.7 billion project). Yet, even with these federal subsidies the consultant reports suggest that a $2.3 billion investment in building the rail corridor would generate only 54,540 jobs over the projected nine-year construction phase. That works out to 2,635 jobs per year at a cost of $42,170 per job. Further analysis found 16,700 permanent jobs would be created by the system once the system was up and running, assuming optimistically that ridership reaches forecasted levels and fares are set to cover its operating costs. While that might seem like a lot of jobs, the effort will do little to stem the economic tide turning against Ohio and other states facing the headwinds of global competition and a rising services-based economy. For transportation investments to have a meaningful economic impact, they will need to cost-effectively improve America's ability to move goods, services, and people from one place to another. High-speed rail doesn't do that. It is an extremely costly way to achieve limited portions of these goals, and it inevitably fails as a broad-based solution to the country's transportation challenges.

#### Economic gains are too far off

Stegemeier 10(Richard, the Anaheim resident is a retired chairman and CEO of Unocal and a longtime member of the National Academy of Engineering, “Richard Stegemeier: High-speed rail economics bleak,” Feb 15, http://www.ocregister.com/articles/speed-234453-high-rail.html)

High-speed rail is a wonderful concept because it uses electricity and could reduce our dependence on fossil fuels sometime in the distant future. But it's also far more expensive than commercial airlines and will require a new source of electricity from solar, wind or nuclear power. The president assures us there will be no pork in the $3.8 trillion federal budget for 2011. That may be true if we ignore the proposed $2.3 billion high-speed-rail grant for California. An undetermined amount of that money would be spent as a down payment on a $42.6 billion proposal to connect Anaheim with House Speaker Nancy Pelosi's San Francisco and Los Angeles with Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid's Las Vegas. That's an "oink-oink" if I ever heard one. I can understand the Las Vegas high-speed link to accommodate the thousands of Californians who want to flee to Nevada to escape California's high taxes. High-speed rail as part of a short-term economic stimulus package is nonsense if it takes a decade or two to build. The environmental impact statement itself will take years. Acquiring 680 miles of right-of-way will be contested in thousands of eminent domain lawsuits and will take at least a decade to complete. If high-speed rail serves intermediate cities then it will increase travel time, create noise and interrupt traffic flow at thousands of intersections. If it bypasses smaller cities to gain the advantage of speed, then it serves only the end terminals and disadvantages everyone in-between.

#### And short term job gains are overstated and overly expensive

Staley 9(Sam, director of urban growth and land use policy for Reason Foundation, “Why High-Speed Rail Fails as a Jobs Program,” August 18 ,http://reason.com/archives/2009/08/18/why-high-speed-rail-fails-as-a)

Setting aside Rep. Cantor's ludicrous 185,000 job creation claims—which are so unreasonably high as to strain credibility, let alone plausibility—even the 20,000 jobs per billion dollars spent figure cited by Gov. Granholm would represent a very expensive public jobs program. At the most basic level, that works out to $50,000 per job and would likely represent a subsidy higher than the wages paid to the typical worker. There are, in fact, better and cheaper ways to create jobs. For example, the federal government could give tax credits to private firms that create new jobs. This type of new jobs subsidy would run about $20,000 per worker and spur up to 1.3 million jobs according analysis by the Upjohn Institute for Employment Research in Michigan.

#### Their estimates are optimistic and assume perfect planning – costs are likely to be 40% over

O’Toole 10(Randal, Senior Fellow at Cato Institute, “High Speed Rail,” June, http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/high-speed-rail)

1. Costs and Ridership. Proponents of high-speed rail projects tend to overstate their benefits and understate their costs. Danish planning professor Bent Flyvbjerg has studied hundreds of government megaprojects, and he argues that project supporters suffer from "optimism bias" regarding the merits of projects, and that they often "strategically misrepresent" project details in order to gain support.30 No high-speed rail line has been built from scratch in the United States. But historically, urban passenger rail projects have, on average, gone 40 percent over their projected costs. At the same time, U.S. passenger rail planners typically overestimate ridership by an average of about 100 percent.31 California's high-speed rail authority is projecting that the San Francisco to Los Angeles line will be carrying two to three times more passengers by 2020 than Amtrak's entire Boston to Washington corridor currently carries.32 A Reason Foundation review of the state rail authority's plan called the ridership projections "the most unrealistic projections produced for a major transport project anywhere in the world."33 A report on the California project from the state's Senate Transportation Committee pointed to many major risks of the project, including inaccurate forecasting, uncertainly regarding rights-of-way, and substantial safety issues.34 Unlike running a bus system or even an airline, building a rail line requires accurate long-range forecasting. Planning and construction can take many years, and the service life of rail lines is measured in decades. A seemingly minor forecasting error—or a deliberately optimistic estimate—can turn what appears to be a sound investment into an expensive white elephant.

#### 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.

#### Transportation isn’t the key to mega-regions – they simply aren’t feasible

Berg 12(Nate, writer for the Atlantic Cities, “Megaregions: Don’t Hold Your Breath,” Jan 3, http://civicanalytics.com/megaregions-dont-hold-your-breath)

But while I agree with the megaregion pundits about transportation and environmental planning, we’re not there yet on economic development, and, as Lang correctly notes, we’re nowhere close on related and equally important issues like (secondary) education. And I’d add workforce development to that list. Costs for major transportation projects must be shared across cities and counties because they can’t afford to go it alone. And fight it though we may, we resist regional cooperation on environmental concerns such as aquifer protection at our own peril. [Characterizing water availability as primarily an environmental issue is foolish in its own right, but that's an entry on communication for another time.] No individual city or county can afford to adequately protect a long-term water supply of regional significance. Cities and counties will maintain separate budgets for local transportation and environmental projects for as long as we have local government, but we’ve crossed the threshold where regional cooperation is no longer questioned in most places. City and county officials can work together on metropolitan planning organizations (MPOs) to lobby for projects that benefit their collective area within the region. Everybody in the region–or at least all users–benefit from the investment, but their residents likely benefit more than people in other municipalities because of proximity and perception. Voters, to the extent they are paying attention, give credit to the local politicians for successfully navigating the regional decision-making process and everybody wins. What’s the counterpart for economic development? Most local economic developers participate in at least one regional effort of some type, such as “regional partner” programs at larger chambers of commerce funded by membership dues or economic development districts funded by the U.S. Economic Development Administration. However, while most local economic developers, especially in smaller communities, understand that acting regionally is the only way to compete effectively in the global economy, how many local politicians or voters give credit to their local economic developers for the project that lands in the community next door? Some of your residents may get new jobs in that facility next door, and perhaps, if the project is large enough, a portion of the spinoff activity will add to your tax base, making the local politicians happy. But rarely do you see local economic developers standing together to explain, convincingly, how a regional win translates to tangible benefits for each individual community. Competition among local economic developers breeds a lot of innovation that pushes the entire field forward. This is not one of those cases. We need to do better. Pundits are right to point to the regional nature of how economies grow–based on shared assets like DFW Airport and networks which form the basis of cluster approaches–but, as much as it pains me to say it, convincing data alone rarely changes behavior. Carrots and sticks change behavior, not academic arguments. Thankfully, we’ve seen more carrots than sticks lately with bottom-up approaches like the Jobs Accelerator at the federal level and the MPO-like process for economic development that’s emerging in states such as New York and Ohio. But it will take some time to see if these new models are politically viable and capable of generating results that are significant enough to accelerate regional cooperation in places around the country where old habits die hard when it comes to economic development. Until I see evidence of that changing, I’ll be skeptical of the megaregion argument.

#### Economic collapse doesn’t cause instability

Fareed Zakaria was named editor of Newsweek International in October 2000, overseeing all Newsweek editions abroad, December 12, 2009, “The Secrets of Stability,” http://www.newsweek.com/2009/12/11/the-secrets-of-stability.html

Others predicted that these economic shocks would lead to political instability and violence in the worst-hit countries. At his confirmation hearing in February, the new U.S. director of national intelligence, Adm. Dennis Blair, cautioned the Senate that "the financial crisis and global recession are likely to produce a wave of economic crises in emerging-market nations over the next year." Hillary Clinton endorsed this grim view. And she was hardly alone. Foreign Policy ran a cover story predicting serious unrest in several emerging markets. Of one thing everyone was sure: nothing would ever be the same again. Not the financial industry, not capitalism, not globalization. One year later, how much has the world really changed? Well, Wall Street is home to two fewer investment banks (three, if you count Merrill Lynch). Some regional banks have gone bust. There was some turmoil in Moldova and (entirely unrelated to the financial crisis) in Iran. Severe problems remain, like high unemployment in the West, and we face new problems caused by responses to the crisis—soaring debt and fears of inflation. But overall, things look nothing like they did in the 1930s. The predictions of economic and political collapse have not materialized at all.

#### Heg unsustainable – multiple constraints ensure collapse and rise of alternatives

Christopher Layne, Chair in National Security at the School of Government and Public Service at Texas A&M University, 09 [“The Waning of U.S. Hegemony—Myth or Reality?: A Review Essay,” International Security, Vol. 34, No. 1, Summer 2009]

For an overview of trends that could affect international politics over the next two decades, a good starting point is the National Intelligence Council’s (NIC’s) Global Trends 2025: A Transformed World.[15](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy.lib.umich.edu/journals/international_security/v034/34.1.layne.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22f15) Global Trends 2025 is not light reading, but it is significantly more insightful and intellectually courageous than typical government reports. Its key geopolitical conclusion is that the U.S.-dominated unipolar world will give way to multipolarity during the next two decades spurred by two causal mechanisms: the emergence of new great powers (and potentially important regional powers); and economic, financial, and domestic political constraints that may erode U.S. capabilities. China, India, and possibly Russia are emerging great powers.[16](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy.lib.umich.edu/journals/international_security/v034/34.1.layne.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22f16) As Global Trends 2025 points out, the rise of China and India to great power status will restore each to “the positions they held two centuries ago when China produced approximately 30 percent and India 15 percent of the world’s wealth” (p. 7). Their ascent is being propelled by “the global shift in relative wealth and economic power” from North America and the Euro-Atlantic world to Asia—a shift “without precedent in modern history” (ibid.). By 2025, China figures to have the world’s second-largest economy (measured by gross domestic product [GDP]) and will be a first-rank military power (p. 30). India, buoyed by its strong economic growth rate, will “strive for a multipolar system with New Delhi as one of the poles” (ibid.). Although both states could encounter speed bumps that might slow—or even derail—their ascents to great power status, the NIC believes that the “chances are good that China and India will continue to rise” (p. 29).[17](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy.lib.umich.edu/journals/international_security/v034/34.1.layne.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22f17)**]** Because of uncertainties about economics, energy prices, domestic governance issues, and especially demography, Russia’s great power trajectory is more problematic than China’s or India’s (pp. 31–32).[18](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy.lib.umich.edu/journals/international_security/v034/34.1.layne.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22f18) Between 2009 and 2025, Russia’s population is forecast to drop from 141 million to below 130 million, affecting the availability of manpower for both the military and the labor pools (pp. 23–24, 30). If Russia overcomes its demographic challenge and continues its revival as a great power, however, the NIC believes it “will be a leading force in opposition to U.S. global dominance” (p. 32). Because its great power status is closely tied to its ability to control both the energy resources and pipelines of Central Asia and the Caucasus, Russia will also seek to reestablish its sphere of influence in the “near abroad” (pp. 32, 82). According to the NIC, in addition to relative decline, the United States will confront other constraints on its international role. U.S. military supremacy will no longer be as dominant as it has been since the Cold War’s end (p. 93). The United States’ soft power may diminish as its liberal model of political and economic development is challenged by authoritarian/statist alternatives (pp. 3, 8–9, 13–14). At home, economic and political constraints may undermine U.S. hegemony. Global Trends 2025 was published just before the full scope of the global financial and economic crisis became apparent. Nevertheless, the NIC did have an inkling of the meltdown’s potential long-term implications for U.S. power. In particular, Global Trends predicts that over the next two decades, the dollar’s role as the international economy’s preeminent reserve currency will erode. Although at the time this issue went to press, the dollar remained strong and will continue to be the reserve currency for some time to come, China’s spring 2009 call to replace the dollar with a new reserve currency signals that the NIC’s long-term worries may be justified.[19](http://muse.jhu.edu.proxy.lib.umich.edu/journals/international_security/v034/34.1.layne.html%22%20%5Cl%20%22f19) **[End Page 153]** As the NIC observes, the financial privileges conferred on the United States by the dollar’s unchallenged reserve currency status have underpinned the preeminent role of the United States in international politics since the end of World War II. Thus, “the dollar’s decline may force the United States into difficult tradeoffs between achieving ambitious foreign policy goals and the high domestic costs of supporting those objectives” (pp. 12, 94, 97). Moreover, the growing dependence of the United States on foreign capital inflows “may curtail U.S. freedom of action in unanticipated ways” (p. 97). The NIC concludes that America’s “interest and willingness to play a leadership role may be more constrained as the economic, military, and opportunity costs of being the world’s leader are reassessed by American voters” (p. 93). Ultimately, although the United States will probably be primus inter pares in a multipolar international system twenty years from now, it will have less power—and foreign policy options—than it has been accustomed to having since 1945 (ibid.).

#### No challengers to competitiveness dominance

Qian 08—reporter of Yale Global [Jiang, February 29th, Is the Sun Setting on US Dominance? – Part II, http://yaleglobal.yale.edu/display.article?id=10435

The proponents of such a "multipolar worldview" often confuse the immense potential of their favored giants with their actual influences. They often overlook the immense internal difficulties these rising giants must overcome to realize their potential. Most importantly, they do not take full account of the strategic interactions between these giants during their simultaneous rise and the strategic opportunities that such interactions present for the US. Among the rising powers, the European Union boasts by far the largest economy, with a strong currency and a comparatively large and prosperous population. However, after a long drive of expansion, Europe faces a serious cohesion problem. It still suffers from a weak security framework that's dependent on NATO and a legalistic rather than executive center in Brussels. Although the EU does chase strategic interests in its proximities such as the central Asia and North Africa, it does so, not for any overreaching vision to compete globally, but mostly for parochial economic reasons. Europe is not yet competing in any "Great Game," for the simple reason that Europe is not yet unified. Recent rejections of the EU constitution show that serious resistance remains towards further integration. After recent stabilization of its economy, a resurgent Russia is often mentioned as a future global power. However, Russia faces severe long-term internal challenges. Its population is declining and aging, its vast Siberia territories hollowing out after the end of Soviet subsidies. Extractive industries such as hydrocarbon, mining and timber account for 80 percent of Russia's exports and 30 percent of its government revenue, whereas its manufacturing industries are mostly outdated and uncompetitive.Russia therefore will have serious issues with its self-image as a major world power, finding it hard to forge an assessment of its global role commensurate with its long-term demographic and economic realities. Japan has a similar problem of updating its self-image as the most "advanced" nation in Asia for more than 100 years. Today Japan faces the harsh reality that, after its neighbors catch up, Japan will again find itself a geographically small, resource-poor island nation dependent on trade, living uneasily among large, populous continental neighbors. It has a largely pacifist, prosperous population in a neighborhood still rife with nationalism.Unlike Europe, East Asia has yet to extinguish historical grievances, border disputes and a taste for raw national powers. As Japan itself proved, economic rises, once initiated, can be rapid indeed, so its current economic strength does not guarantee its future influence. Furthermore, barring a rapid re-militarization, Japan's growth in national strengths is bound to be slower than that of its still maturing neighbors, therefore its relative strategic position in East Asia will only grow weaker. Either re-militarization or an erosion of its self-perceived leadership in the region is likely to require a profound reassessment of Japan's postwar consensus of national purposes. India sees itself as an up-and-coming power, proud to be a democracy yet simultaneously aspiring to more traditional "hard" powers. As a diverse and still poor country, it faces immense internal challenges. Its manufacturing base and infrastructure need major overhaul. Beyond these, India is limited by its geographical constraint in the South Asia and the thorn in its side that’s Pakistan. Sandwiched between Pakistan, Burma and the Himalayas, India’s ambition beyond the subcontinent could not blossom until its geographical perimeter is secured. China borders three of the ambitious giants – India, Russia and Japan. China's neighborhood is far tougher than that of either Europe or the US. Like India, China is a large, poor country rife with internal tensions. Unlike Europe or America, its current form of government does not enjoy wide ideological appeal. Compared with Russia’s or even Japan’s, its military is still modernizing. It has recently become fashionable in America and Europe to describe Chinese "expansions" in Africa and South America. But the evidence is mostly economic deals over raw materials. This is not expansionism, but mercantilism. China is indeed playing an active geopolitical game in its immediate environment: Southeast Asia, Central Asia and Korea Peninsula. But this only serves to show that China is still mired in local complexities.

### Extension – No Challengers

#### America is too awesome – Other countries can’t even eat on the same plate

The Economist 08 (“What crisis? Innovation” June 14, 2008, U.S. Edition. Lexis)

Worries that America is losing its edge in science and technology are overblown "THE wolves have not encircled us yet," the Denver Post opined in an article in 2006 entitled "Signs America's Scientific Edge is Slipping", "but there's no denying the sounds of scratching at the door."This was a pithy summary of a mountain of reports from congressional committees, scientific panels and business groups. But a new report from the RAND Corporation's National Defence Research Institute, "US Competitiveness in Science and Technology", suggests that the panic is overblown. The report demonstrates that America is still the world's science and technology powerhouse. It accounts for 40% of total world spending on research and development, and produces 63% of the most frequently cited publications. It is home to 30 of the world's leading 40 universities, and employs 70% of the world's living Nobel laureates. America produces 38% of patented new technologies in the OECD and employs 37% of the OECD's researchers. There is little evidence that America is resting on its laurels, according to RAND. Developing countries such as China and India may be boosting their science and technology muscle faster than America. But they are starting from a low base. America is outperforming Europe and Japan on many performance measures: in 1993-2003 America's growth rate in patents averaged 6.6% a year compared with 5.1% for the European Union and 4.1% for Japan. One reason for America's angst was that the growth of federal spending on R&D slowed significantly with the end of the cold war. It only grew by 2.5% a year in 1994-2004 compared with a long-term average of 3.5% since 1953. The trouble with this statistic is that America has lots of sources of R&D spending: federal money accounted for only $86 billion of the $288 billion that it spent on R&D in 2004. Spending on the life sciences is increasing rapidly, a reasonable bet on the future. Others worry that non-US citizens now account for 41% of science and engineering PhDs. But this is arguably a sign of America's continuing world domination: the world's brightest people are gravitating to the world's best opportunities. A higher proportion than ever of these paragons want to make their homes in the United States.

### Extension – Can’t Help Economy

#### Costs are too high and speeds won’t be enough to have an impact

O’Toole 10(Randal, Senior Fellow at Cato Institute, “High Speed Rail,” June, http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/high-speed-rail)

While the Obama administration has started funding high-speed rail, it has no detailed financial plan, no cost estimates for the proposed system, no source of long-term funding, and no expectation that passenger fares will cover all of the operating costs or any of the capital costs. Only two high-speed rail routes in the world, Tokyo-Osaka and Paris-Lyon, earn enough revenues to cover capital and operating costs.4 The Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) plan, upon which the Obama administration is basing its high-speed rail ideas, could more accurately be titled "moderate-speed rail."5 For the most part, it calls for trains running no faster than 110 miles per hour, which high-speed rail aficionados do not even consider to be true high-speed rail. Such trains would hardly be innovative: starting in the 1930s, several American railroads regularly operated passenger trains at top speeds of 110 miles per hour or more. Yet those fast trains did not stop the decline of passenger trains after World War II. Amtrak today runs trains at top speeds of 100 miles per hour or more in several corridors, but top speeds are far greater than average speeds. For example, the average speed in the Boston-to-Washington corridor is less than 85 miles per hour. The Obama administration has two reasons for focusing on moderate-speed rail instead of true high-speed rail. First, a complete network of true high-speed rail lines would be "prohibitively expensive," according to Amtrak's president.6 Thus, Obama's plan calls for running 110-mile-per-hour passenger trains on existing tracks shared with freight trains. For safety reasons, faster trains would require the construction of an entirely new rail system. It is much less expensive to upgrade existing tracks to support 110-mile-per-hour trains than to build brand-new tracks. Second, the administration wants to aid private freight railroads at the same time it builds the new passenger rail system. President Obama hopes that upgrading freight lines to run faster passenger trains will also allow the railroads to increase their freight speeds and capacities, thus capturing traffic from truckers. Historically, the freight railroads have received very little federal aid: only 18,700 of 350,000 miles of rail lines built in the United States received federal subsidies.7

#### No benefit to faster speeds for freight trains – only increases maintenance issues

O’Toole 8(Randal, senior fellow at CATO, “High-Speed Rail: The Wrong Road for America,” October 31, http://www.cato.org/publications/policy-analysis/highspeed-rail-wrong-road-america)

The problem with increasing existing track speeds from 79 to 110 miles per hour or more is that the rails in nearly all of these corridors are privately owned by freight railroads such as BNSF, CSX, Norfolk Southern, and Union Pacific. Nominally, the railroads would benefit from such improvements, but since their freight trains would rarely need to go more than 79 miles per hour—60 is more typical— they see no reason to help pay for the expensive signaling and track maintenance required for the higher speeds. Moreover, a rail line running both 110-mile-per-hour (or faster) passenger trains and 60-mile-per-hour freight trains presents major operational problems that are not welcomed by the freight railroads.

#### HSR can’t help the economy and ridership estimates are exaggerated

Samuelson 11(Robert, writer for Newsweek and Washington Post, “High-Speed Rail Is a Fast Track to Government Waste,” Daily Beast, Feb 16, http://www.thedailybeast.com/newsweek/2011/02/16/high-speed-rail-is-a-fast-track-to-government-waste.html)

High-speed rail would transform Amtrak's small drain into a much larger drain. Once built, high-speed-rail systems would face a dilemma. To recoup initial capital costs - construction and train purchases - ticket prices would have to be set so high that few people would choose rail. But lower prices, even with favorable passenger loads, might not cover costs. Government would be stuck with huge subsidies. Even without recovering capital costs, high-speed-rail systems would probably run in the red. Most mass-transit systems, despite high ridership, routinely have deficits. The reasons passenger rail service doesn't work in America are well-known: Interstate highways shorten many trip times; suburbanization has fragmented destination points; air travel is quicker and more flexible for long distances (if fewer people fly from Denver to Los Angeles and more go to Houston, flight schedules simply adjust). Against history and logic is the imagery of high-speed rail as "green" and a cutting-edge technology. It's a triumph of fancy over fact. Even if ridership increased fifteenfold over Amtrak levels, the effects on congestion, national fuel consumption and emissions would still be trivial. Land-use patterns would change modestly, if at all; cutting 20 minutes off travel times between New York and Philadelphia wouldn't much alter real estate development in either. Nor is high-speed rail a technology where the United States would likely lead; European and Asian firms already dominate the market.

### Extension – Heg Unsustainable

#### Decline is inevitable – heg is economically unsustainable

Layne, 09 – Mary Julia and George R. Jordan Professor of International Affairs at Texas A&M's George Bush School of Government and Public Service, Ph.D. in Political Science from the University of California, LL.M. in International Law from Virginia Law, J.D. from USC, and Research Fellow with the Center on Peace and Liberty at The Independent Institute (Christopher, "The Waning of U.S. Hegemony—Myth or Reality? A Review Essay", International Security, Vol. 34, No. 1, Summer 2009, July 6th 2010, Galileo, p. 21-23) PDF

The publications reviewed in this essay examine whether the United States is in (or is headed for) relative decline.74 Brooks and Wohlforth purport to deny the possibility that America is in relative decline, but a growing number of analysts disagree.75 The long-term impact of the current economic crisis largely will determine who is right (and to be fair, Brooks and Wohlforth wrote their book before its effects became evident). Yet, even before the meltdown, longterm structural weaknesses that have been accumulating for more than three decades were causing U.S. economic power to wane.76 The warning signs with respect to U.S. decline are a looming fiscal crisis and doubts about the future of the dollar as the reserve currency, both of which are linked to the fear that after recovery, the United States will face a serious inflationary threat.77 Optimists contend that once the United States recovers, fears of a fiscal crisis will fade: the country faced a larger debt to GDP ratio after World War II, and yet embarked on a sustained era of growth. The postwar era, however, was a golden age of U.S. industrial and financial dominance, trade surpluses, and sustained high growth rates. The United States of 2009 is far different from the United States of 1945, however, which is why many economists believe that even in the best case, it will emerge from the current crisis with serious macroeconomic handicaps.78 Chief among these handicaps are the increase in the money supply (caused by the massive amount of dollars the Federal Reserve and Treasury have pumped into circulation to rescue the economy), and the $1 trillion plus budget deficits that the Brookings Institution and the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) project the United States will incur for at least a decade.79 When the projected deficits are bundled with the persistent U.S. current account deficit, the entitlements overhang, and the cost of two ongoing wars, there is reason to worry about the United States’ longterm fiscal stability.80 The CBO states, “Even if the recovery occurs as projected and the stimulus bill is allowed to expire, the country will face the highest debt/GDP ratio in 50 years and an increasingly urgent and unsustainable fiscal problem.”81 If the Congressional Budget Office is right, it spells trouble ahead for the dollar. As Jonathan Kirshner noted on the eve of the meltdown, the dollar’s vulnerability “presents potentially significant and underappreciated restraints upon contemporary American political and military predominance.”82 The dollar’s loss of reserve currency status would undermine U.S. dominance, and recent events have magnified concerns that predated the financial and economic crisis. 83 First, the other big players in the international economy now are either military rivals (China) or ambiguous “allies” (Europe) that have their own ambitions and no longer require U.S. protection from the Soviet threat. Second, the dollar faces an uncertain future because of concerns that its value will diminish over time. Because of these two factors, as Eric Helleiner notes, if the dollar experiences dramatic depreciation in the future, there is a “risk of defections generating a herd-like momentum” away from it.84

#### U.S hegemony is unsustainable

Snyder PhD, Professor of Public Policy at the University of Maryland 2010 – [Quddus Z. Snyder, “Systermic theory in an era of declining US hegemony,” <http://www.bsos.umd.edu/gvpt/irworkshop/papers_fall09/snyder.pdf>]

At the turn of the century it appeared as if we were living through a ‘hegemonic age.’ But recent developments might justify a reevaluation of this conclusion. With its armed forces over-extended, and resources stretched, the US appears much weaker today than it did five years ago. The classic Gilpinian dilemma provides insight into the present predicament the US finds itself in: This three-way struggle over priorities (protection, consumption, and investment) produces a profound dilemma for society. If it suppresses consumption, the consequence can be severe internal social tensions and class conflict…If the society neglects to pay the costs of defense, external weakness will inevitably lead to its defeat by rising powers. If the society fails to save and reinvest a sufficient fraction of its surplus wealth in industry and agriculture, the economic basis of the society and its capacity to sustain either consumption or protection will decline. Thus far the US has maintained a massive defense budget while consumption and investment have been sustained by deficit spending. It is unclear how long this formula will work. The problem does not only stem from fact that the US is bogged down in two wars, it is also in the throes of a serious economic downturn. Of course, everyone is getting hit. Because all are suffering, the US is still a giant in terms of relative power differentials. Relative power is important, but so is the hegemon’s ability to actually do things. It is unlikely that the US will have either the political will or capability to take on major international undertakings. It is unclear when the US will fully withdraw from Iraq and Afghanistan; however, these projects will gobble up massive amounts of resources and treasure at a time when America’s own recovery is being partly bankrolled by foreign powers like China**.**43 The point is simply that America’s unilateral assertiveness on the international scene is changing. US security guarantees may prove less credible than they once were, leading allies to enhance their own military capabilities. The US may still be a giant, but one that, for now at least, seems more bound.

### Extension – Hegemony Impact Defense

#### Heg collapse doesn’t cause global nuclear war

Richard Haas (president of the Council on Foreign Relations, former director of policy planning for the Department of State, former vice president and director of foreign policy studies at the Brookings Institution, the Sol M. Linowitz visiting professor of international studies at Hamilton College, a senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, a lecturer in public policy at Harvard University’s John F. Kennedy School of Government, and a research associate at the International Institute for Strategic Studies) April 2008 “Ask the Expert: What Comes After Unipolarity?” <http://www.cfr.org/publication/16063/ask_the_expert.html>

Does a non polar world increase or reduce the chances of another world war? Will nuclear deterrence continue to prevent a large scale conflict? Sivananda Rajaram, UK Richard Haass: I believe the chance of a world war, i.e., one involving the major powers of the day, is remote and likely to stay that way. This reflects more than anything else the absence of disputes or goals that could lead to such a conflict. Nuclear deterrence might be a contributing factor in the sense that no conceivable dispute among the major powers would justify any use of nuclear weapons, but again, I believe the fundamental reason great power relations are relatively good is that all hold a stake in sustaining an international order that supports trade and financial flows and avoids large-scale conflict. The danger in a nonpolar world is not global conflict as we feared during the Cold War but smaller but still highly costly conflicts involving terrorist groups, militias, rogue states, etc.

#### Hegemony doesn’t prevent war

Christopher Layne (Associate Professor in the Bush School of Government and Public Service at Texas A&M University) 2006 “The Peace of Illusions” p 176-7

A second contention advanced by proponents of American hegemony is that the United States cannot withdraw from Eurasia because a great power war there could shape the post conflict international system in ways harmful to U.S. interests. Hence, the United States "could suffer few economic losses during a war, or even benefit somewhat, and still find the postwar environment quite costly to its own trade and investment."sa This really is not an economic argument but rather an argument about the consequences of Eurasia's political and ideological, as well as economic, closure. Proponents of hegemony fear that if great power wars in Eurasia occur, they could bring to power militaristic or totalitarian regimes. Mere, several points need to be made. First, proponents of American hegemony overestimate the amount of influence that the United States has on the international system. There are numerous possible geopolitical rivalries in Eurasia. Most of these will not culminate in war, but it's a good bet that some will. But regardless of whether Eurasian great powers remain at peace, the outcomes are going to be caused more by those states' calculations of their interests than by the presence of U.S. forces in Eurasia. The United States has only limited power to affect the amount of war and peace in the international system, and whatever influence it does have is being eroded by the creeping multipolarization under way in Eurasia. Second, the possible benefits of "environment shaping" have to be weighed against the possible costs of U.S. involvement in a big Eurasian war. Finally, distilled to its essence, this argument is a restatement of the fear that U.S. security and interests inevitably will be jeopardized by a Eurasian hegemon. This threat is easily exaggerated, and manipulated, to disguise ulterior motives for U.S. military intervention in Eurasia.

### Extension – Economy Impact Defense

#### Global economy resilient

Fareed Zakaria was named editor of Newsweek International in October 2000, overseeing all Newsweek editions abroad, December 12, 2009, “The Secrets of Stability,” http://www.newsweek.com/2009/12/11/the-secrets-of-stability.html

This revival did not happen because markets managed to stabilize themselves on their own. Rather, governments, having learned the lessons of the Great Depression, were determined not to repeat the same mistakes once this crisis hit. By massively expanding state support for the economy—through central banks and national treasuries—they buffered the worst of the damage. (Whether they made new mistakes in the process remains to be seen.) The extensive social safety nets that have been established across the industrialized world also cushioned the pain felt by many. Times are still tough, but things are nowhere near as bad as in the 1930s, when governments played a tiny role in national economies. It's true that the massive state interventions of the past year may be fueling some new bubbles: the cheap cash and government guarantees provided to banks, companies, and consumers have fueled some irrational exuberance in stock and bond markets. Yet these rallies also demonstrate the return of confidence, and confidence is a very powerful economic force. When John Maynard Keynes described his own prescriptions for economic growth, he believed government action could provide only a temporary fix until the real motor of the economy started cranking again—the animal spirits of investors, consumers, and companies seeking risk and profit. Beyond all this, though, I believe there's a fundamental reason why we have not faced global collapse in the last year. It is the same reason that we weathered the stock-market crash of 1987, the recession of 1992, the Asian crisis of 1997, the Russian default of 1998, and the tech-bubble collapse of 2000. The current global economic system is inherently more resilient than we think. The world today is characterized by three major forces for stability, each reinforcing the other and each historical in nature. The first is the spread of great-power peace. Since the end of the Cold War, the world's major powers have not competed with each other in geomilitary terms. There have been some political tensions, but measured by historical standards the globe today is stunningly free of friction between the mightiest nations. This lack of conflict is extremely rare in history. You would have to go back at least 175 years, if not 400, to find any prolonged period like the one we are living in. The number of people who have died as a result of wars, civil conflicts, and terrorism over the last 30 years has declined sharply (despite what you might think on the basis of overhyped fears about terrorism). And no wonder—three decades ago, the Soviet Union was still funding militias, governments, and guerrillas in dozens of countries around the world. And the United States was backing the other side in every one of those places. That clash of superpower proxies caused enormous bloodshed and instability: recall that 3 million people died in Indochina alone during the 1970s. Nothing like that is happening today.

#### The U.S. and global economy are resilient

Behravesh, 6 (Nariman, most accurate economist tracked by USA Today and chief global economist and executive vice president for Global Insight, Newsweek, “The Great Shock Absorber; Good macroeconomic policies and improved microeconomic flexibility have strengthened the global economy's 'immune system.'” 10-15-2006, www.newsweek.com/id/47483) // JMP

The U.S. and global economies were able to withstand three body blows in 2005--one of the worst tsunamis on record (which struck at the very end of 2004), one of the worst hurricanes on record and the highest energy prices after Hurricane Katrina--without missing a beat. This resilience was especially remarkable in the case of the United States, which since 2000 has been able to shrug off the biggest stock-market drop since the 1930s, a major terrorist attack, corporate scandals and war. Does this mean that recessions are a relic of the past? No, but recent events do suggest that the global economy's "immune system" is now strong enough to absorb shocks that 25 years ago would probably have triggered a downturn. In fact, over the past two decades, recessions have not disappeared, but have become considerably milder in many parts of the world. What explains this enhanced recession resistance? The answer: a combination of good macroeconomic policies and improved microeconomic flexibility. Since the mid-1980s, central banks worldwide have had great success in taming inflation. This has meant that long-term interest rates are at levels not seen in more than 40 years. A low-inflation and low-interest-rate environment is especially conducive to sustained, robust growth. Moreover, central bankers have avoided some of the policy mistakes of the earlier oil shocks (in the mid-1970s and early 1980s), during which they typically did too much too late, and exacerbated the ensuing recessions. Even more important, in recent years the Fed has been particularly adept at crisis management, aggressively cutting interest rates in response to stock-market crashes, terrorist attacks and weakness in the economy. The benign inflationary picture has also benefited from increasing competitive pressures, both worldwide (thanks to globalization and the rise of Asia as a manufacturing juggernaut) and domestically (thanks to technology and deregulation). Since the late 1970s, the United States, the United Kingdom and a handful of other countries have been especially aggressive in deregulating their financial and industrial sectors. This has greatly increased the flexibility of their economies and reduced their vulnerability to inflationary shocks. Looking ahead, what all this means is that a global or U.S. recession will likely be avoided in 2006, and probably in 2007 as well. Whether the current expansion will be able to break the record set in the 1990s for longevity will depend on the ability of central banks to keep the inflation dragon at bay and to avoid policy mistakes. The prospects look good. Inflation is likely to remain a low-level threat for some time, and Ben Bernanke, the incoming chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, spent much of his academic career studying the past mistakes of the Fed and has vowed not to repeat them. At the same time, no single shock will likely be big enough to derail the expansion. What if oil prices rise to $80 or $90 a barrel? Most estimates suggest that growth would be cut by about 1 percent--not good, but no recession. What if U.S. house prices fall by 5 percent in 2006 (an extreme assumption, given that house prices haven't fallen nationally in any given year during the past four decades)? Economic growth would slow by about 0.5 percent to 1 percent. What about another terrorist attack? Here the scenarios can be pretty scary, but an attack on the order of 9/11 or the Madrid or London bombings would probably have an even smaller impact on overall GDP growth. So what would it take to trigger a recession in the U.S. or world economies over the next couple of years? Two or more big shocks occurring more or less simultaneously. Global Insight recently ran a scenario showing that a world recession could happen if the following combination of events were to take place: oil prices above $100 per barrel, inflation and interest rates running 3 percentage points above current levels and a 10 percent drop in home prices across many industrial nations (e.g., the United States, the United Kingdom, Spain, Australia, Sweden). The likely timing of such a recession would be 2007. However, given the extremeness of these assumptions, the probability of such a scenario is less than 20 percent. The good news is that the chances of a recession occurring in the next couple of years are low. The not-so-good news is that assertions about recessions being relegated to history's trash heap are still premature.

### Extension – Mega Regions Defense

#### Mega-region planning is based on faulty and unpredictable economics

Krugman 8(Paul, professor of economics and international affairs at Princeton, “Mega More,” April 14, http://krugman.blogs.nytimes.com/2008/04/14/mega-more/)

I thought I should say some more about the “mega-region” issue — specifically, why I’m not as convinced as Richard Florida that encouraging mega-region growth is the right idea. My basic view is that at a point in time the economic geography we see is more or less an equilibrium — that is, the individual costs and benefits of moving from one place to another are roughly balanced. Suppose that we see two regions, M (the mega) and N (a not so mega). M will have higher productivity and wages, offset by higher commuting costs and/or higher housing prices. An individual considering a move from N to M will take these into account, so that roughly speaking the two locations will be equally attractive. Now we know that’s not the whole story. Adding to M’s work force will reinforce the positive spillovers from a large concentration of talent etc.. That’s the argument for encouraging more people to move to M. But there are other considerations. For one thing, there are negative spillovers too, such as traffic congestion. For another, there are spillovers in N as well. For example, reducing the smaller city’s work force may deprive it of the critical mass needed to support some amenities, or maintain a cost-competitive position in some industries. Do we know enough about these cross-cutting effects to be sure that moving people from Des Moines to Acelaland makes America better off? I don’t think we do. And as anyone who’s tried to study positive externalities knows, it’s very hard to pin them down.

#### Plan doesn’t solve megaregions – broader action beyond just HSR is necessary

Todorovich 9 (Petra, director of America 2050, “Megaregions and America’s Economic Recovery,” September, http://www.spur.org/publications/library/article/megaregions\_and\_america%E2%80%99s\_economic\_recovery)

. Looking ahead, a national infrastructure strategy that promotes megaregion-scale coordination could be rolled out at the federal level in a variety of ways. It could take shape in multiple, separate pieces of legislation: the reauthorization of the surface transportation bill, the water resources bill, and climate and energy legislation. In each of these areas, megaregion-scale planning, cooperation and coordination could be encouraged by competitive grant programs or modest, additional incentive-funding to develop megaregion-scale plans for certain resources or infrastructure systems, along the lines of the competitive high-speed rail grant program. These legislative reforms will require a broader federal vision that responds to the transformative change underway in our national economy, global environment and national population demographics. Until we make a break from the inertia of past practices, we will be ill-equipped to respond to the challenges of tomorrow

#### Current mega-region growth sufficient

Oxford Analytica 10(independent strategic-consulting firm drawing on a network of more than 1,000 scholar-experts at Oxford and other leading universities and research institutions around the world, “'Mega-Regions' Drive Wealth,” June 4, http://www.forbes.com/2010/06/03/cities-regions-urban-wealth-business-oxford.html)

These economic centers are expanding, and will be crucial to the way communities live in coming decades. Over 50% of the world's population lives in cities. Within a couple of decades, 70% will be urban-based because of the rapid formation of "mega-regions." The U.N. biannual State of the World Cities reports increasingly emphasize the growth of mega-cities--massive interconnected urbanization zones housing 20-50 million inhabitants (or in some cases more). Mega-regions are an economic unit, defined as an interlocking economic system with common access to natural resources and ecosystems, and in more developed economies, transportation systems linking population centers within a single region. They have grown as, what once were considered distinct cities with their own cores and suburbs and rural hinterlands, have grown into each other physically, creating distinct mega-regions with no non-urban intervening territory. The largest contemporary urban-based mega-region is Hong Kong-Shenzhen-Guangzhou, with nearly 120 million people. The United States possesses about 10 mega-regions, including the Boston-Washington corridor, which, with a population of 54 million, is the second largest in the world in terms of economic output (topped by Greater Tokyo). Others exist in: --Brazil: Rio de Janeiro-Sao Paulo with 43 million people; --India: Delhi-Lahore and Mumbai-Pune corridor; --Japan: Nagoya-Osaka-Kyoto-Kobe, moving toward 60 million people; and --West Africa: the urban corridor linking Nigeria-Benin-Togo-Ghana. Economic centers. Cities and urban centers always played key roles as engines of economic growth. Mega-regions are no different, but are more than simply larger versions of city economies. As cities integrate hinterlands, mega-regions develop as metropolitan regions expand outward, forming a new natural economic unit with distinct traits from constituent city parts. For instance, where U.S. cities once served as centers exploiting natural resources, they now function as centers of human capital development and application. Transformative implications. Mega-regions are expanding, and will be crucial to the way communities live and economies develop in coming decades. By 2050 the U.N. calculates that only 14% and 33% of residents in rich and poor countries respectively will live outside cities.

#### Too many alt causes to megaregions – broad vision key

Berg 9(Nate, “Megaregions and Megaproblems,” writer for The Atlantic Cities, June 25, http://www.planetizen.com/node/39414)

As America's metropolitan areas meld into "megaregions", officials and policymakers will need to figure out how to deal with their shared and growing infrastructure problems. Consider the ball rolling. The growing population of America is creating major metropolitan regions that can span state lines and encompass tens of millions of people. These emerging regions are projected to continue to grow, and as they do, their infrastructure is expected to struggle to keep up with the pace of expansion. In areas like transportation, energy and water, how these regions meet the needs of the near future is a question nobody quite knows how to answer. What's needed is a "third century vision", says Mark Pisano, West Coast Director of America 2050, an effort to develop a nationwide infrastructure strategy. The group has been holding collaborative conferences with policymakers in each of the 11 "megaregions" forming in the U.S. to try to jumpstart regional thinking and cooperation . Due to their cross-border nature, these megaregions are seen by the group as stepping stones towards development of a national policy on infrastructure. The emerging megaregions of the U.S., according to America 2050. And while crumbling infrastructure is not necessarily a new problem for cities, continued growth will create a greater reliance on these interconnecting systems. Traffic congestion does not stop at city borders, nor do depleted water sources. Energy transmission lines may not be up to the task of fulfilling the needs of larger populations, and may not even reach some newer areas. "Each of these systems is under environmental stress. Each of these systems is increasingly unreliable as we move to the future," said John Kirlin, Executive Director of the State of California's Delta Vision Foundation at a recent America 2050 forum on devising infrastructure strategies for the "Southwest Megaregion." Kirlin was part of a panel focusing on the three key infrastructure areas: transportation, energy and water. Beyond the specifics of what's not working in each region, the overarching problem many at the forum saw is the lack of clear national leadership. "Megaregions don't have representation in congress," argued Polly Trottenberg, executive director of Building America's Future, a bi-partisan coalition of elected officials working for greater investment in infrastructure. Officials need to start recognizing the cross-jurisdictional issues that affect them as a region, according to Trottenberg, who was recently nominated as assistant secretary for policy at the federal Department of Transportation. "We're not institutionally prepared to do it yet," said Kirlin. Key among these issues is water. "Water is without a home in the federal policy structure. There's a Department of Transportation, a Department of Energy. Is there a Department of Water? No," said Timothy F. Brick, Chairman of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California. Brick argued that many of the decisions about water and water policy happen at a very local level. But many of those local areas receive their water from far-off places, especially in the arid Southwest. With water being transported from Northern to Southern California, oversubscription to supplies from the Colorado River, and plans to build a North-South water pipeline to feed Las Vegas, the problem of water is one already steeped in cross-jurisdictional politics. But generating funding for projects that are built in specific cities or areas but which have cross-state benefits and implications is not an easy prospect. "We have all kinds of things where if we had the money we'd spend it tomorrow," said Nevada State Assemblyman Tick Segerblom. Convincing Northern Nevada to invest in a water pipeline serving Las Vegas has been a challenge, however, so the money just isn't there. The idea behind America 2050 is that places within these megaregions already rely on each other, and unless they start acting -- and investing -- like it, the fall of one place could likely result in the fall of many others. As the group pulls together the ideas and advice of officials and policymakers from these 11 megaregions, they hope to plot out a way to argue that case – a move many hope will spark a more unified approach for addressing the infrastructural needs of America.

## A-to Air Pollution advatnage

### Environment – 1NC Frontline

#### Environmental benefits are overstated

O’Toole 10(Randal, Senior Fellow at Cato Institute, “High Speed Rail,” June, http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/high-speed-rail)

2. Environmental Benefits. The environmental benefits of high-speed rail would be negligible at best. President Obama's moderate-speed trains are expected to be powered by diesel locomotives, which burn petroleum and emit pollutants and greenhouse gases. Even electrically powered, true high-speed rail is unlikely to be clean. California rated its proposal as environmentally sound only by projecting impossibly high ridership numbers and unrealistically assuming that future automobiles and airplanes would be no more energy-efficient than they are today. In 2005, Florida's High-Speed Rail Authority proposed a 125-mph rail line between Tampa and Orlando. The environmental impact statement for the proposal estimated that the trains would produce more nitrogen oxide pollution and volatile organic compounds than would be saved by the automobiles taken off the road.35 It also calculated that operating and maintaining the gas-turbine locomotives would consume 3.5 to 6.0 times as much energy as would be saved by the cars replaced.36 The statement concluded that "the environmentally preferred alternative is the No Build Alternative" because it "would result in less direct and indirect impact to the environment."37 The Tampa-Orlando proposal was subsequently killed, only to be revived by the Obama administration. In January, the Department of Transportation announced that Florida will receive $1.25 billion of the $8 billion in high-speed rail stimulus funding for the route.38

#### Initial environmental costs outweigh future benefits

O’Toole 8(Randal, senior fellow at CATO, “High-Speed Rail: The Wrong Road for America,” October 31, http://www.cato.org/publications/policy-analysis/highspeed-rail-wrong-road-america)

Although the electrically powered train might be somewhat more energy-efficient and (if the electricity does not come from fossil fuels) less polluting than airplanes, the energy and pollution cost of constructing the rail line (which will require huge amounts of fossil fuels) will be so great that it will take decades of operational savings to pay back that cost. And, soon after those decades are finally up, it will be time to completely rebuild the line—at a high energy as well as fiscal cost. In short, high-speed rail will require a huge amount of public money to build. The decision to build carries a huge risk both that the ultimate cost will be much greater than predicted, and that the ridership and other benefits will be lower—especially since the consulting firms hired to forecast those benefits expect to profit from rail construction. Once built, the environmental benefits will be miniscule and the main effect will be to reduce the availability of private, relatively unsubsidized modes of transportation

#### Aff estimates don’t assume increasing efficiency of cars and planes

O’Toole 10(Randal, Senior Fellow at Cato Institute, “High Speed Rail,” June, http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/high-speed-rail)

In considering the costs and benefits of high-speed rail, fast trains should be compared not to today's cars and planes, but to tomorrow's more efficient cars and planes. If automakers are able to meet the administration's latest fuel-economy targets, and consumers continue to replace the nation's auto fleet at the usual rate, cars and light trucks on the road in 2020 will be almost 25 percent more energy efficient than they are today, on average, and by 2030 they will be 38 percent more fuel-efficient. Meanwhile, the energy efficiency of air travel has increased an average 2 percent per year since 1980.39 Boeing promises that its 787 plane will be 20 percent more fuel efficient than comparable planes today.40 Jet engine makers have set a goal of doubling fuel efficiency by 2020.41 The California high-speed rail authority claims that high-speed trains will produce large energy savings.42 Yet the authority's own environmental impact statement (EIS) reveals that the benefits will be negligible. The EIS projects that the energy savings from operating high-speed rail will repay the energy cost of construction in just five years.43 But the EIS assumes that the energy efficiency of autos and planes won't improve.44 But if, over the lifetime of a high-speed rail project, autos and planes become 30 percent more fuel efficient, then the energy payback period for high-speed rail rises to 30 years. Since rail lines require expensive (and energy-intensive) reconstruction about every 30 years, high-speed rail is not likely to save energy at all. Steven Polzin, of the University of South Florida's Center for Urban Transportation Research, points out that automobiles and buses have relatively short life cycles, so they can readily adapt to the need to save energy or reduce pollution. By contrast, he says rail systems "may be far more difficult or expensive to upgrade to newer, more efficient technologies."45 The American auto fleet completely turns over every 18 years, and the airline fleet turns over every 21 years, so both can quickly become more fuel-efficient. With rail lines, however, we are stuck for at least three to four decades with whatever technology is selected.

#### Their pollution estimates are wrong

O’Toole 9(Randal, senior fellow at CATO, “High-Speed Rail is Not ‘Interstate 2.0,’” September 9, http://www.cato.org/pubs/bp/bp113.pdf)

When announcing his high-speed rail vision, President Obama promised high speed rail would provide “clean, energy-efficient transportation.” 38 Many people assume that trains use significantly less energy and produce less pollution and greenhouse gas emissions than other forms of travel. In fact, passenger rail’s environmental benefits are negligible and costly. Amtrak claims its trains are more energy efficient than driving, but it bases this claim on an assumption that the average automobile has just 1.6 occupants. 39 In fact, autos tend to carry more people in the intercity travel that would compete with high-speed rail. An independent analysis for the California High Speed Rail Authority found that intercity autos average 2.4 people. 40 This makes Amtrak only 8 percent more energy efficient than light trucks and 15 percent less energy efficient than cars. As a Department of Energy report concluded in 2000, “intercity auto trips tend to be relatively efficient highway trips with higher than-average vehicle occupancy rates—on average, they are as energy-efficient as rail intercity trips.” Moreover, the report added, “if passenger rail competes for modal share by moving to high-speed service, its energy efficiency should be reduced somewhat—making overall energy savings even more problematic.” 41 This explains why the Florida High Speed Rail Authority’s analysis of a Tampa-Orlando rail line concluded that “the environmentally preferred alternative is the No-Build Alternative” because it “would result in less direct and indirect impact to the environment.” 42 An objective analysis of other high-speed rail proposals would reach the same conclusion. Not all analyses agree with this assessment.

#### Too many alt causes to air pollution for the plan to save a significant number of people

BROOK et al 04 M.D. and several other doctors writing for Circulation magazine from the American Heart Association [Circulation magazine Robert D. Brook, MD; Barry Franklin, PhD, Chair; Wayne Cascio, MD; Yuling Hong, MD, PhD; George Howard, PhD; Michael Lipsett, MD; Russell Luepker, MD; Murray Mittleman, MD, ScD; Jonathan Samet, MD; Sidney C. Smith, Jr, MD; Ira Tager, MD, “Air Pollution and the Cardiovascular Disease” June 1, 2004, <http://circ.ahajournals.org/cgi/content/full/109/21/2655#SEC1/>] k ward

A brief description of several individual air pollutants is provided first for background. A complete discussion is beyond the scope of this statement, and interested readers may find a more comprehensive review on this subject elsewhere.26 Particulate Matter Airborne Particulate Matter consists of a heterogeneous mixture of solid and liquid particles suspended in air, continually varying in size and chemical composition in space and time (Figure 1). Primary particles are emitted directly into the atmosphere, such as diesel soot, whereas secondary particles are created through physicochemical transformation of gases, such as nitrate and sulfate formation from gaseous nitric acid and sulfur dioxide (SO2), respectively. The numerous natural and anthropogenic sources of PM include motor vehicle emissions, tire fragmentation and resuspension of road dust, power generation and other industrial combustion, smelting and other metal processing, agriculture, construction and demolition activities, residential wood burning, windblown soil, pollens and molds, forest fires and combustion of agricultural debris, volcanic emissions, and sea spray. Although there are thousands of chemicals that have been detected in PM in different locations, some of the more common constituents include nitrates, sulfates, elemental and organic carbon, organic compounds (eg, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons), biological compounds (eg, endotoxin, cell fragments), and a variety of metals (eg, iron, copper, nickel, zinc, and vanadium).

### Extension – Air Pollution Defense

#### US has pollution under control – we are making advances

Schwartz 03 Adjunct Scholar @ Competitive Enterprise Institute [Joel Schwartz, “Particulate Air Pollution: weighing the risks” April 2003 <http://cei.org/pdf/3452.pdf/>] Kevin W. Prep ‘11

There is no question that high levels of air pollution can kill. About 4,000 Londoners died during the infamous five-day “London Fog” episode of December 1952, when soot and sulfur dioxide soared to levels tens of times greater than the highest levels experienced in developed countries today, and visibility dropped to less than 20 feet.1 A number of other high-pollution episodes up through the 1970s exacted a similarly horrifying toll.2 Fortunately, the United States has been very successful in reducing air pollution. Due to a combination of technological advances and regulatory intervention, pollution levels have been declining for decades, despite large increases in population, energy use, and driving. Nevertheless, many health researchers, regulators, and environmental activists are concerned that airborne particulate matter (PM), especially smaller particulates known as PM10 and PM2.5,3 might still be causing tens of thousands of premature deaths each year,.4 Policymakers and environmental activists have recently focused special attention on the health effects of power-plant emissions, which are a significant contributor to PM2.5 levels in parts of the eastern United States. Bills introduced by Senator James Jeffords (I-VT) and the Bush Administration would require cuts in power plant emissions well beyond current requirements; advocates for both proposals claim they would save thousands of lives per year.5 Environmental groups have published a series of reports claiming substantial harm to public health from power plant emissions.6 These groups ardently oppose the Clear Skies Initiative as well as the Bush Administration’s proposed reform of the Clean Air Act’s New Source Review regulation, arguing that it would allow substantial increases in power plant emissions.7

### Extension – Small benefit

#### Negligible environmental benefits at best

O’Toole 8(Randal, senior fellow at CATO, “High-Speed Rail: The Wrong Road for America,” October 31, http://www.cato.org/publications/policy-analysis/highspeed-rail-wrong-road-america)

In the face of high energy prices and concerns about global warming, environmentalists and planners offer high-speed rail as an environmentally friendly alternative to driving and air travel. California, Florida, the Midwest, and other parts of the country are actively considering specific high-speed rail plans. Close scrutiny of these plans reveals that they do not live up to the hype. As attractive as 110-to 220-mile-per-hour trains might sound, even the most optimistic forecasts predict they will take few cars off the road. At best, they will replace for profit private commuter airlines with heavily subsidized public rail systems that are likely to require continued subsidies far into the future. Nor are high-speed rail lines particularly environmentally friendly. Planners have predicted that a proposed line in Florida would use more energy and emit more of some pollutants than all of the cars it would take off the road. California planners forecast that high-speed rail would reduce pollution and greenhouse gas emissions by a mere 0.7 to 1.5 percent—but only if ridership reached the high end of projected levels. Lower ridership would nullify energy savings and pollution reductions.

### Extension – Bad Assumptions

#### Aff predictions are wrong – too many faulty assumptions

O’Toole 8(Randal, senior fellow at CATO, “High-Speed Rail: The Wrong Road for America,” October 31, http://www.cato.org/publications/policy-analysis/highspeed-rail-wrong-road-america)

? High-speed rail must be considered highly risky. A recent oversight report on the California high-speed rail project from that state’s Senate Transportation Committee pointed to many specific risks of high-speed rail, including forecasting, rights-of-way, and safety risks. 68 Unlike running a bus system or even an airline, building a rail line requires accurate long-range forecasting. Planning and construction can take many years, and the service life of the rail line is measured in decades. A seemingly minor forecasting error can turn what appears to be a productive asset into an expensive white elephant. The most obvious forecasting issue is cost. All of the cost estimates for the Midwest, Florida, and California rail projects were made before 2005. Since then, the prices of steel, concrete, and energy have risen dramatically. As a result, it is likely that projected costs need to be adjusted upwards by 50 percent or more. Denver’s 120-mile Fas Tracks rail project, which was planned at the same time as the Florida and California high-speed rail projects, is now estimated to cost 68 percent more than was projected in 2004. 69 This is not unusual: according to a 2006 study by researchers at Northeastern University, U.S. rail transit costs average 40 percent more than their original approved budgets. 70 The other forecasting problem, of course, has to do with ridership and other benefits. Danish planning professor Bent Flyvbjerg notes that U.S. rail projects typically overestimated ridership by an average of 100 percent. 71 He also notes that “rail forecasts are substantially more inaccurate and biased than road forecasts.” 72 Some of the questionable assumptions made in the Florida and California estimates of future ridership and other benefits include the following: 1. Cars and planes will not become more fuel-efficient in the future. 2. Airports will not become more efficient at moving people. 3. Cars that use alternative fuels will not become feasible or popular. 4. Downtowns will remain or be restored as preeminent job centers. 5. No new technologies will help reduce highway congestion. 6. People will want to go where the trains go. Assumptions 1 and 4 are clearly wrong: as previously noted, cars are likely to be at least 33 percent more fuel-efficient by 2030, and downtowns have been losing their importance as job centers since at least 1950. Many of the other assumptions are also likely to be wrong. Any forecasts of high-speed rail ridership, energy savings, and other benefits based on these assumptions are likely to be greatly overestimated. The last assumption—that people will want to go where the trains go—may be the riskiest of all. While many people travel between, say, San Francisco and Los Angeles, that does not mean 13 If high-speed rail cannot capture or even maintain rail’s share of passenger travel in Europe, how can it work in the United States? that they travel from downtown to downtown, which will be the areas served by rail. Jobs and people are spread throughout modern cities in a fine-grained pattern. As economist William Bogart observes, only about 10 to 15 percent of metropolitan jobs are located in central city downtowns. In Los Angeles, it’s less than 5 percent. Even when the suburban downtown areas are counted—only a small fraction of which would be served by high-speed rail—the total is still only 30 to 40 percent. 73 That means most people will rarely, if ever, find high-speed rail to be convenient.

### Extension – Optimistic Estimates

#### Their evidence assumes the most optimistic estimates – HSR is likely to reduce more emissions than it saves

O’Toole 9(Randal, senior fellow at CATO, “High-Speed Rail is Not ‘Interstate 2.0,’” September 9, http://www.cato.org/pubs/bp/bp113.pdf)

The FRA’s high-speed rail plan claims that its trains would reduce carbon dioxide (CO2 ) emissions by 6 billion pounds(2.7 million metric tons) per year. 43 This was based on an analysis by the Center for Clean Air Policy that assumed that: •Auto fuel prices would remain low, leading cars in 2025 to be only a little more energy-efficient than today. 44 Considering recent spikes in fuel prices and Obama’s new fuel-economy standards, the average car on the road in 2025 is likely to be considerably more fuel-efficient than today. 45 •The average automobile on the road carries 1.6 people. 46 As previously noted, occupancies for intercity travel are closer to 2.4. •Airline energy efficiencies would grow by 0.6 percent per year. 47 In fact, airline energy efficiencies have grown by 3.2 percent per year since 1970. 48 Considering new technologies now in development, there is every reason to believe that aircraft energy efficiencies will grow much faster than 0.6 percent per year. 49 •The average high-speed train in every corridor would operate at 70 percent of passenger capacity. 50 Yet, in 2008,the average Amtrak train operated at only 51 percent of capacity; Amtrak’s moderate-speed trains in the Boston-Washington, Los Angeles–San Diego, and Philadelphia Harrisburg corridors all operated at 34 to 48 percent of capacity. 51 These are examples of what Danish planning professor Bent Flyvbjerg calls “optimism bias.” 52 Such bias, says Flyvbjerg, explains why large public works projects almost inevitably cost more and produce smaller benefits than originally promised. In addition, nearly 1 billion pounds of the projected annual reduction of CO2 were from the Boston-to-Washington Corridor, which is not part of the FRA plan. 53 That means the plan itself is projected to save only 2.3million metric tons per year. Substituting more realistic assumptions greatly changes the results. In the 19 years between 1975 and 1994, automobile fuel economies increased by 33 percent and commercial airline economies increased by 44 percent. 54 If they achieve similar efficiencies in the 19 years between 2006 and 2025, and if the average auto carries 2.4 people in intercity travel and the average high-speed train fills only 51 percent of its seats, then rather than save 2.3 million metric tons of CO2 per year, high speed trains would instead add 220,000 metric tons of CO2 to the atmosphere each year. Moreover, not building high-speed rail would save huge amounts of energy and millions of tons of CO2 that would otherwise be used and released during construction.

## Solvency

### Solvency 1nc

#### HSR empirically doesn’t get enough ridership

Utt 10(Ronald, Research Fellow in the Thomas A. Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies at the Heritage Foundation, “America’s Coming High-Speed Rail Financial Disaster,” March 19, http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2010/03/america-s-coming-high-speed-rail-financial-disaster)

To put the European commitment to passenger rail in perspective, rail ridership (high speed, conventional intercity, and metropolitan commuter rail) in these six countries accounted for just 7.9 percent of all surface transportation modes on a per passenger, per billion kilometer basis. This suggests that these countries received a poor return on their money given that more than 90 percent of passengers in these countries chose other travel modes-- mostly auto--despite the subsidies. In Europe as a whole (EU-27), rail accounted for only 6.1 percent of passenger travel in 2007, including travel by air and sea. Buses accounted for 8.3 percent of the market, and air travel accounted for 8.8 percent. Despite Europe's huge investment in passenger rail, its market share declined from 6.6 percent in 1995 to 6.1 percent in 2007. Over that same period, commercial air increased its share from 6.3 percent to 8.8 percent. By providing faster service and competitive prices, it took passengers away from rail, buses, and autos. This last point is of some importance because one goal of the HSR scheme is to shift travel from largely unsubsidized commercial aviation to heavily subsidized trains. Yet the same scheme in Europe seems to have failed over the past dozen years, despite massive government subsidies. Nonetheless, as problematic as the general European experience with passenger rail has been, some individual countries have experienced even worse results.

Eminent domain and environmental lawsuits gut solvency – fiat doesn’t solve

Longman 11(Phillip, senior fellow at Washington Monthly and New America foundation, “The Case for Not-Quite-So-High-Speed Rail,” Aug, http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/magazine/julyaugust\_2011/features/the\_case\_for\_notquite\_sohighsp030492.php?page=2)

But as great as it would be to have passenger service as fast and elegant as the TGV in the United States, there are many reasons not to put our first dollars into such an ambitious project. First off, building a truly high-speed rail system in today’s America would be so expensive, disruptive, contentious, and politically risky that it just might not be possible. It would require, for example, securing brand-new rights-of-way, because trains traveling at more than around 125 mph can’t share tracks with slower freight or passenger trains. This in turn would require using eminent domain to secure millions of acres of real estate, and these days, in the U.S., that would involve endless litigation, environmental review, and the innumerable other processes that always stand to derail any large-scale infrastructure project. Plans to build a high-speed rail in California between San Diego and the Bay Area are now foundering for precisely this reason. Big showcase high-speed projects in Texas and Florida flopped in the 1990s for the same reason, plus another: the shifting currents of polarized American politics.

### Extension – No Switch

#### Not enough people will switch

O’Toole 10(Randal, Senior Fellow at Cato Institute, “High Speed Rail,” June, http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/high-speed-rail)

The assumption that people will want to go where new high-speed train lines would go is a big risk. New rail lines would likely go from downtown to downtown, but downtowns have been losing their importance as job centers for decades. While many people travel between, say, the San Francisco and Los Angeles areas, that does not mean that they travel between downtowns, which will be the primary points served by rail. Jobs and people are spread throughout modern cities in a fine-grained pattern. As economist William Bogart observes, only about 10 to 15 percent of metropolitan jobs are located in central city downtowns—in Los Angeles it is less than 5 percent.46 Even when suburban downtowns are counted—only a small fraction of which would be served by high-speed rail—the total is still only 30 to 40 percent.47 That means that most people won't find high-speed rail convenient for business travel.5. Mobility Benefits. The mobility benefits of high-speed rail are negligible. Despite huge subsidies, the average residents of France and Japan ride their TGVs and bullet trains just 400 miles a year. With slower trains connecting lower-density cities and regions, the Obama administration's proposed high-speed rail system would be lucky to reach even 100 miles per capita of travel. Even a much more comprehensive, truly high-speed network is unlikely to approach 400 miles per capita because, unlike Europe and Japan, the United States has few major city pairs located close enough for high-speed trains to compete with airlines. High-speed rail's inability to draw more riders should be no surprise considering rail's inherent disadvantages compared with driving and air travel. Driving offers point-to-point convenience, while rail drops most travelers miles from their final destinations. Air service is at least twice as fast as the fastest trains and—since most Americans no longer live or work downtown—leaves average travelers no farther from their destinations than downtown train stations. Though high-speed rail is somewhat competitive on trips of 200 miles or so, it is not the optimal transportation mode at any distance. In sum, a cost-effective high-speed rail system is a fantasy. Modern airliners go much faster than the fastest trains and they do not require expensive infrastructure along their entire routes. Even with a massive government investment, high-speed rail would not likely capture more than about 1 percent of the nation's market for passenger travel. High-speed rail should be killed before it diverts tens of billions of transportation dollars into a black hole, producing negligible benefits.

#### Empirics prove enough people won’t switch

O’Toole 8(Randal, senior fellow at CATO, “High-Speed Rail: The Wrong Road for America,” October 31, http://www.cato.org/publications/policy-analysis/highspeed-rail-wrong-road-america)

These assessments are confirmed by the actual experience of high-speed rail lines in Japan and Europe. Since Japan introduced high-speed bullet trains, passenger rail has lost more than half its market share to the automobile. Since Italy, France, and other European countries opened their high-speed rail lines, rail's market share in Europe has dwindled from 8.2 to 5.8 percent of travel. If high-speed rail doesn't work in Japan and Europe, how can it work in the United States? As megaprojects—the California high-speed rail is projected to cost $33 to $37 billion—high-speed rail plans pose serious risks for taxpayers. Costs of recent rail projects in Denver and Seattle are running 60 to 100 percent above projections. Once construction begins, politicians will feel obligated to throw good taxpayers' money after bad. Once projects are completed , most plans call for them to be turned over to private companies that will keep any operational profits,while taxpayers will remain vulnerable if the trains lose money. In short, high-speed rail proposals are high cost, high-risk megaprojects that promise little or no congestion relief, energy savings, or other environmental benefits. Taxpayers and politicians should be wary of any transportation projects that cannot be paid for out of user fees.

#### Not enough people live downtown

O’Toole 8(Randal, senior fellow at CATO, “High-Speed Rail: The Wrong Road for America,” October 31, http://www.cato.org/publications/policy-analysis/highspeed-rail-wrong-road-america)

Contrary to the apparent attraction of fast downtown-to-downtown travel times, the truth is that few people live or work in downtowns anymore. As a result, even a 200-mileper-hour train won’t take more than 3 or 4 percent of cars off the highways it parallels. Instead, the main effect of this heavily subsidized train will be to put struggling (and relatively unsubsidized) short-haul airlines out of business.

#### Even those who would potentially utilize HSR won’t use public transportation

O’Toole 9(Randal, senior fellow at CATO, “High-Speed Rail is Not ‘Interstate 2.0,’” September 9, http://www.cato.org/pubs/bp/bp113.pdf)

Who would be among the lucky few to enjoy heavily subsidized high-speed train rides? One answer can be found by comparing fares in Amtrak’s New York–Washington corridor. At the time of this writing, $99 will get you from Washington to New York in 2 hours and 50 minutes on Amtrak’s high-speed train, while $49 pays for a moderate-speed train ride that takes 3 hours and 15minutes.Meanwhile, relatively unsubsidized and energy-efficient buses with leather seats and free Wi-Fi cost $20 for a trip that takes 4 hours and 15-minutes between the two cities .Airfares start at $119 for a 1-hourflight. High-speed rail plans in other parts of the country propose similar fare premiums. Midwest high-speed rail fares “will be competitive with air travel,” says the Midwest High Speed Rail Initiative, and will be “up to 50 percent higher than current Amtrak fares to reflect improved services.” 36 Few who pay their own way will spend five times as much for a high-speed train ticket to save less than 90 minutes of their time—and those who value their time that highly would spend another $20 for a plane ticket that would save them an additional hour. Rail advocates respond that high-speed trains have an 5 Amtrak’s high speed train from New York to Washington costs $99, while for just $20 you can ride a relatively unsubsidized bus with leather seats and free WiFi. Table 1 Interstate and High-Speed Rail Costs, Per Passenger Mile Capital Cost Amortized Cost Passenger Miles Cost Per Passenger ($billions) ($billions) (billions) (cents) Interstate highways 425 33.9 1,034.4 3.2 Moderate-speed rail 27 2.1 12.7 27.3 California high-speed rail 52 4.2 7.9 32.6 Source: See text. Note: The interstate highways are 10 times more cost-effective at moving people than high-speed rail. advantage over flying when adding the time it takes to get between downtowns and airports. Yet less than 8 percent of Americans work in downtowns. 37 Who are they? Bankers, lawyers, government officials, and other high-income people who hardly need taxpayer-subsidized transportation.