# Economy Advantage

## 1NC Frontline

1. IWTF planning fails – leads to cost overruns and program failures

Stern, 4-12

Analyst in Natural Resources Policy for the Congressional Research Service (Charles V., 4/12/2012, “Inland Waterways: Recent Proposals and Issues for Congress”, Congressional Research Service, www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R41430.pdf)

In addition to problems with the IWTF financing system, other concerns have been raised in recent years. Specifically, fuel-tax payers (represented by the IWUB) have registered complaints related to structural inefficiencies and inequities in the Corps project planning process for inland waterways investments. Many users note that in the past, decisions within the executive branch have led to what some consider inefficient project implementation and use of tax dollars (in the form of cost escalation and schedule delays on some IWTF projects). As a partial response to these concerns, in FY2006 the Corps implemented several reforms to its project delivery process, including implementation of risk-based cost estimates and prioritized funding for projects with a high risk of cost overruns. While the IWUB generally recognized these changes as improvements, many continue to advocate for additional structural reforms to the planning process (see below section, “Inland Waterways Users Board Proposal”), and highlight the most recent round of cost overruns at Olmsted Lock and Dam as evidencing the ongoing need for these reforms.25

1. No waterway congestion – current infrastructure can handle extra load

NWF, ’08

The National Waterways Fund, a think tank dedicated to studying American waterways (“Waterways: Working for America”, National Waterways Fund, www.americanwaterways.com/TTI/tti\_study\_brochure.pdf)

America’s Waterways Are Ready to Meet Growing Demands Except for a few congested locks scheduled for replacement, our navigable inland waterways system has an abundance of unused capacity. Waterways will transport the bulk commodities needed today and tomorrow while also moving an increasing share of intermodal cargo in the years to come. By relieving growing transportation congestion with the least impact of any surface mode on air quality, public safety and the environment, waterways really are our transportation solution for the future.

1. The advantage turns itself – competitiveness causes protectionist conflicts which their Friedberg & Schonfeld ev says causes war

Krugman, ’94

Paul Krugman, B.A. in Economics from Yale, Ph.D. from MIT, former professor at Yale, MIT, UC Berkeley, and Stanford, Nobel Prize in Economics, Professor of Economics and International Affairs at Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University, Centenary Professor at the London School of Economics, and columnist for The New York Times, Mar/Apr 1994 (“Competitiveness: A Dangerous Obsession,” Foreign Affairs, Vol. 73, No. 2)

A much more serious risk is that the obsession with competitiveness will lead to trade conflict, perhaps even to a world trade war. Most of those who have preached the doctrine of competitiveness have not been old-fashioned protectionists. They want their countries to win the global trade game, not drop out. But what if, despite its best efforts, a country does not seem to be winning, or lacks confidence that it can? Then the competitive diagnosis inevitably suggests that to close the borders is better than to risk having foreigners take away high-wage jobs and high-value sectors. At the very least, the focus on the supposedly competitive nature of international economic relations greases the rails for those who want confrontational if not frankly protectionist policies.

1. No offense – Competitiveness barely contributes to economic success

Krugman 94⎯Paul Krugman, B.A. in Economics from Yale, Ph.D. from MIT, former professor at Yale, MIT, UC Berkeley, and Stanford, Nobel Prize in Economics, Professor of Economics and International Affairs at Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University, Centenary Professor at the London School of Economics, and columnist for The New York Times, Mar/Apr 1994 (“Competitiveness: A Dangerous Obsession,” Foreign Affairs, Vol. 73, No. 2)

But isn't it a fact that the stagnation of U.S. living standards has been in large part due to a failure to compete effectively on world markets? No, it's not a fact. **From 1979 to 1989 the real compensation of all U.S. workers rose 5.8%, while productivity rose 5.1**%. These are purely domestic variables -- that is, **productivity is not measured relative to other countries**, and no data about global market shares or anything that involves the global economy are taken into account. Yet the two series rose by almost exactly the same (disappointing) amount. So **we got** almost **exactly the growth in living standards we would have gotten if the U.S. were alone in the world and we had no international trade at all**.(3) "High productivity." Just about everyone now agrees that the U.S. economy needs higher productivity. Most people, however, are confused about why. **The most popular explanation is that we need to be productive in order to compete in the global economy**. That was the explanation President Clinton gave in February 1993, when he tried to justify an economic package that included painful tax increases. **But it's wrong**. We need to be more productive in order to produce more, and this would be true even if the U.S. were completely without foreign competitors or customers. To illustrate, let's consider three questions. First, what happens to a country whose productivity is inferior to that of the countries it trades with? The common view is that it will suffer. After all, if you aren't better than your rivals in something, how can you sell anything on world markets? The right answer is that **being less productive than your trading partners poses no** special **problems**. Of course, a country whose productivity is low across the board is not going to have a high standard of living; but that has nothing to do with the fact that it must coexist with more productive nations. In fact, the option of exporting to those superior "competitors" the things you don't make too badly, and importing from them the things you do, delivers a somewhat higher living standard than a country with very low domestic productivity might otherwise enjoy. This is the basic point David Ricardo made in 1817 when he first expounded the principle of comparative advantage -- a principle that every student learns in Economics 101 and that most politicians persist in ignoring. Second question: What happens to a country whose productivity growth lags behind that of its rivals? The common view is that it is in big trouble -- after all, a corporation that systematically fails to match competitors' productivity gains is not going to stay in business. The right answer, however, is that **how fast productivity is growing abroad, and whether we are ahead of or behind** the pack, **is irrelevant**. From World War II until 1973, **productivity in the U.S**. rose 2.8% annually. **After 1973, it rose only 0.9% annually, a rate** generally **slower than in other advanced nations**. If the rest of the world did not exist, this slowdown would have reduced growth in U.S. incomes by 1.9% per year. **Any effects from lagging behind foreign competitors contributed at most** another **0.1 percentage point**. The moral: What matters for the trend in U.S. living standards is our domestic rate of productivity growth – period.

1. Global economic decline is inevitable

Roubini, 12

[Nouriel Roubini, Professor of Economics at New York University's Stern School of Business, Former Senior Adviser to the White House Council of Economic Advisers and the US Treasury, “Reasons to be cheerful about the economy – but more to be cautious,” February 16th 2012, http://www.guardian.co.uk/business/economics-blog/2012/feb/16/reasons-cheerful-economy-cautious?newsfeed=true]

But at least four downside risks are likely to materialise this year, undermining global growth and eventually negatively affecting investor confidence and market valuations of risky assets. First, the eurozone is in deep recession, especially in the periphery, but now also in the core economies, as the latest data shows an output contraction in Germany and France. The credit crunch in the banking system is becoming more severe as banks deleverage by selling assets and rationing credit, exacerbating the downturn. Meanwhile, not only is fiscal austerity pushing the eurozone periphery into economic freefall, but the loss of competitiveness there will persist as relief at the waning prospect of disorderly defaults strengthens the euro's value. To restore competitiveness and growth in these countries, the euro needs to fall towards parity with the US dollar. And, while the risk of a disorderly Greek collapse is now receding, it will re-emerge this year as political instability, civil unrest and more fiscal austerity turn the Greek recession into a depression. Second, there is now evidence of weakening performance in China and the rest of Asia. In China, the economic slowdown under way is unmistakable. Export growth is down sharply, turning negative vis-à-vis the eurozone's periphery. Import growth, a sign of future exports, has also fallen. Similarly, Chinese residential investment and commercial real-estate activity are slowing sharply as home prices start to fall. Infrastructure investment is down as well, with many high-speed railway projects on hold and local governments and special-purpose vehicles struggling to obtain financing amid tightening credit conditions and lower revenues from land sales. Elsewhere in Asia, Singapore's economy shrank for the second time in three quarters at the end of 2011. India's government predicts 6.9% annual GDP growth in 2012, which would be the lowest rate since 2009. Taiwan's economy fell into a technical recession in the fourth quarter of 2011. South Korea's economy grew at a mere 0.4% in the same period – the slowest pace in two years – while Japan's GDP contracted at a larger-than-expected 2.3%, as the yen's strength weighed down exports. Third, while US data has been surprisingly encouraging, America's growth momentum appears to be peaking. Fiscal tightening will escalate in 2012 and 2013, contributing to a slowdown, as will the expiration of tax benefits that boosted capital spending in 2011. Moreover, given continuing malaise in credit and housing markets, private consumption will remain subdued; indeed, two percentage points of the 2.8% expansion in the last quarter of 2011 reflected rising inventories rather than final sales. And, as for external demand, the generally strong dollar, together with the global and eurozone slowdown, will weaken US exports, while still-elevated oil prices will increase the energy import bill, further impeding growth.

1. US not key to world economy

The Economist, ’09

[“Decoupling 2.0” May 21, 2009, http://www.economist.com/opinion/displaystory.cfm ?story\_id=13697292]

REMEMBER the debate about decoupling? A year ago, many commentators—including this newspaper—argued that emerging economies had become more resilient to an American recession, thanks to their strong domestic markets and prudent macroeconomic policies. Naysayers claimed America’s weakness would fell the emerging world. Over the past six months the global slump seemed to prove the sceptics right. Emerging economies reeled and decoupling was ridiculed. Yet perhaps the idea was dismissed too soon. Even if America’s output remains weak, there are signs that some of the larger emerging economies could see a decent rebound. China is exhibit A of this new decoupling: its economy began to accelerate again in the first four months of this year. Fixed investment is growing at its fastest pace since 2006 and consumption is holding up well. Despite debate over the accuracy of China’s GDP figures (see article), most economists agree that output will grow faster than seemed plausible only a few months ago. Growth this year could be close to 8%. Such optimism has fuelled commodity prices which have, in turn, brightened the outlook for Brazil and other commodity exporters. That said, even the best performing countries will grow more slowly than they did between 2004 and 2007. Nor will the resilience be universal: eastern Europe’s indebted economies will suffer as global banks cut back, and emerging economies intertwined with America, such as Mexico, will continue to be hit hard. So will smaller, more trade-dependent countries. Decoupling 2.0 is a narrower phenomenon, confined to a few of the biggest, and least indebted, emerging economies. It is based on two under-appreciated facts: the biggest emerging economies are less dependent on American spending than commonly believed; and they have proven more able and willing to respond to economic weakness than many feared.

1. Economic decline doesn’t cause war

Barnett, Senior Managing Director Enterra Solutions LLC, ‘9 (Thomas, August 24, “The New Rules: Security Remains Stable Amid Financial Crisis” World Politics Review, http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/4213/the-new-rules-security-remains-stable-amid-financial-crisis)

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

## 2NC Planning Fails XT

The IWTF fails – too many structural inefficiencies – even with reforms it went severely over-budget and badly implemented projects⎯recent Olmsted lock project proves that reforms are a pre-requisite to effective solvency⎯that’s Stern

Lots of structural problems that the aff doesn’t solve – even implementing IWUB reforms causes more bureaucracy and conflicts of interest

Stern 4/12⎯Analyst in Natural Resources Policy for the Congressional Research Service (Charles V., 4/12/2012, “Inland Waterways: Recent Proposals and Issues for Congress”, Congressional Research Service, www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R41430.pdf)

The IWUB has also asked Congress to weigh in to provide reforms to Corps IWTF planning processes. Among other things, the IWUB proposed a number of reforms to increase its involvement and improve project prioritization. Industry users argue that many of these reforms will decrease the likelihood of cost overruns, which have in the past been a problem for IWTF projects. A previous study by the Corps concluded that in several cases, a number of factors contributed to cost overruns, including inaccurate construction schedules and costs, general cost escalation, and non-optimal funding. However, the degree of involvement by a non-federal entity in the planning and decision-making process could raise concerns related to conflicts of interest.

## 2NC Krugman XT

Their competitiveness impact turns their protectionism arguments – maintaining competitiveness requires future protectionist policies in order to hedge against brain drains from important industries – this destroys global commerce and triggers protectionist conflicts – that’s 1NC Krugman – Internal link turns their terminal impact

And there’s only a risk of our offense – capital that flows outside the US is always re-invested which means competitiveness is irrelevant – contributes to less than 0.1% of relative growth – that’s Krugman – more ev – competitiveness is meaningless

Krugman 94⎯Paul Krugman, B.A. in Economics from Yale, Ph.D. from MIT, former professor at Yale, MIT, UC Berkeley, and Stanford, Nobel Prize in Economics, Professor of Economics and International Affairs at Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs, Princeton University, Centenary Professor at the London School of Economics, and columnist for The New York Times, Mar/Apr 1994 (“Competitiveness: A Dangerous Obsession,” Foreign Affairs, Vol. 73, No. 2)

The problem is: It's baloney. **In reality, there is** almost **nothing to our fixation with national competitiveness, or its central idea -- that every country is like a giant corporation** slugging it out **against rivals in global markets**. The U.S. and Japan are simply not competitors in the same way that, say, Ford competes with Toyota. **Any country's standard of living depends almost entirely on its own domestic economic performance, and not on how it performs relative to other countries**. That's not just my view; it's what most economists think.Why should you care? One important reason: **Countries that wrongly think they are in a competitive struggle** over who gets the spoils are more likely to fall into a major trade war. Such conflicts don't destroy economies the way real wars do, but they harm everyone -- and it takes a long time to recover from them. When protectionist measures like the infamous Smoot-Hawley tariff shattered the global trading system between the two world wars, trade among industrial countries didn't regain its 1914 peak until 1970. The other risk is that **true believers in competitiveness** -- **I call them strategic traders**, to point up their obsession with winning export battles -- **often advocate pouring huge sums of taxpayer money into projects they hope will create jobs or build prestige but that make** almost no economic sense. Example: the billions of dollars France has spent propping up its computer industry. Leading American strategic traders -- among them, Labor Secretary Robert Reich, Clinton health policy adviser Ira Magaziner, and MIT economist Lester Thurow -- have argued for similarly extravagant (and misguided) investments to enhance national competitiveness.

Prefer our ev – our argument is backed by years of empirics, economic consensus and PhDs like Krugman – which is a lot more than you can say about their authors

## 2NC Decoupling XT

US isn’t key to the global economy – That’s The Economist. Countries aren’t dependent on the American economy and were resilient during the last recession. Empirically proven by China who showed growth during the past recession.

The Decoupling is coming back – Proves the U.S. is not key to the global economy

Wassener, ’09

[Bettina Wassener, Reporter for the New York Times, MSc in European Politics from the London School of Economics,, Some Economies Show Signs of Less Reliance on U.S., June 30, 2009, <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/07/01/business/economy/01decouple.html?ref=business>]

HONG KONG — For a while, when the economic crisis was at its worst, it was a dirty word that only the most provocative of analysts dared to use. Now, the D-word — decoupling — is making a comeback, and nowhere more so than in Asia. Put simply, the term refers to the theory that emerging markets — whether China or Chile — will become less dependent [on] the United States as their economies become stronger and more sophisticated. For much of last year, the theory held up. Many emerging economies had steered clear of investments that dragged down banking behemoths in the West, and saw nothing like the turmoil that began to engulf the United States and Europe in 2007. But then, last autumn, when the collapse of Lehman Brothers caused the financial system to convulse and consumer demand to shrivel, emerging economies around the world got caught in the downdraft, and the D-word became mud. Now, the tables are turning, especially in Asia, where many emerging economies are showing signs of a stronger recovery than in the West. And economists here have begun to talk of the decoupling once again. “Decoupling is happening for real,” the chief Asia-Pacific economist at Goldman Sachs in Hong Kong, Michael Buchanan, said in a recent interview. To be sure, the once sizzling pace of Asian economic growth has slowed sharply as exports to and investments from outside the region slumped. Across Asia, millions of people have lost their jobs as business dropped off and companies cut costs and output. Asia is heavily dependent upon selling its products to consumers in the United States and Europe, and many executives still say a strong American economy is a prerequisite for a return to the boom of years past. But for the past couple of months, data have revealed a growing divergence between Western economies and those in much of Asia, notably China and India. The World Bank last week forecast that the economies of the countries that use the euro and the United States would contract 4.5 percent and 3 percent, respectively, this year — compared with 7.2 percent and 5.1 percent growth forecast for China and India. Forecasts from the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development that were also published last week backed up this general trend. Major statistics for June, due Wednesday, are expected to show manufacturing activity in China and India are on the mend. By contrast, purchasing managers indexes for Europe and the United States are forecast to be merely less grim than before but still show contractions. Why this diverging picture? The crisis hit Asia much later. While the American economy began languishing in 2007, Asian economies were doing well until the collapse of Lehman Brothers in September. What followed was a rush of stimulus measures — rate cuts and government spending programs. In Asia’s case, these came soon after things soured for the region; in the United States, they came much later. Moreover, developing Asian economies were in pretty good shape when the crisis struck. The last major crisis to hit the region — the financial turmoil of 1997-98 — forced governments in Asia to introduce overhauls that ultimately left them with lower debt levels, more resilient banking and regulatory systems and often large foreign exchange reserves. Another crucial difference is that Asia, unlike the United States and Europe, has not had a banking crisis. Bank profits in Asia have plunged and some have had to raise extra capital but there have been no major collapses and no bailouts. “The single most important thing to have happened in Asia is that there has not been a banking crisissaid Andrew Freris, a regional strategist at BNP Paribas in Hong Kong. “Asia is coming though this crisis with its banking system intact. Yes, some banks may not be making profits — but it is cyclical and not systemic.” The lack of banking disasters also has meant that, unlike in Europe and the United States, Asian governments have not had to spend cash to clean the balance sheets of faltering banks. Add to that the fact that companies and households in Asia are typically not burdened with the kind of debt that is forcing Americans and Europeans to cut back consumption and investment plans. Asians are generally big savers; those in developing nations have limited health care and pension systems to fall back on. So they put aside cash for retirement, sickness and their children’s education, rather than maxing out multiple credit cards. Paul Schulte of Nomura said this difference was leading to a long-term shift. Western nations and consumers will struggle for years to pay down debt — and in some cases face higher taxes as governments try to rein in their swelling budget deficits. Consumers there, he said, will thus spend less. In developing Asia, by contrast, incomes are expected to rise gradually and savings rates to fall as improving health and welfare systems make the region’s fast-growing population less determined to save. Taken together, Mr. Schulte said, this means Asian consumers, as a whole, will become more important in global terms — another example of how the region will become less dependent on the West.

## 2NC No War XT

Economic crisis don’t cause war – prefer statistical studies over abstract IR theories

Miller, Former World Bank Director, 2K—PhD in economics from McGill U, MSc in economics from the London School of Economics, Fmr adjunct professor at U of Ottawa, Fmr executive director of the World Bank in Washington D.C. [Morris, August 2000, “Poverty as a Cause of Wars?”, University of Ottawa Center on Governance, <http://www.management.uottawa.ca/miller/poverty.htm>]

It seems reasonable to believe that a powerful "shock" factor might act as a catalyst for a violent reaction on the part of the people or on the part of the political leadership. The leadership, finding that this sudden adverse economic and social impact destabilizing, would possibly be tempted to seek a diversion by finding or, if need be, fabricating an enemy and setting in train the process leading to war. There would not appear to be any merit in this hypothesis according to a study undertaken by Minxin Pei and Ariel Adesnik of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. After studying 93 episodes of economic crisis in 22 countries in Latin America and Asia in the years since World War II they concluded that Much of the conventional wisdom about the political impact of economic crises may be wrong …..The severity of economic crisis - as measured in terms of inflation and negative growth – bore no relationship to the collapse of regimes….(or, in democratic states, rarely) to an outbreak of violence…In the cases of dictatorships and semi-democracies, the ruling elites responded to crises by increasing repression (thereby using one form of violence to abort another.)

# Tradable Lock Permits CP

## 1NC CP Shell

Counterplan Text: The United States federal government should adopt a policy of tradable priority permits on inland waterways in the United States.

Tradable lock permits solve waterway congestion and uncertainty

Cook and Plott 5⎯\*Researcher for the National Economic Research Associates, \*\*professor at the California Institute of Technology [\*Joseph P. Cook, \*\*Charles R. Plott, “Congestion at Locks on Inland Waterways: An Experimental Testbed of a policy of Tradable Priority Permits for Lock Access”, Division of the Humanities and Social Sciences at the California Institute of Technology, www.hss.caltech.edu/SSPapers/wp1240.pdf]

A policy of tradable permits for priority access to locks on the inland waterways can conform to the constraining factors and offer the desired benefits. Unlike fixed appointments policies, such a policy increases flexibility in shipping schedules as each party is able to decide whether to exercise, sell or hold their priority permits, which were previously not available. It also allows shipments with costlier delays to move through at a priority, increasing the efficiency of the system, while not necessarily increasing the number of lockages per day or the number of vessels, or tug-barge combinations that moved through a lock each day. Such a policy reduces the uncertainty associated with the position one may get in the queue so as to aid in operators’ abilities to improve their business arrangements and pursue more time sensitive shipments. It also increases operator profits by increasing the flexibility of the operator to respond to changing market conditions, allowing the operators to better compete with alternative means of transport by reducing the uncertainties associated with delivery conditions, and allowing the operators to expand the set of contracts they can profitably undertake. The priority permits are a ready means of responding to congestion, including extended or unscheduled outages at a lock and valuing increases in lock capacity. Finally, the system has the advantage of being similar to industry self-help. See Appendix A for excerpts from a meeting with industry discussing the closure of the McAlpine Lock. A policy of tradable priority permits is consistent with and similar to self-adopted industry policies to meet temporary difficulties; however, institutionalization of the system will provide for a quicker response time and broader application. Commercial users of the inland waterways are familiar with priority systems and have found them beneficial to help resolve congestion in the past.16 However, because in the past these solutions have been ad hoc, the benefits are not maximized. Motivations for the use of priorities include limits on the sources of or storage capacity for inputs of some customers and their need for a continuous supply to remain in operation.17 Managing the uncertainty associated with delivery and with the negative outcomes that may ensue, including the closure of some plants dependent on supplies of inputs over the waterways and the exercise “transportation risk management,” become of increasing significance.18 While not an “easy task” for the industry to take on an ad hoc basis, the benefits seem clear.19

## 2NC Overview

The counterplan creates a system of tradable priority permits that allows companies to properly schedule urgent transports through waterways – solves poor management through first-come-first-serve usage structures which is the root cause of waterway congestion and an alternative cause to aff solvency

The net benefit to the CP is \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ – that doesn’t link because the CP doesn’t build new waterways

## 2NC Solvency XT

Tradable lock permits are comparatively the best way to fix congestion

Cook and Plott 5 – \*Researcher for the National Economic Research Associates, \*\*professor at the California Institute of Technology [\*Joseph P. Cook, \*\*Charles R. Plott, “Congestion at Locks on Inland Waterways: An Experimental Testbed of a policy of Tradable Priority Permits for Lock Access”, Division of the Humanities and Social Sciences at the California Institute of Technology, www.hss.caltech.edu/SSPapers/wp1240.pdf]

Previous considerations included a variety of policies that were not market-based. Lockage fees might be charged for the use of a lock and that charge might be higher at periods of peak use, or additional fees might be added for a “slow” lockage.15 However, systems that penalize “slow” lockages were set aside, as the length of the lockage may influenced by factors beyond the control of the operators, such as weather conditions. Similarly, systems using fixed-time appointments were less attractive. Moreover, the general appeal flexibility made command and control systems unlikely to be the most useful line of inquiry. A tradable priority permit system suggested itself as likely to best serve the objectives of reducing the costs of congestion, including costs associated with uncertainty and providing a means to measure the value of increased lock capacity.

Economic theory and empirics prove the CP solves

Cook and Plott 5⎯\*Researcher for the National Economic Research Associates, \*\*professor at the California Institute of Technology [\*Joseph P. Cook, \*\*Charles R. Plott, “Congestion at Locks on Inland Waterways: An Experimental Testbed of a policy of Tradable Priority Permits for Lock Access”, Division of the Humanities and Social Sciences at the California Institute of Technology, www.hss.caltech.edu/SSPapers/wp1240.pdf]

This research is focused on the problem of congestion at locks on the inland waterways of the United States, and particularly on the Mississippi and Illinois Rivers. The current policy of first-come-first-served exacerbates the problem and adds to delays and inefficiency. An alternative policy of marketable priority access permits is proposed and studied. The dimensions of the policy relative to the needs of operators are discussed. Well established economic theory suggests that the system of marketable priority permits will increase the economic efficiency with which locks operate and that by the endowing of current operators with these permits will increase their profitability. A testbed experiment was conducted to illustrate how the principles operate. The policy objective of increased efficiency is observed thereby establishing proof of principle. More importantly, the policy works according to all of the many predictions that theory holds thereby establishing design consistency. Not only is the value of system use increased, prices converge to the competitive levels, the removal of delay for certain classes of permits transforms system use to higher valued activities and operator profitability is increased. In the testbed, the policy produces the desired outcomes and it does so for understandable reasons.

## 2NC A2 New Waterways Key

Their solvency deficit isn’t quantifiable – even if congestion exists without new waterways the CP makes it too little to matter

Cook and Plott 5⎯\*Researcher for the National Economic Research Associates, \*\*professor at the California Institute of Technology [\*Joseph P. Cook, \*\*Charles R. Plott, “Congestion at Locks on Inland Waterways: An Experimental Testbed of a policy of Tradable Priority Permits for Lock Access”, Division of the Humanities and Social Sciences at the California Institute of Technology, www.hss.caltech.edu/SSPapers/wp1240.pdf]

The proposed policy does not increase lock capacity, nor can it change the peak load aspect of the system in the upper Mississippi. While the proposed policy does increase the economic value associated with river commerce by reducing the cost associated with congestion, it does not decrease the amount of river traffic or increase the number of possible lockages. Some measure of congestion will likely remain in the system when demand is relatively high, but the delays associated with that congestion will be less costly. That is, the policy increases the value of the use of the river to all parties. Moreover, the market prices of the priority permits provide a measure of the value of avoiding those delays and, therefore, to reducing congestion.

## Explanation/Policy Detail

Nitty-gritty explanation of the CP

Cook and Plott 5⎯\*Researcher for the National Economic Research Associates, \*\*professor at the California Institute of Technology [\*Joseph P. Cook, \*\*Charles R. Plott, “Congestion at Locks on Inland Waterways: An Experimental Testbed of a policy of Tradable Priority Permits for Lock Access”, Division of the Humanities and Social Sciences at the California Institute of Technology, www.hss.caltech.edu/SSPapers/wp1240.pdf]

The recommendation is to create a system of tradable priority permits that will be issued to existing river barge operators in proportion to existing and historical operations on the river. The major features of the instrument and policy variables are as follows. A. Rights of the holder A permit will give to the holder the right to move ahead of all vessels waiting for access to the lock and traveling in the same direction, up to the holder of a permit in the queue being exercised with equal rights. That is, the function of the instrument is not to govern access to or use of a lock. It only serves to alter the order from one of “first come first served” where there are several potential users in queue for a lock but with different waiting costs. The permits would only alter the order of access among commercial traffic; the existing priorities governing non-commercial traffic would be unchanged. B. The Master Instrument The tradable priority permits are instruments with two principal components: (1) the master instrument and (2) the two-week permits. The master instrument provides the holder a perpetual stream of two-week permits for the life of the program. So, the holder of a master instrument for a given lock will be reissued each year the same tradable priority permits for the 26 two-week periods unless and until the master instrument is sold. C. Marketability The instruments will be marketable and transferable. Either the master instrument or one or more of the two-week permits it generates can be marketed and sold. Sales of the latter do not affect the ownership and control of the master instrument. One may sell priority permits that are not expected to be used or not highly valued to others, while retaining the master instrument and, therefore, the ongoing stream of priority permits in the future. D. Permit validity and timing Permits will be designated as “Upstream” or “Downstream.” The permits will be lock specific and have a limited life. The life of the permit will be sufficiently long and the grant of permits overlapping so that the flexibility of vessel operators is maintained. For example, a permit might be valid for use within a given two-week period with other permits beginning (and ending) their useful life at the end of the first week. In fact, this “overlapping” structure of instruments will add flexibility for vessel owners to meet unforeseen changes that occur during a voyage. Still, the number of permits of a given priority available to be exercised at any time is limited, so savings in delay costs are still achieved. The queues, “Upstream” and “Downstream,” are treated separately. The current procedures by which the lock masters allocate between upstream and downstream traffic is not altered by this proposal, in part, because the congestion is understood to be typically one- way.20 However, if a priority needed to be viewed as a queue for use of the lock regardless of direction, that can easily be addressed by, as one alternative, avoiding the distinction between upstream and downstream priority and making one unified priority not conditioned on direction. Such would, of course, risk sacrificing a distinct market for upstream and downstream priorities that adds somewhat to flexibility in planning in making more precise forecasts about river use and relative priority. common allocation method for tradable permit systems.21 Historical capacities under various conditions can provide some insight into the number of lockages that can be accomplished under extreme operating conditions. Similarly, one can have insights into the length of time that might be required to clear a queue built up during a complete closure. Finally, patterns of use by particular firms offer some indications as to their scale and, perhaps, the type of transport service they offer. Using this background, as a starting point for the discussion, we might begin with the number of permits at the highest priority equal to the available capacity, number of lockages that can be accomplished, during the relevant time period when congestion is at its highest levels, barring complete closure for the entire period. The relevant time interval should be wide enough to offer the flexibility that vessel operators demand. A starting point might be a window of two weeks. To increase flexibility, the priority permits would have overlapping time intervals. Master instruments and the priority permits they produce could be evenly divided across two cycles that are staggered by one week. Half the master instruments will produce permit streams that have their first two-week permit begin on January 1 and the other half will have their first begin on January 8. See figure 1 below. E. Priority levels Unless otherwise determined four priority levels will exist and can be labeled as 1st through 4th. Holders of 1st level priority that present themselves at a lock during a week for which the instrument is valid will be moved ahead of all traffic holding lower level priority. Notice, that under this right a 1st place holder cannot allow a lower level holder in front while holding back another 1st place holder. In general, an nth level holder can move ahead of any n+1th level holder. Given the current tracking of tows between locks in place, this system would add only incrementally to the existing information that is now available to tows on the river. Tows are currently able to access information regarding the number of tows ahead of them in the queue. With the priority system, they would be able to ascertain the number of tows in the queue at each level of priority. In this way, they would be better able to determine whether or not they can profitably accept or compete over delivery conditions in a prospective contract. F. Limited useful life The instruments are good only for the time interval and lock for which the instrument was issued. So, in periods without congestion, the permits will expire without being exercised. Unexercised permits whose valid life is past may not ever be subsequently exercised. Of course, the following year, permits will be regenerated for that year according to the ownership of the Master Instrument. G. The initial number and allocation of permits The initial allocation of permits to operators and the number of permits for each priority level are related questions and, to a large extent, distributional questions beyond the scope of this inquiry. A sensible starting point for such a discussion, however, is historical use and capacities. According to Tietenberg (2003), this type of grandfathering tends to be the most The initial distribution would be relatively conservative in that the number of higher level priorities would be relatively low. This conservatism would be in order to avoid the need to downgrade priorities during the preliminary stages in which some adjustment might be required. A conservative starting distribution might, e.g., involve only 5 percent of the priorities being granted at each of the three most preferred levels of priority. A likely solution to the distributional question would include “grandfathering” the existing operators in the sense that the existing operators receive the priority permits free of charge, or perhaps for a small administrative fee. If all else were equal, equity might suggest that each firm receive a proportional share of standard portfolios. For example, a firm with x percent of the lockages over the last three years will receive x percent of the issue of each type of permit. Those whose business models benefit from a greater than proportional share of higher priority permits would be expected to acquire the two-week permit transfers of ownership are valid only after official notification to the Corps. The record of ownership held by the Corps will be the determining factor in the case of disputes, suspected fraud, forgery, or other suspected misuses. I. Enforcement The ownership of the master instrument and associated permits will be kept by the Corps and be available to both lock masters and any vessel that might wish to offer to purchase a priority permit from another operator. The lock master will direct repositioning of tows in accord with the permits held by those who might approach the lock and state they are exercising a priority permit. This can be done in accordance with current practice and the existing tracking and communication systems. The lock master will verify the number of the certificate held by the operator using the lock. The nature and punishment for violations and failure to comply will be determined by the Corps. The exercise of any priority permit is conditioned on it being possible to safely alter the queue based on all the prevailing facts and circumstances.them on the market from those who derive less value from them. The number of permits and number of the level of priorities present an interesting tradeoff. With a very high number of priorities and low number of permits of each type, one might observe that, for all intents and purposes, the permits of the same priority all sell for much the same price. Firms may not be willing to pay substantially more to be first as opposed to second. However, this degree of fineness also makes it more difficult to make the initial distribution of instruments more equitable, that is, that all firms with substantial participation get at least one master instrument for each lock they use at each level of priority. If there were 10 firms that all used the same lock and only three master instruments of the highest priority, an apparently equitable initial distribution might not be possible. So, the number of permits is generally not less than the number of firms with substantial participation at the lock. Moreover, larger numbers of master instruments ease trade among the participants and make pricing more distinct as between priorities. Ultimately, the initial distribution of permits involves complex questions of equity among the operators that lie beyond the scope of the question of the effect that such a system would have if implemented. While the factors mentioned above offer some guidance as to the considerations that would be addressed, the process of arriving at a consensus on an equitable distribution is largely a political one. However, we can add to this list of factors an adjustment rule for the total number of licenses at each level of priority. The rule, developed in detail in Appendix B, is based on a comparison of the cost of congestion to the relative prices of the permits. If the difference between the high and low priority permits exceeds the cost of congestion, then adding a permit at the highest level would be efficiency enhancing. H. Recording System Each master instrument and associated two-week permit is numbered; a record of the owner will be kept by the Corps and made publicly available. These numbers will relate so that each two-week permit can be associated with the master instrument that produced it and the time period for which it is valid. For example, the master instrument might be AAA111 and

# Agriculture Advantage

## 1NC Frontline

1. There is no reverse causal internal link – they do not have a piece of ev that says that a failure to get coal and oats and soybeans across the canal system efficiently would collapse trade or the ag sector – only that it helps trade
2. Can’t solve – Brown concludes Amazon Deforestation is inevitable absent a stabilization of world population growth

Brown, 1AC Author, 9 --- President of the Earth Policy Institute (Lester R. Brown, the recipient of many prizes and awards, including 25 honorary degrees, a MacArthur Fellowship, the 1987 United Nations' Environment Prize, the 1989 World Wide Fund for Nature Gold Medal, and the 1994 Blue Planet Prize for his "exceptional contributions to solving global environmental problems." In 2012, he was inducted into the Earth Hall of Fame Kyoto, “Growing Demand for Soybeans Threatens Amazon Rainforest”, December 30, 2009, http://www.earth-policy.org/plan\_b\_updates/2009/update86)

The Amazon rainforest sustains one of the richest concentrations of plant and animal biological diversity in the world. It also recycles rainfall from the coastal regions to the continental interior, ensuring an adequate water supply for Brazil’s inland agriculture. And it is an enormous storehouse of carbon. Each of these three contributions is obviously of great importance. But it is the release of carbon, as deforestation progresses, that most directly affects the entire world. Continuing destruction of the Brazilian rainforest will release massive quantities of carbon into the atmosphere, helping to drive climate change. Brazil has discussed reducing deforestation 80 percent by 2020 as part of its contribution to lowering global carbon emissions. Unfortunately, if soybean consumption continues to climb, the economic pressures to clear more land could make this difficult. Although the deforestation is occurring within Brazil, it is the worldwide growth in demand for meat, milk, and eggs that is driving it. Put simply, saving the Amazon rainforest now depends on curbing the growth in demand for soybeans by stabilizing population worldwide as soon as possible.

1. Beef exports is an alt cause to Amazon Collapse

CIFOR, ’04 (The Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR) was established in 1993 as part of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) in response to global concerns about the social, environmental and economic consequences of forest loss and degradation. CIFOR research produces knowledge and methods needed to improve the well-being of forest-dependent people and to help tropical countries manage their forests wisely for sustained benefits. This research is done in more than two dozen countries, in partnership with numerous partners. Since it was founded, CIFOR has also played a central role in influencing global and national forestry policies, “ Hamburger Connection Fuels Amazon Destruction,” <http://www.veganimal.info/IMG/pdf/rapportCIFORamazon-2.pdf>)

The Brazil Government’s National Institute of Space Research (INPE) will soon release the latest annual deforestation figure for the Brazilian Amazon 2 . It is expected the rate of deforestation will equal last year's appallingly high figure of 2.5 million hectares, and could even be higher. This report explains the link between this frightening increase in deforestation and the growth in international demand for Brazilian beef. It also calls on the international community to provide urgent assistance. Brazil’s beef exports have grown markedly due to the devaluation of the Brazilian currency and factors related to animal diseases such as foot and mouth disease, mad cow disease (Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy), and the avian flu. While many analysts have previously discussed the link between cattle ranching and deforestation in the Amazon, until now the main concern has been production for sale within Brazil. Until this report, very little attention has been given to the role played by the international demand for Brazilian beef in rapidly escalating Brazil's loss of Amazonian rainforest.

1. Droughts make deforestation inevitable

Cubby, Sydney Morning Herald, 3-13-09 [Ben, “Amazon Rainforest may be ruined by drought” http://www.smh.com.au/environment/global-warming/amazon-jungle-may-be-ruined-by-drought-20090312-8wih.html]

HUGE swathes of the Amazon jungle could be destroyed by drought this century, even if nations make a massive effort to slow down global warming, according to a paper presented at a conference on climate science in Denmark yesterday. The report, from the British Meteorological Office, was one of many delivered at the Copenhagen conference that carry grim predictions of the scale and speed of climate change. Australian researchers joined hundreds from around the world to present their latest findings, which update and in most cases confirm some of the more bleak projections made by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change in 2007. The Amazon report used computer models to calculate the effects of rising temperatures on the rainforest and found that if temperatures rose by 2 degrees by the middle of the century - considered a conservative prediction - between 20 and 40 per cent of the rainforest would die. If temperatures rose by 3 degrees, three-quarters of the forest would die and transform into grassland. "On any kind of pragmatic time-scale, I think we should see the loss of the Amazon forest as irreversible," Dr Chris Jones, a lead researcher at the meteorological office's Hadley Centre, told the conference. The study, due for publication in the journal Nature Geoscience, was the first to measure the expected loss of trees in the Amazon as a result of climate change. The forest contains about 10 per cent of the world's land-based carbon sinks, and earlier studies have shown changes there would affect the earth's climate.

1. They don’t have an internal link to biodiversity – no reason the Amazon is key to global bio-d
2. GMOs make bio-diversity loss inevitable

Bello, ’09 (Walden, “A Critique of Orthodox Perspectives,” All Africa, Opinions, http://allafrica.com/stories/200906260740.html, AD: 6/30/09)

Proponents of GMOs have not been able to alleviate worries that transgenic foods have the potential for creating unexpected reactions in humans unless these foods, which have never been seen before and thus not selected for human consumption by eons of evolution, are tested rigorously in accordance with the universally recognised precautionary principle. Neither have they been able to allay worries that non-target populations might be negatively affected by genetic modification aimed at specific pests, as in the case of Bt corn's impact on the monarch butterfly. Nor have they dispelled the very real threat of loss of biodiversity posed by GMOs. The risks are hardly trifling, as noted by one account: The effects of transgenic crops on biodiversity far extend the concerns already raised by monocropping under the Green Revolution. Not only is diversity decreased through the physical loss of species, but because of its 'live' aspect, it has the potential to contaminate, and potentially to dominate, other strains of the same species. While this may be a limited concern with respect to the contamination of another commercial crop, it is significantly more worrisome when it could contaminate and eradicate generations of evolution of diverse and subtly differentiated strains of a single crop, such as the recently discovered transgenic contamination of landraces of indigenous corn in Mexico. [3]

1. You don’t solve warming – Co2 emissions in other countries, base-load emissions, and farming practices contribute to 80% of fossil fuel GHG emissions. At best you delay the inevitable.
2. Cosmic rays are an alt cause

NIPCC 09 (Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change, “Climate Change Reconsidered,” June, <http://www.nipccreport.org/reports/2009/pdf/CCR2009FullReport.pdf>)

Kirkby (2008) reports that “diverse reconstructions of past climate change have revealed clear associations with cosmic ray variations recorded in cosmogenic isotope archives, providing persuasive evidence for solar or cosmic ray forcing of the climate.” He discusses two different classes of microphysical mechanisms that have been proposed to connect cosmic rays with clouds, which interact significantly with fluxes of both solar and thermal radiation and, therefore, climate: “firstly, an influence of cosmic rays on the production of cloud condensation nuclei and, secondly, an influence of cosmic rays on the global electrical circuit in the atmosphere and, in turn, on ice nucleation and other cloud microphysical processes.” Kirkby observes that “considerable progress on understanding ion-aerosolcloud processes has been made in recent years, and the results are suggestive of a physically plausible link between cosmic rays, clouds and climate” and “with new experiments planned or underway, such as the CLOUD facility at CERN, there are good prospects that we will have some firm answers to this question within the next few years.”

1. Adaptation and development solve the short term Co2 spike

**NIPCC ’10** (Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change, multi-national scientific coalition comprised of leading climate scientists, “Tropospheric Ozone Trends Around the World,” http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2010/jun/25jun2010a5.html, AM)

Logan et al. (2010) describe and discuss what was revealed at a "Tropospheric Ozone Changes Workshop" held in Boulder, Colorado (USA) on 14-16 October 2009, where they say that "long-term ozone records from regionally representative surface and mountain sites, ozonesondes, and aircraft were reviewed by region." According to the authors, "in the Southern Hemisphere, surface measurements from South Africa and Tasmania and sonde data from New Zealand show a significant increase over the past 25 years." North of the equator, on the other hand, the story is somewhat different. In western Europe, for example, they write that "several time series of ~15-40 years ... show a rise in ozone into the middle to late 1990s and a leveling off, or in some cases declines, in the 2000s, in general agreement with precursor emission changes." Similarly, they state that "surface measurements within North America show a pattern of mostly unchanged or declining ozone over the past two decades that [also] seems broadly consistent with decreases in precursor emissions," while noting that "the Japanese sonde record suggests rising ozone into the 1980s and small changes thereafter." The spatial and temporal distributions of these observations would seem to suggest that: whereas increasing industrialization originally tends to increase the emissions of precursor substances that lead to the creation of greater tropospheric ozone pollution, subsequent technological advances tend to ameliorate that phenomenon, as they appear to gradually lead to (1) a leveling off of the magnitude of precursor emissions and (2) an ultimatelydecreasing trend in tropospheric ozone pollution. And in light of these observations it can be appreciated that when atmospheric ozone and CO2concentrations both rise together, the plant-growth-*enhancing* effect of atmospheric CO2 enrichment is significantly muted by the plant-growth-*retarding*effect of contemporaneous increases in ozone pollution, but that as the troposphere's ozone concentration gradually levels off and *declines* -- as it appears to be doing with the development of new and better anti-pollution technology in the planet's more economically advanced countries -- we should begin to see more-rapid-than-usual increases in earth's vegetative productivity, which should promote an acceleration of the greening of the earth phenomenon.

## 2NC No I/L XT

There is no internal link to this advantage – The internal link is not reverse causal – they have ev that says that the exports would help the ag sector not that a lack of waterways would totally collapse the ag industry. Obviously, we could trade to other regions.

## 2NC A2 AG helps Food

This impact makes no sense –

A. Trade solves the impact

Allouche 10 Jeremy Allouche Research Fellow in water supply and sanitation. Institute of Development Studies, Brighton, U The sustainability and resilience of global water and food systems: Political analysis of the interplay between security, resource scarcity, political systems and global trade. Food Policy (2010), doi:10.1016/j.foodpol.2010.11.013

Debates on resource scarcity and conﬂict have ignored the role of trade in both causing and addressing local and regional shortages. In the case of food and water, this has led to conclusions that are highly questionable. Indeed, food security has essentially been addressed through national water availability and ignores the spectacularly successful beneﬁts of international trade, in this particular case food imports (Allan, 2001). Water availability is often hidden in international trade. Countries with more water are able to trade water-intensive goods for export. Water embedded in traded crops has been termed ‘virtual water’ and trade in virtual water has been suggested as a way to alleviate water shortages. However, the limit of this logic should be recognized in that global trade is based on broader political and economic factors rather than on water. Through global trade, one can observe an overall increase in terms of food security between 1970 and 1990. The greatest improvements were in North Africa and the Middle East, moderate change in Asia and Oceania and Latin America, and a decline in Sub-Saharan Africa. A number of specialists emphasize the need for free international trade in order to assure global food security, as it enables supply and demand to be balanced across regions (Godfray et al., 2010). Global trade therefore is seen as a solution to the ‘equality’ problem as it enables food security as deﬁned by the FAO (namely when ‘‘all people, at all times, have physical and economic access to sufﬁcient, safe and nutritious food to meet their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life’’ – as deﬁned at the 1996 World Food Summit, FAO, 1996). Although it has been acknowledged that free markets usually penalize the poorest who have the least inﬂuence on how global markets are structured and regulated (see Anderson, 2009 and Aksoy and Beghin, 2005), alternatives have usually been dismissed.

B. The internal link is ag productivity – if people need more food they will pay more

## 2NC Amazon Alt Causes XT

Amazon –

Cattle expansion is increasing rapidly

CIFOR ’04 (The Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR) was established in 1993 as part of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) in response to global concerns about the social, environmental and economic consequences of forest loss and degradation. CIFOR research produces knowledge and methods needed to improve the well-being of forest-dependent people and to help tropical countries manage their forests wisely for sustained benefits. This research is done in more than two dozen countries, in partnership with numerous partners. Since it was founded, CIFOR has also played a central role in influencing global and national forestry policies, “ Hamburger Connection Fuels Amazon Destruction,” <http://www.veganimal.info/IMG/pdf/rapportCIFORamazon-2.pdf>)

Cattle expansion in the Amazon in the last twelve years has been phenomenal. During this period, the number of cattle more than doubled, from 26 million in 1990 to 57 million in 2002. In the process it has gone from representing 17.8% of Brazil's total cattle herd to almost one third (see table 1). In fact, 80% of all of the growth in Brazil's livestock population in this period was in the Amazon. The overwhelming majority of the new cattle are concentrated in Brazil’ s Amazon states of Mato Grosso, Pará, and Rondônia, which were also the states with the greatest deforestation in 2002 (see table 2)

That wrecks the Amazon

CIFOR ’04 (The Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR) was established in 1993 as part of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) in response to global concerns about the social, environmental and economic consequences of forest loss and degradation. CIFOR research produces knowledge and methods needed to improve the well-being of forest-dependent people and to help tropical countries manage their forests wisely for sustained benefits. This research is done in more than two dozen countries, in partnership with numerous partners. Since it was founded, CIFOR has also played a central role in influencing global and national forestry policies, “ Hamburger Connection Fuels Amazon Destruction,” <http://www.veganimal.info/IMG/pdf/rapportCIFORamazon-2.pdf>)

The previously mentioned changes in exchange rates and livestock diseases have given much greater force to Amazonian dynamics that were already underway. These include the rapid expansion of the region's road and electricity network and large investments in modern new slaughterhouses and meatpacking and dairy plants. Very low land prices in the Amazon also help to make ranching profitable. These prices remain very low in part because farmers find it easy to illegally occupy government land without being prosecuted, and to deforest areas much larger than the 20% of their farms currently permitted by law.

The Bio-d impact is inevitable – Genetically modified organisms will destroy bio-diversity – modifications accidentally destroy species – there’s a scientific consensus that it’s a huge threat to bio-d – that’s Bello

Urban expansion also causes it

Muirhead No Date (Sarah, Publisher of Food Inc., “The Facts – Global Warming,” Foodlink, http://www.feedstuffsfoodlink.com/ME2/dirsect.asp?sid=F7B9ABB3F82C4F90BBA7424BE84C2C41&nm=Food+Facts, AD: 6/30/09)

An August 2002 United Nations’ report predicted that agricultural and urban expansion will threaten biodiversity on 72% of the global land area by 2032. The "World Atlas of Biodiversity: Earth's Living Resources for the 21st Century" report said that up to 48% of these areas will be converted to agricultural land, plantations and urban areas, compared with 22% today.

## 2NC Bio-D Defense

99.9% of bio-d loss has no impact

Sagoff, ’97

[Mark, Senior Research Scholar @ Institute for Philosophy and Public policy in School of Public Affairs @ U. Maryland, William and Mary Law Review, “INSTITUTE OF BILL OF RIGHTS LAW SYMPOSIUM DEFINING TAKINGS: PRIVATE PROPERTY AND THE FUTURE OF GOVERNMENT REGULATION: MUDDLE OR MUDDLE THROUGH? TAKINGS JURISPRUDENCE MEETS THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT”, 38 Wm and Mary L. Rev. 825, March]

Although one may agree with ecologists such as Ehrlich and Raven that the earth stands on the brink of an episode of massive extinction, it may not follow from this grim fact that human beings will suffer as a result. On the contrary, skeptics such as science writer Colin Tudge have challenged biologists to explain why we need more than a tenth of the 10 to 100 million species that grace the earth. Noting that "cultivated systems often out-produce wild systems by 100-fold or more," Tudge declared that "the argument that humans need the variety of other species is, when you think about it, a theological one." n343 Tudge observed that "the elimination of all but a tiny minority of our fellow creatures does not affect the material well-being of humans one iota." n344 This skeptic challenged ecologists to list more than 10,000 species (other than unthreatened microbes) that are essential to ecosystem productivity or functioning. n345 "The human species could survive just as well if 99.9% of our fellow creatures went extinct**,** provided only that we retained the appropriate 0.1% that we need." n346 [\*906] The monumental Global Biodiversity Assessment ("the Assessment") identified two positions with respect to redundancy of species. "At one extreme is the idea that each species is unique and important, such that its removal or loss will have demonstrable consequences to the functioning of the community or ecosystem." n347 The authors of the Assessment, a panel of eminent ecologists, endorsed this position, saying it is "unlikely that there is much, if any, ecological redundancy in communities over time scales of decades to centuries, the time period over which environmental policy should operate." n348 These eminent ecologists rejected the opposing view, "the notion that species overlap in function to a sufficient degree that removal or loss of a species will be compensated by others, with negligible overall consequences to the community or ecosystem." n349 Other biologists believe, however, that species are so fabulously redundant in the ecological functions they perform that the life-support systems and processes of the planet and ecological processes in general will function perfectly well with fewer of them, certainly fewer than the millions and millions we can expect to remain even if every threatened organism becomes extinct. n350 Even the kind of sparse and miserable world depicted in the movie Blade Runner could provide a "sustainable" context for the human economy as long as people forgot their aesthetic and moral commitment to the glory and beauty of the natural world. n351 The Assessment makes this point. "Although any ecosystem contains hundreds to thousands of species interacting among themselves and their physical environment, the emerging consensus is that the system is driven by a small number of . . . biotic variables on whose interactions the balance of species are, in a sense, carried along." n352 [\*907] To make up your mind on the question of the functional redundancy of species, consider an endangered species of bird, plant, or insect and ask how the ecosystem would fare in its absence. The fact that the creature is endangered suggests an answer: it is already in limbo as far as ecosystem processes are concerned. What crucial ecological services does the black-capped vireo, for example, serve? Are any of the species threatened with extinction necessary to the provision of any ecosystem service on which humans depend? If so, which ones are they? Ecosystems and the species that compose them have changed, dramatically, continually, and totally in virtually every part of the United States. There is little ecological similarity, for example, between New England today and the land where the Pilgrims died. n353 In view of the constant reconfiguration of the biota, one may wonder why Americans have not suffered more as a result of ecological catastrophes. The cast of species in nearly every environment changes constantly-local extinction is commonplace in nature-but the crops still grow. Somehow, it seems, property values keep going up on Martha's Vineyard in spite of the tragic disappearance of the heath hen. One might argue that the sheer number and variety of creatures available to any ecosystem buffers that system against stress. Accordingly, we should be concerned if the "library" of creatures ready, willing, and able to colonize ecosystems gets too small. (Advances in genetic engineering may well permit us to write a large number of additions to that "library.") In the United States as in many other parts of the world, however, the number of species has been increasing dramatically, not decreasing, as a result of human activity. This is because the hordes of exotic species coming into ecosystems in the United States far exceed the number of species that are becoming extinct. Indeed, introductions may outnumber extinctions by more than ten to one, so that the United States is becoming more and more species-rich all the time largely as a result of human action. n354 [\*908] Peter Vitousek and colleagues estimate that over 1000 non-native plants grow in California alone; in Hawaii there are 861; in Florida, 1210. n355 In Florida more than 1000 non-native insects, 23 species of mammals, and about 11 exotic birds have established themselves. n356 Anyone who waters a lawn or hoes a garden knows how many weeds desire to grow there, how many birds and bugs visit the yard, and how many fungi, creepy-crawlies, and other odd life forms show forth when it rains. All belong to nature, from wherever they might hail, but not many homeowners would claim that there are too few of them. Now, not all exotic species provide ecosystem services; indeed, some may be disruptive or have no instrumental value. n357 This also may be true, of course, of native species as well, especially because all exotics are native somewhere. Certain exotic species, however, such as Kentucky blue grass, establish an area's sense of identity and place; others, such as the green crabs showing up around Martha's Vineyard, are nuisances. n358 Consider an analogy [\*909] with human migration. Everyone knows that after a generation or two, immigrants to this country are hard to distinguish from everyone else. The vast majority of Americans did not evolve here, as it were, from hominids; most of us "came over" at one time or another. This is true of many of our fellow species as well, and they may fit in here just as well as we do. It is possible to distinguish exotic species from native ones for a period of time, just as we can distinguish immigrants from native-born Americans, but as the centuries roll by, species, like people, fit into the landscape or the society, changing and often enriching it. Shall we have a rule that a species had to come over on the Mayflower, as so many did, to count as "truly" American? Plainly not. When, then, is the cutoff date? Insofar as we are concerned with the absolute numbers of "rivets" holding ecosystems together, extinction seems not to pose a general problem because a far greater number of kinds of mammals, insects, fish, plants, and other creatures thrive on land and in water in America today than in prelapsarian times. n359 The Ecological Society of America has urged managers to maintain biological diversity as a critical component in strengthening ecosystems against disturbance. n360 Yet as Simon Levin observed, "much of the detail about species composition will be irrelevant in terms of influences on ecosystem properties." n361 [\*910] He added: "For net primary productivity, as is likely to be the case for any system property, biodiversity matters only up to a point; above a certain level, increasing biodiversity is likely to make little difference." n362 What about the use of plants and animals in agriculture? There is no scarcity foreseeable. "Of an estimated 80,000 types of plants [we] know to be edible," a U.S. Department of the Interior document says, "only about 150 are extensively cultivated." n363 About twenty species, not one of which is endangered, provide ninety percent of the food the world takes from plants. n364 Any new food has to take "shelf space" or "market share" from one that is now produced. Corporations also find it difficult to create demand for a new product; for example, people are not inclined to eat paw-paws, even though they are delicious. It is hard enough to get people to eat their broccoli and lima beans. It is harder still to develop consumer demand for new foods. This may be the reason the Kraft Corporation does not prospect in remote places for rare and unusual plants and animals to add to the world's diet.

## 2NC Cosmic Rays XT

Alt causality – Cosmic rays – historical records conclude that cosmic rays are the biggest factor in climate change – directly affect cloud formation and atmospheric processes – That’s the NIPCC

Cosmic rays are key – fluctuations are better correlated with climate that CO2 levels are

NIPCC 09 (Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change, “Climate Change Reconsidered,” June, <http://www.nipccreport.org/reports/2009/pdf/CCR2009FullReport.pdf>)

In conclusion, and as Kirkby (2008) rightly notes, “the question of whether, and to what extent, the climate is influenced by solar and cosmic ray variability remains central to our understanding of the anthropogenic contribution to present climate change.” Clearly, carbon dioxide is not the allimportant dominating factor in earth’s climatic history. Within the context of the Holocene, the only time CO2 moved in concert with air temperature was over the period of earth’s recovery from the global chill of the Little Ice Age (the past century or so), and it does so then only quite imperfectly. The flux of galactic cosmic rays, on the other hand, appears to have influenced ups and downs in both temperature and precipitation over the entire 10-12 thousand years of the Holocene, making it the prime candidate for “prime determinant” of earth’s climatic state.

## 2NC Adaptation XT

No terminal impact – emissions inevitably level off as countries reach a certain level of development – empirically confirmed – initial increases in emissions gradually lower as efficiency becomes more commonplace – That’s NIPCC

Adaptation checks – US action is also irrelevant

Michaels, ’07 Senior fellow in environmental studies at the Cato Institute, Research professor of environmental sciences at the University of Virginia (Patrick J. Michaels, CATO Institute, 21 August 2007, “Global Warming: No Urgent Danger; No Quick Fix,” <http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=8651)>)

What we do in the United States is having less and less of an effect on the concentration of carbon dioxide in the world's atmosphere. We certainly adapted to 0.8 C temperature change quite well in the 20th century, as life expectancy doubled and some crop yields quintupled. And who knows what new and miraculously efficient power sources will develop in the next hundred years. The stories about the ocean rising 20 feet as massive amounts of ice slide off of Greenland by 2100 are also fiction. For the entire half century from 1915 through 1965, Greenland was significantly warmer than it has been for the last decade. There was no disaster. More important, there's a large body of evidence that for much of the period from 3,000 to 9,000 years ago, at least the Eurasian Arctic was 2.5 C to 7 C warmer than now in the summer, when ice melts. Greenland's ice didn't disappear then, either. Then there is the topic of interest this time of year — hurricanes. Will hurricanes become stronger or more frequent because of warming? My own work suggests that late in the 21st century there might be an increase in strong storms, but that it will be very hard to detect because of year-to-year variability. Right now, after accounting for increasing coastal population and property values, there is no increase in damages caused by these killers. The biggest of them all was the Great Miami Hurricane of 1926. If it occurred today, it would easily cause twice as much damage as 2005's vaunted Hurricane Katrina. So let's get real and give the politically incorrect answers to global warming's inconvenient questions. Global warming is real, but it does not portend immediate disaster, and there's currently no suite of technologies that can do much about it. The obvious solution is to forgo costs today on ineffective attempts to stop it, and to save our money for investment in future technologies and inevitable adaptation.

Largest negative feedbacks check

NIPCC ’10 (Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change, leading multi-national coalition of climate scientists, “Warming Reduces Permafrost Thaw Rates???,” http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2010/oct/20oct2010a4.html)

Authors Blok et al. (2010) write that there are "fears" that if earth's permafrost thaws, "much of the carbon stored will be released to the atmosphere," as will great quantities of the greenhouse gas *methane* (further exacerbating warming), as is claimed is already happening -- and at an accelerating rate -- by many climate alarmists, such as Al Gore in his 21 March 2007 testimony before the United States Senate's Environment & Public Works Committee and Michael Mann and Lee Kump (2008) in their *Dire Predictions* book. Quite to the contrary, however, Blok et al. report **that "it has been demonstrated that increases in air temperature sometimes lead to vegetation changes that *offset* the effect of air warming on soil temperature** [italics added]," citing the studies of Walker *et al*. (2003) and Yi *et al*. (2007) as specific examples of the phenomenon. In an attempt to explore the subject within the context of real-world experimentation, Blok *et al*. conducted a study within the Kytalyk nature reserve in the Indigirka lowlands of northeastern Siberia (Russia), where they measured the thaw depth or *active layer thickness* (ALT) of the soil, the ground heat flux, and the net radiation in 10-meter-diameter plots either possessing or not possessing a natural cover of bog birch (*Betula nana*) shrubs, the latter of which set of plots had all *B. nana* shrubs removed from their native tundra vegetation in 2007. The Dutch, Swiss and Russian researchers report that "experimental B. nana removal had increased ALT significantly by an average of 9% at the end of the 2008 growing season, compared with the control plots," which implies reduced warming in the more shrub-dominated plots, and that "in the undisturbed control plots with varying natural B. nana cover, ALT decreased with increasing B. nana cover," also "showing a negative correlation between B. nana cover and ALT," which again implies reduced warming in the more shrub-dominated plots. Blok *et al*. say their results suggest that **"the expected expansion of deciduous shrubs in the Arctic region, triggered by climate warming, may reduce summer permafrost thaw**," and that the "increased shrub growth may thus partially offset further permafrost degradation by future temperature increases," while in further support of their conclusion, the six scientists write that (1) permafrost temperature records "do not show a general warming trend during the last decade (Brown and Romanovsky, 2008), despite large increases in surface air temperature," that (2) during the decade before that, "data from several Siberian Arctic permafrost stations do not show a discernible trend between 1991 and 2000 (IPCC, 2007)," and that (3) "a recent discovery of ancient permafrost that survived several warm geological periods suggests that vegetation cover may help protect permafrost from climate warming (Froese *et al*., 2008)." And last of all, **they note that this phenomenon "could feedback negatively to global warming**, because the lower soil temperatures in summer would slow down soil decomposition and thus the amount of carbon released to the atmosphere."

# A2 Add-Ons

## A2 Energy Security Add-on

#### Barges don’t help the environment – even one collision would reverse any benefits.

Lori Lyons, writer for the Times-Picayune (New Orleans newspaper), 2/17/12, “Barges collide in St. John the Baptist Parish, spilling crude oil in Mississippi River,” Times-Picayune, <http://www.nola.com/environment/index.ssf/2012/02/barges_collide_in_st_john_the.html>

A construction barge and a tank barge, towed by separate vessels, collided in the Mississippi River early Friday in St. John the Baptist Parish near Edgard, closing a portion of the river to traffic for most of the day and spilling about 10,000 gallons of Louisiana sweet crude oil into the water, the Coast Guard said. No injuries were reported, said Coast Guard sector commander and federal on-scene coordinator Capt. Pete Gautier. The cause of the collision remained under investigation. Officials in St. Charles and St. John parishes closed drinking-water intake valves in the Mississippi River for much of the day but reopened them Friday afternoon. Gautier said officials were notified Friday at 1:58 a.m. that a construction barge being towed by the tug boat Alydar and an oil tanker barge being towed by the vessel Clarence W. Settoon had collided near mile marker 139, about 50 miles upriver from New Orleans. The tank barge suffered a gash in its portside hull about 18 feet by 5 feet wide and began dumping Louisiana sweet crude oil into the Mississippi River. “We don’t have a precise, exact amount of oil that’s spilled,” Gautier said. “We are estimating the amount of oil spilled in the water at somewhere less than 10,000 gallons. These estimates are based on the amount of product known to be in the tank before the incident. The exact amount of oil spilled will be determined over the next few weeks as we offload and get a better idea of the amount of oil that still remains on the barge.” The impacted cargo tank reportedly was holding 3,535 barrels, or 148,470 gallons, of crude oil, officials said. Gautier said officials quickly moved the damaged barge into shallower waters close to the west bank to get the gash above the waterline. Oil spill response crews brought in booms to contain the spill, and a five-mile stretch of the river was closed to maritime traffic. Meanwhile, a light silver sheen of small to medium patches of oil impacting a two-mile stretch slowly moved down river. By late afternoon, Gautier said, the sheen had passed within a few miles of the Hale Boggs Bridge in Luling in St. Charles Parish. The most immediate concern, Gautier said, was to the water supplies in both St. John and St. Charles parishes, which closed off their water intake systems as a precaution. Officials in both parishes said there was an adequate supply of water in storage to meet the demands of the public and no oil was reported to have gotten into either parish’s water system. Gautier said the Coast Guard will likely allow the oil to disperse naturally. “This is very light sweet crude,” Gautier said. “I think we can expect about 30 percent of the oil that has been spilled to evaporate within a few hours. And the river is running at high stage right now, at about 5 miles per hour. That’s going to create a lot of natural dispersion of the oil. “We’ll see pocket of very light sheen and the sheen is very thin. Unless this oil presses up against something, a natural collection area, it’s really not anything we can recover.” Gautier said the weather system expected to move through the area late Friday and Saturday would help with the dispersing of the oil, but may hinder cleanup and recovery activities. He added that there has been no reported impact to any wildlife. “Any spill that occurs is a bad event and we respond aggressively to these things,” Gautier said. The river reopened late Friday to one-way traffic between mile markers 140 and 120. Southbound vessels will be allowed through until 6 a.m. on Saturday, at which time northbound vessels will be allowed to travel.”

## A2 Hydropower Add-on

#### Hydropower is not going to work anyway as a source of clean energy – once all the glaciers have melted there will be no flow, meaning to hydropower.

Kristin Underwood, science writer for Treehugger.com, 10/22/09, “Hydropower Not Likely Under New Climate Future,” Treehugger.com, <http://www.treehugger.com/clean-water/hydropower-not-likely-under-new-climate-future.html>

Countries that have built dams as part of their "clean" energy future may have to rethink that future, thanks to climate change. As glaciers are melting faster and faster, the water just isn't there. In Peru, Ecuador, Bolivia and Colombia, the UN IPCC has already identified the "the lack of water for hydropower as 'critical.'" Reuters reports that rapidly declining glaciers around the world may mean an end to hydropower and major changes for the more than one billion people who live in areas fed by glaciers. Switzerland, for example, relies on hydropower for about half of their energy supply. Melting glaciers are responsible for everything in the area from farming to cooling nuclear towers, in addition to moving hydropower turbines. Hydropower won't be the only thing to suffer in a glacier-free world. Earlier this year Matthew reported that scientists around the global are not just melting faster, but that their rate of melt is accelerating, meaning that we are losing glaciers way sooner than anyone predicted. How does the hydropower industry plan for something like that? Not just the loss of glaciers, but the accelerating timeline they are looking at that is rapidly coming to a close. You can bet that they are keeping an eye on this. In Switzerland, for example, one study predicts that the country will go from 60% hydropower to 46% by 2035 due to a lack in rainfall, loss of glaciers and an increase in energy use. The hydroelectric industry is funding multiple studies, but trying to predict water resources in a changing environment is like trying to hit a moving target. This also means that countries using hydropower to meet part of their climate goals may have to rethink that as the lack in meltwater translates to less power produced. And yet, there will still be winners in this losing battle. Norway, which produces almost 100% of its power from hydropower will actually get more rain and snow, even as their glaciers melt. No word on whether it will be enough to cover their hydropower needs. While the dams may not work as well for hydropower, they can be used as reservoirs to spread out water resources throughout the threatened region over the year. Switzerland, for example, is already rethinking how to use its hydropower. Typically they store water up until September when winter is just around the corner and more energy will be needed for heating homes and buildings. In April the storage lakes are typically dry and, with summers getting drier and drier, water usage allotments will have to change. In the short-term, the melting glaciers will give more water for use in hydropower, but in the future the country will have to rely on rainfall to fill the storage lakes and manage their water resources differently. This is challenged by the energy industry which was recently liberalized and therefore there is a greater incentive to make money in the short term, rather than plan for dwindling supplies. Switzerland can also use "pumped storage power stations" to bring water to high reservoirs and release it only when demand increases. China, on the other hand, plans to build 20 more dams on the headwaters of the Yangtze River, despite a rapidly declining water source in the Himalayas. These schemes only work if a country or industry have the ability to plan out into the future and also the resources to shift where their water supplies come from. If a nation doesn't have a fall-back "plan" like increased precipitation, they may have to turn to other energy production methods that might not be as "green" as hydropower. That is, unless they can use their muscle to force neighboring countries also dependent on the glaciers to help come up with (or finance) a solution.

## A2 Emergency Preparedness Add-On

Barges can’t solve. The range of aid is too small.

Heather Nachtmann- phd in industrial engineering

And Edward A Pohl- Phd in industrial engineering-January 14, 20**10**-“Emergency Response via Inland waterways”-MBTC DOT 3008 / MBTC DHS 1106-http://ww2.mackblackwell.org/web/research/ALL\_RESEARCH\_PROJECTS/3000s/3008/MBTC%203008.pdf

o Accessibility to Navigable Inland Waterway A community that is located hundreds of miles from the nearest navigable inland waterway does not stand to benefit significantly from WEMS. In contrast, a community that is located directly on a navigable river could potentially benefit greatly from waterway assistance in the event of a disaster. Although ground-based medical vehicles could possibly be transported and deployed by a barge, the effective range of the watercraft is still limited to navigable waterways. We consider medical assistance via an inland waterway to be infeasible if a community is located more than a three hour drive from the nearest navigable waterway with an assumed driving speed of thirty-five miles per hour. For the purposes of calculating the WEMS index, the *Accessibility to Navigable Inland Waterway* factor is divided into two categories: Accessible (≤ 3 hours of driving time) and Inaccessible (> 3 hours of driving time). Counties classified as Accessible or Inaccessible receive a score of one or zero respectively. o Proximity to Barge Origin The index is affected by how quickly a barge can respond to an emergency or disaster in a given community. A barge is powerful yet slow. While it has the capability to move many tons of cargo along rivers, it can take several days to travel across a state. If an emergency occurs that requires a response within a matter of hours, a barge may only be able to assist if the community is within a few miles of the barge’s home base. We define *Proximity to Barge Origin* as how long it takes the nearest medical barge to arrive at the nearest port on the nearest navigable waterway to the community. For the WEMS index, the *Proximity to Barge Origin* factor is divided into three categories: Very Near (< 2 days), Near (2 – 4 days), and Far (> 4 days). Communities classified as Very Near, Near, or Far will receive values of three, two, or one respectively.

# DA Links

## Elections Links

#### Inland waterways are extremely unpopular among Americans

Tom White, of the Association of American Railroads, 2/9/06, “Harris Poll Says Americans Favor More Freight, Passengers Moving by Rail,” Association of American Railroads, <http://www.aar.org/NewsAndEvents/Press-Releases/2006/02/Harris%20Poll%20Says%20Americans%20Favor%20More%20Freight%20Passengers%20Moving%20by%20Rail.aspx>

The American public would like to see more freight and passenger traffic going by rail, according to a nationwide Harris Poll released February 8. “The American public clearly recognizes the value of railroads,” said Association of American Railroads (AAR) President and CEO Edward R. Hamberger. The poll showed that 63 percent of those surveyed believe that a greater portion of freight should move by rail, a higher total than was reported for any other mode. “The public knows that moving more freight by rail will be good for the environment, will help the economy continue to expand and will reduce highway congestion” Hamberger said, adding that one train can carry the load of 500 trucks.. “Today’s transportation infrastructure is already under stress,” he said, “and all modes of transportation will have to grow to meet the needs of an expanding economy.” Hamberger pointed out that railroads face a particular challenge when it comes to increasing capacity. He pointed to a recent Congressional Budget Office report that said, "The railroad industry faces higher costs or other obstacles that competing industries — truckers and water carriers — do not face. Railroads provide their own infrastructure, whereas their competitors do not." Because of this, Hamberger added, “It is imperative that the nation adopt transportation policies that will encourage more investment in rail infrastructure.” The Harris Poll showed that while 63 percent of adults would like to see rail have an increasing share of freight transportation, 35 percent favored moving more by air and 24 percent favored more moving by truck.. Other options offered respondents were coastal shipping, favored by 17 percent; pipelines, 13 percent; and inland waterway, 8 percent. Because respondents could choose more than one mode, the totals add up to more than 100 percent. Commuter and long- distance trains top the list of nine modes of transportation that adults would like to see "have an increasing share of passenger transportation," with 44 percent selecting commuter trains and 35 percent selecting long-distance trains. Other options included local bus service, 23 percent; airlines, 23 percent; local travel by car 11 percent; travel by bicycle, 11 percent; long-distance travel by car 10 percent; pedestrian travel 8 percent and long distance bus service, 6 percent.

# Topicality – PPP

## 1NC T Shell

#### Interpretation – Transportation infrastructure investment requires private-sector participation

Khasnabis & Mishra, Engineering Prof, ’09

[Professor of Civil Engineering and Graduate Student of Engineering, Wayne State. “Developing and Testing a Framework for Alternative Ownership, Tenure and Governance Strategies for Proposed Detroit-Windsor River Crossing. Feb 2009. http://www.utoledo.edu/research/ututc/docs/UTUTC-IU-1\_Final\_Report1.pdf//Cal-JV]

Transportation infrastructure investments typically undertaken by the public sector, has recently attracted private entities, thereby forming a joint participation commonly referred to as Public Private Partnership (PPP). Financing techniques are developed to provide various forms of ownership, tenure and governance (OTG) strategies. There are a number of reasons for the growing trend of private participation in public projects. These include, the scarcity of fiscal resources at the public sector level, the perception that the private sector is more efficient in managing (construct, operate, and maintain) large projects, and sharing risks and uncertainties with the private sector, thereby reducing exposure levels to financial losses for both entities. Most investment decisions share three important characteristics in varying degrees. First, the investment is partially or completely irreversible in that the funds invested are completely “sunk” in the project. Thus the agency or agencies responsible for managing the project, must be fully committed to the project once the investment is made. Second, there are uncertainties over the future outcome from the investment. One way to address this is to assess the probabilities of the alternative outcomes that can mean greater or smaller profit (or loss) for the investment. The third characteristic is related to timing of the investment. With proper planning, investment decisions can be postponed until credible information about future outcomes may be available. These three characteristics interact to determine the optimal decision of investors (Weston and Brigham 1976)*.*

1. Violation – The plan is fully funded and implemented by the federal government – it does not operate via a public private partnership
2. Vote Neg – Requiring private sector participation is key to ground because it ensures we have good market-based disadvantage ground and it prevents aff’s which have exclusive federal control which there is little mechanism literature on

## 2NC Overview

Transportation infrastructure investment requires joint ownership between the public and private sector when building infrastructure projects – That’s Khasnabis & Mishra

This is distinct from transportation infrastructure investment which refers to public infrastructure projects the private sector could implement on their own but need the government to do so properly

Their interpretation destroys neg ground by allowing for aff’s that only the federal government has the jurisdiction to implement like all military affs and critical transportation infrastructure

These affs are bad for debate because there is no negative literature on what outside actors besides the federal government should do about a problem – this turns the topic into a simple yes-no question which prevents a breadth of topic education – market based counterplans and DA’s based on private sector involvement are at the core of transportation infrastructure investment debates

And we have a case-list – High Speed Rail, […] are all topical under our interpretation

## 2NC Violation Evidence

More evidence – “infrastructure investment” is a term of art that excludes pubic investment

Kappeler & Valilia, Senior Economist @ The EIB, ’07

[Director of the Institute of East European Studies University of Vienna and \*\*Senior economist at the European Investment Bank ( 2007, \*Andreas and \*\*Timo, “ Economic Financial Report: Introduction,” http://www.eib.org/attachments/efs/efr\_2007\_v02\_en.pdf)

Public investment has received only limited academic attention as an aggregate variable, and its composition has to our knowledge received none at all, at least in the European context. This paper seeks to fill that gap at least in part by presenting some stylised facts about the composition of public investment in Europe and by presenting an empirical analysis of what drives different types of public investment, with a special focus on the impact of fiscal federalism. Perhaps because of lack of academic attention, misconceptions abound concerning the nature, drivers, and impact of public investment. Most notably, there is often confusion about what it is in the first place. Perhaps the most prominent example of this type of confusion is the customary synonymous use of “public investment” and “infrastructure investment” in much of economic literature. There is, however, a great deal of infrastructure investment that is not public, and there is a great deal of public investment that is not infrastructure investment. While it is well-known that many roads, water and sanitation networks, and municipal swimming pools are publicly funded and provided, neither economic theory nor empirical analyses have really distinguished between them when studying what determines “public investment” or how productive “public investment” is. As a starting point for a more nuanced analysis and understanding of public investment, we first break it down into different types with distinctly different economic characteristics in section 2. We then propose to use the traditional theory of fiscal federalism and some of its more recent extensions, reviewed in section 3, to derive hypotheses about the link between fiscal decentralisation and the composition of public investment. Section 4 seeks to articulate empirical tests of the hypotheses, and their results are interpreted from an economic perspective in section 5, before concluding in section 6. 3

## 2NC A2 C/I Investment = Capital Spending

1. Turn – Your interpretation is bad for aff ground – if capital investment is all that is required for a project then the source of where the money comes from doesn’t matter – means there’s zero fed key warrants
2. Their interpretation is too narrow and misses the majority of government involvement in infrastructure

Heller, IMF Fiscal Affairs Deputy Director, ’09

[Peter S., Former Deputy Director of the Fiscal Affairs Department – International Monetary Fund and Currently Senior Adjunct Professor of International Economics – Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies at The Johns Hopkins University, “Public Investment: Vital for Growth and Renewal, But Should it be a Countercyclical Weapon?”, http://www.unctad.org/en/Docs/webdiae20091\_en.pdf]

While any capital outlay of a government would be defined as “public investment” in normal budgetary classification terms, this approach sidesteps a number of important conceptual issues. First, from a normative public finance perspective, the reason that governments spend on public assets is because some form of market failure is present that either leads to inefficient provision by the private sector or entails excess rents to a private producer. Specifically, the asset gives off externalities, positive or negative, or the asset is a “public good,” whose services are subject to “nonrivalness” in consumption or where it is difficult to exclude potential consumers. Or, there are economies of scale involved, such that a natural monopoly situation would be entailed, justifying either public provision or regulation of a private monopoly. Many kinds of infrastructural networks are subject to such natural monopoly conditions. Moreover, the public sector’s role in public investment is not limited to its own budgetary spending. A simple focus on government outlays may yield too narrow a picture of the level of public investments and more importantly, a too restricted perspective on the potential role played by governments with regard to the provision of public infrastructure. Most obviously, when the government collaborates in a public-private partnership (PPP), most outlays will normally be made by private sector entities. Yet the purpose of these outlays would be to provide goods or services for which there is justified public involvement. And the government’s role in relation to the PPP arrangement—in terms of monitoring, regulation, risk bearing, and ultimately purchaser of the asset (long in the future perhaps but part of the PPP contractual terms)—will still remain prominent. Similarly, in cases where the private sector invests in the production of goods characterized by natural monopoly conditions, government regulatory involvement is called for. In other spheres of private investment, a government regulatory or planning role may also be fundamental in order to take account of public policy objectives (in the case of externalities), though such investments would still be recognized as private. The challenge of classifying public investment is rendered even more complex in the context of privatization efforts, where the sale of a government asset is classified, in budgetary terms, as a “negative investment,” though in fact the transaction simply represents a reclassification of ownership. The complexities of measuring public investment and the changes in the definitions that have occurred over time has led the OECD, in its recent effort to analyze the linkage between public investment and growth, to rely on indicators of physical stock rather than measures of the financial value of public investment or the net value of its capital stock. Rather than being misled by a narrow budgetary classification, what is important to recognize are the ways in which governments have a responsibility in the creation of capital goods and their need to intervene, particularly when market failure leads to underspending on goods vital for the realization of public policy objectives.

## 2NC A2 No Fed Key Ground

1. [If You Read Heller 9] Not True – C/A Heller 9 – The government’s role in public sector infrastructure projects in terms of regulation and capital investment remains crucial to the success of the overall project

OR

1. **Not True – Government regulation, monitoring and investment in projects conducted by the private sector are crucial to their effectiveness**

Heller, IMF Fiscal Affairs Deputy Director, ’09

(Peter S., Former Deputy Director of the Fiscal Affairs Department – International Monetary Fund and Currently Senior Adjunct Professor of International Economics – Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies at The Johns Hopkins University, “Public Investment: Vital for Growth and Renewal, But Should it be a Countercyclical Weapon?”, http://www.unctad.org/en/Docs/webdiae20091\_en.pdf)

A simple focus on government outlays may yield too narrow a picture of the level of public investments and more importantly, a too restricted perspective on the potential role played by governments with regard to the provision of public infrastructure. Most obviously, when the government collaborates in a public-private partnership (PPP), most outlays will normally be made by private sector entities. Yet the purpose of these outlays would be to provide goods or services for which there is justified public involvement. And the government’s role in relation to the PPP arrangement—in terms of monitoring, regulation, risk bearing, and ultimately purchaser of the asset (long in the future perhaps but part of the PPP contractual terms)—will still remain prominent. Similarly, in cases where the private sector invests in the production of goods characterized by natural monopoly conditions, government regulatory involvement is called for. In other spheres of private investment, a government regulatory or planning role may also be fundamental in order to take account of public policy objectives (in the case of externalities), though such investments would still be recognized as private. The challenge of classifying public investment is rendered even more complex in the context of privatization efforts, where the sale of a government asset is classified, in budgetary terms, as a “negative investment,” though in fact the transaction simply represents a reclassification of ownership. The complexities of measuring public investment and the changes in the definitions that have occurred over time has led the OECD, in its recent effort to analyze the linkage between public investment and growth, to rely on indicators of physical stock rather than measures of the financial value of public investment or the net value of its capital stock. Rather than being misled by a narrow budgetary classification, what is important to recognize are the ways in which governments have a responsibility in the creation of capital goods and their need to intervene, particularly when market failure leads to underspending on goods vital for the realization of public policy objectives.

## 2NC Competing Interpretations Good

Default to competing interpretations –

1. Topic specific education. Discussing definitions determines what the topic should look like and figuring out what are the most important parts of the topic. That’s a prerequisite to meaningful and substantive debates.
2. Fairest. Reasonability allows for judge intervention letting the debate get decided on judge bias and competing interpretations checks abuse by establishing which definitions produce the best vision for the topic.
3. Infinitely regressive. There’s no brightline for what is and what is not reasonable. Teams will always push these limits to catch the neg unprepared – we have evidentiary support

**Stone ‘23**

[Justice in the Circuit Court of Appeals, 8th Circuit. Sussex Land & Live Stock Co v. Midwest Refining Co, 1923. Lexis//Cal-JV]

Where the use of land affects others, the use must be "reasonable" to escape liability for resultant damage to others. What is "reasonable" depends upon a variety of considerations and circumstances. It is an elastic term which is of uncertain value in a definition. It has been well said that "reasonable," means with regard to all the interest affected, his own and his neighbor's and also having in view public policy. But, elastic as this rule is, both reason and authority have declared certain limitations beyond which it cannot extend. One of these limitations is that it is "unreasonable" and unlawful for one owner to physically invade the land of another owner. There can be no damnum absque injuria where there is such a trespass.

1. Potential Abuse is a voter. If we prove their interpretation is bad for debate it’s a reason to reject the team. It’s not about what they do, it’s what they justify. They destroy debate by encouraging people to run similar squirrely AFF’s destroying the limits on the topic. Potential abuse is functionally in-round abuse, we’re not going to waste time reading a DA we know they’ll just say “no link” to.

## 2NC A2 Competing Interpretations Arbitrary

1. Competing interpretations is about determining which world is best for debate; an arbitrary definition constructed to exclude the AFF will never win the standards debate.
2. Not arbitrary – our interpretation has the intent to define transportation infrastructure investment – the actual wording of the resolution – it’s not our fault they only researched forms of “transportation infrastructure”

## 2NC A2 Literature Checks

1. Doesn’t prove they’re topical, don’t punish us for doing extra research – we also don’t need a non-viable strategy to prove abuse
2. You can find literature on anything, the internet is full of crazy hacks. Expecting us to research all of the crazy transportation systems that exist like hover cars would be impossible