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Lack of funding will prevent NextGen, a plan to revolutionize the airline industry, from implementation.

Holeywell and Lippman 12

[Ryan Holeywell, staff writer at Governing, Daniel Lippman, Governing contributor, April 3, 2012, “The 5 Biggest U.S. Infrastructure Projects, Plus 5 at Risk,” Governing, http://www.governing.com/topics/transportation-infrastructure/gov-5-biggest-us-infrastructure-projects-plus-5-at-risk.html]

When airplanes are delayed, nobody wins. Airlines lose money. Passengers become inconvenienced. Airports get overwhelmed. That’s why the FAA is touting an effort that it says could reduce delays by 35 percent by 2018.

The project, which aviation administrators began planning in 2003, is dubbed NextGen, and proponents say it would revolutionize air travel in this country by switching from radar-based to satellite-based flight-tracking technology. That, along with other technological advances like improved weather forecasting and communication systems, would allow planes to fly more direct routes instead of following the existing, inefficient flight paths that are arranged like highways in the sky. The result: More flights in the air at any given time, fewer delays and less wasted fuel.

But the cost is enormous. FAA officials say they’ll need between $20 billion and $27 billion for the project through 2025. The Government Accountability Office says the cost could actually be as high as $160 billion. Meanwhile, there’s an ongoing debate about what proportion of the cost should be picked up by the airline industry, which has historically been skeptical of the benefits of government-mandated technologies. A recent report from the Department of Transportation’s inspector general said the system will likely face delays because the “FAA has not made critical, longer-term design decisions on NextGen ground and aircraft systems.”

To complicate matters, the FAA has spent more than four years without a long-term funding bill, thanks to congressional inaction. That’s made it difficult to pursue larger projects like this one. A long-term bill signed earlier this year should help on that front, but the funding for the effort is still in question. The president’s 2013 budget calls for just over $1 billion for NextGen, which is a drop in the bucket. In a Congress focused on spending cuts, launching something like NextGen could be tough. “I’m guessing we’ll muddle along,” says David Plavin, an aviation consultant. “They won’t provide the big, incremental investment … that’s ultimately necessary.”

Congressional funding remains uncertain

AviationDaily 4/5 [2012, “Panel Calls On Political Leaders To Stabilize NextGen Funding” Madhu Unnikrishnan] Lexis

A high-powered panel of Washington aviation insiders called for more political leadership in solving the funding conundrum facing the NextGen air traffic control modernization program. The panel argued that NextGen funding, although more assured now that Congress has passed an FAA reauthorization bill, remains uncertain given the scope of the program. A new study by the Eno Transportation Foundation, a non-partisan think tank, says in the 1980s, modernizing the ATC system was expected to cost $12 billion and take 10 years. The reality now is that NextGen is expected to cost $40 billion and will not be completed until 2025, said Sakib Bin Salam, the Eno Fellow who authored the study. Operators are unwilling to pay for equipage until they know the certainty of the infrastructure’s deployment. Funding for NextGen, which comes for the Airports and Airways Trust Fund, is adequate for now, but it is still subject to annual congressional review, Bin Salam says. This could come under pressure as the country grapples with fiscal discipline. But the benefits of NextGen are obvious, he says. A 1% fuel savings could lead to $229 million in savings for airlines, while a 35% fuel savings would save $1.145 billion per year. Delays and congestion would also be reduced, resulting in further savings, Bin Salam says. Given these benefits, funding NextGen should be a priority, yet it is not, says Jeffrey Shane, partner at Hogan Lovells and former undersecretary for policy at the U.S. Transportation Department «It is important that we quantify the benefits,» he says. Funding for the program comes from ticket taxes, which are a percentage of fares. With fares falling in real dollars, taxes are lower. «It’s not surprising that we have the capital we need for NextGen.» Selling NextGen to lawmakers and the public is a challenge, says Sharon Pinkerton, Airlines for America VP-government affairs. «We need to tie the services to the benefits and costs.» Ensuring that NextGen has a stable source of funding will go a long way toward convincing carriers and general aviation operators to invest in the necessary equipage, she says. It is not just the message that is lacking, but the political leadership to make this program a priority, former Transportation Secretary Norman Mineta argued forcefully. Infrastructure investment are vital to keeping the country’s economy strong. «It is really frustrating and I am corked off by the lack of political leadership to get this moving,» Mineta said. «I’m afraid that in 15 years we’ll be standing around with our shorts around our ankles, wondering ?what happened?’»

Plan: The United States federal government should fully fund the transportation infrastructure components of the Next Generation Air Transportation System in the United States.

Advantage 1: Economy

Economy is faltering – it’s headed toward another recession

Constable July 7

(2012, Simon Constable, columnist at Dow Jones Newswires and business journalist, “The Threat from a Recession,” Barron’s, http://online.barrons.com/article/SB50001424053111904317504577496670432140932.html?mod=BOL\_twm\_mw#text.print)

Fresh data show the U.S. economy is weakening. The economy added a paltry 80,000 jobs in June, not enough to keep up with population growth. Earlier last week, we learned the manufacturing sector contracted in June for the first time since July 2009. Other indicators have been equally uninspiring. Why does this matter to commodities? The raw-materials sector tends to get hit harder than the rest of the economy in a recession. The Economic Cycle Research Institute, which claims a perfect recession-forecasting record, says an economic contraction is imminent. "We have not seen a slowdown where year-over-year payroll job growth has dropped this low without a recession," ECRI states in a May report.

**We improve the economy.**

**1st internal link: jobs.**

NextGen generates recovery through jobs and business efficiency

Calio 11

[Nicholas Calio, President and CEO of the Air Transport Association of America, 2/9/11, “Aviation infrastructure is vital to winning the future,” http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/technology/143033-aviation-infrastructure-is-vital-to-winning-the-future]

With broad consensus in the business community and organized labor that Congress should work with the president to improve the nation’s aging infrastructure, it is timely for bipartisan actions that support strategic investments to grow the economy. With deficit reduction a national priority, investing in infrastructure is not at cross purposes with cleaning up the nation’s finances. In fact, they go hand-in-hand. Making real progress on the deficit requires that we spark economic growth that drives job creation and generates additional tax revenue. It is essential that key infrastructure projects receive funding now so that industries like commercial aviation that enable businesses to grow can contribute more to the economic recovery. Providing the funding to accelerate implementation of modern air traffic infrastructure should be a top priority in the 112th Congress. The antiquated, ground-based system in place today is a major drag on productivity. As Ben Franklin famously proclaimed, time is money. Unfortunately, the nation has been losing both for years because our archaic air traffic control system has been unable to meet the demands placed upon it – let alone the demands of the future. According to a recent study commissioned by the FAA, flight delays cost the U.S. $31 billion in 2007. With a satellite-based system, airline efficiency will increase and flight delays will be minimized. Safety and customer satisfaction will improve and businesses - large and small - will reap the benefits of greater efficiency and be better positioned to create jobs. Commercial aviation already provides key connections that make the economy grow. The industry contributes $1.2 trillion to the economy, is responsible for 5.2 percent of the nation’s GDP and supports nearly 11 million jobs. A fully operational, NextGen air traffic management system will unleash the true economic power of commercial aviation and benefit every industry in this country. Conservative estimates predict that implementation of this system will lead to the creation of more than 150,000 jobs. In reality, the economic impact of this investment in modern infrastructure will be exponentially bigger. The sky is the limit for what this industry can contribute to the economy. Now it is up to our leaders in Washington to provide airlines with the infrastructure needed to compete successfully and support the U.S. in our national ambition to win

**2nd Internal Link: Congestion**

NextGen ends airport congestion – boosting America’s economy

Schank 6/23

[Joshua L. Schank, President and CEO Eno Center for Transportation, 6/23/12, http://www.enotrans.org/eno-brief/the-federal-role-in-transportation-four-ideas-for-greater-federal-involvement]

We often think of airports as local economic generators, and they are that, but some also have substantial national importance. The aviation network is dependent on large hub airports for the efficient and timely movement of passengers across the country and the world. A safe and reliable aviation network is essential for maintaining our competitiveness in the global economy. Unfortunately, we are in danger of losing our edge in this area because of congestion. Successful NextGen implementation could greatly alleviate the problem, but even if that happens airlines could take advantage of the new capacity and provide more frequent flights. Once economic growth picks up again we are likely to see airport congestion and delays increase as well. Airports such as Newark, San Francisco, and Chicago O’Hare already have approximately 30-40 percent of their flights delayed. Airports face substantial challenges in trying to tackle this issue on their own. The most widely recommended solution is pricing airport runways by time of day. But this politically unpopular solution has faced substantial opposition from communities such as smaller cities flying into hubs, or general aviation aircraft that are concerned about being effectively priced out of the market for a given airport. Congested airports would have a much greater chance of success if they were trying to tackle congestion in partnership with the federal government and other local transportation agencies. The federal role could be improved by dedicating a portion of the Airport Improvement Program (AIP) to provide grants to airports in regions that have a plan to work collaboratively to reduce congestion and overcome some of the political barriers to more effective pricing. Or the AIP could be retooled to set specific performance goals for airports and rewarding achievement. However it is done, there is a clear national interest at play here and the federal government needs to be more involved.

NextGen improves airplanes, airports, and their net-centricity

Joint Planning and Development Office, 7

[Joint Planning and Development Office, “Concept of Operations for the Next Generation Air Transportation System,” 2/28/07, http://www.jpdo.gov/library/nextgenconopsv12.pdf]

These transformations fundamentally change the approach to air transportation operations in 38 2025. Capacity and efficiency are increased with the transformation from clearance-based 39 operations to trajectory-based operations (TBO), as required by demand and complexity. 40 Advancements in aircraft capabilities allow for reduced separation and support the transition 41 from rules-based operations to performance-based operations. Controller workload is no longer a 42 limiting factor because of tools and automation, which provide expanded information and 43 improved decision-making capabilities. In addition, the transition of separation responsibility 44 from the controller to the flight crew in some areas allows controllers to focus on overall flow 45 management instead of individual flight management. Increased levels of service and dynamic 46 resource management will enable the NextGen to meet demand rather than constrain demand to 47 meet available resources. 48 Airports are the nexus of many of the NextGen transformation elements, including air traffic 49 management (ATM), security, and environmental goals. Accordingly, the sustainability and 50 advancement of the airport system is critical to the growth of the nation’s air transportation 51 system. Airports form a diverse system that serves many aviation operators and communities 52 with different needs. Airport operators include a mix of private and local government/public 53 entities that are responsible for aligning their activities with NextGen goals. New technology and 54 procedures will improve access to airports, enabling better utilization of existing infrastructure 55 and currently underutilized airports. The sustainability of existing airports will be enhanced with 56 a preservation program to enhance community support and protect against encroachment of 57 incompatible land uses and impacts to airport protection surfaces. Finally, new airport 58 infrastructure will be developed using a comprehensive planning architecture that integrates 59 facility planning, finance, regional system planning, and environmental activities to enable a 60 more efficient, flexible, and responsive system that is balanced with NextGen goals. 61 At the heart of the NextGen concept is the information-sharing component known as net-centric 62 infrastructure services or net-centricity. Its features allow the NextGen to adapt to growth in 63 operations as well as shifts in demand, making NextGen a scalable system. Net-centricity also 64 provides the foundation for robust, efficient, secure, and timely transport of information to a 65 broad community of users and individual subscribers. This results in a system that minimizes 66 duplication, achieves integration, and facilitates the concepts of distributed decisionmaking by 67 ensuring that all decision elements have exactly the same information upon which to base a 68 decision, independent of when or where the decision is made. The net-centricity component 69 binds NextGen operational and enterprise services together, thereby creating a cohesive link. 70 Enterprise services provide users with a common picture of operational information necessary to 71 perform required functions. The suite of enterprise services includes shared situational awareness 72 (SSA), security, environment, and safety. 73 SSA services offer a suite of tools and information designed to provide NextGen participants 74 with real-time aeronautical and geospatial information that is communicated and interpreted 75 between machines without the need for human intervention. A reliable, common weather picture 76 provides data and automatic updates to a wide range of users, aiding optimal air transportation 77 decision-making. PNT services reduce dependence on costly ground-based navigation aids 78 (NAVAID) by providing users with current location and any corrections, such as course, 79 orientation, and speed, that are necessary to achieve the desired destination. Real-time air 80 situational awareness is provided by integrating cooperative and noncooperative surveillance 81 data from all air vehicles.

**3rd Internal Link: Accidents**

NextGen improves aviation safety

Joint Planning and Development Office 7

[Joint Planning and Development Office, “Concept of Operations for the Next Generation Air Transportation System,” 2/28/07, http://www.jpdo.gov/library/nextgenconopsv12.pdf]

Aviation safety is steadily improved to accommodate the anticipated growth in air traffic while 97 the number of accidents is decreased through an integrated Safety Management System (SMS). 98 A national safety aviation policy is established and formalizes safety requirements for all 99 NextGen participants. The safety improvement culture is encouraged by management and 100 utilizes nonreprisal reporting systems. Safety assurance focuses on a holistic view of operators’ 101 processes and procedures rather than the individual pieces of the system. Modeling, simulation, 102 data analysis, and data sharing are utilized in prognostic assessments to improve safety risk 103 management. 104 Data from the above services are used to provide real-time system-level risk assessments and 105 operational impact reviews to evaluate the performance, system safety, and security of NextGen 106 via the performance management service. Real-time, onboard data are monitored and shared to 107 evaluate and manage individual aircraft risk. Safety compliance is monitored through network- 108 enabled data gathering, which collects interaircraft and pilot-to-pilot performance data. This 109 enhanced monitoring of operational characteristics facilitates the integration of “instantaneous” 110 system performance metrics into system management decisions.

NextGen solves weather disruptions

Stough 7

[Paul Stough, Senior research engineer in the Aviation Operations and Evaluation Branch at the

NASA Langley Research Center, “AIRCRAFT WEATHER MITIGATION FOR THE NEXT GENERATION AIR TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM,” http://ntrs.nasa.gov/archive/nasa/casi.ntrs.nasa.gov/20070006538\_2007005339.pdf]

In the U.S., a Next Generation Air Transportation System is envisioned that can handle up to three times the current level of operations. A key to achieving this level of operations is minimizing the disruptions due to adverse weather. In addition to improvements in weather observing systems, forecasts, communications, and information integration, there is a desire for aircraft to operate in more demanding environments and even worse weather conditions than are currently possible, so as to enable further increases in the efficiency and capacity of the air transportation system. Needs have been identified to improve aircraft and their systems to counter the effects of turbulence, ice, wake vortices, obstructions to visibility, space weather, and atmospheric particulates. The solution is seen as an integrated system of observations, forecasts, information integration and dissemination, and aircraft enhancements that provide the greatest overall operational benefit for the least cost.

Accidents negatively affect the aviation industry

Bosch, Eckard, and Singal 98

[Jean-Claude Bosch, Associate Professor of Finance at the University of Colorado, E. Woodrow Eckard, Professor of Economics at the University of Colorado, Vijay Singal, Professor of Finance at Virginia Tech, “THE COMPETITIVE IMPACT OF AIR CRASHES: STOCK MARKET EVIDENCE,\*” 1998, http://www.finance.pamplin.vt.edu/faculty/vs/pdfs/JLE1998.pdf]

Our central hypothesis is that the product market reacts to air crashes either by consumer switching and/or negative spillovers. We expect the switching effect to be stronger the greater the overlap with the crash airline. We therefore first report difference-between-means tests for non-crash airline sub-samples with above and below mean market overlap (PCTLAP, see Section IV), as shown in Table 4.27 An economically and statistically significant difference of about 1.2 percent exists between the high and low PCTLAP sub-samples over the (0,2) event window. Non-crash airlines with little market overlap lose value while close rivals on average experience slight gains. The last step in our analysis is a regression of individual non-crash airline abnormal returns on the overlap index PCTLAP. The constant term in the regression allows us to simultaneously test the negative spillover hypothesis that implies a negative abnormal return absent a switching effect (zero market overlap). We also incorporate a dummy variable TWA96 that equals one for non-crash airlines at the 1996 “crash” (mid- air explosion) of TWA flight 800. The exceptionally large negative abnormal returns for the non-crash airlines (see regression results below and Table 1) may be caused by the initial reports of a possible surface-to-air missile attack.28 This suggests a new safety threat to all airlines beyond the control of present air security measures, that is, a large negative externality. Because our dependent variables are estimated with error, heteroscedasticity may be present. We therefore report weighted least squares 12 regressions where the weights are the inverse of the standard errors of the individual abnormal returns. This procedure assigns a greater weight to more precisely estimated returns, thereby increasing parameter estimation efficiency. The results are summarized in Table 5.29 First, PCTLAP is positive and statistically significant at the 10 percent level or better, supporting the switching hypothesis, and consistent with the means-tests of Table 4. Second, the constant term is negative in all equations. While it is not significant in the AR(0) equation, it approaches significance at the 10 percent level in the CAR(0,1) regression (t = 1.57), and is significant at better than the 1 percent level in the CAR(0,2) regression (t = 3.27). This suggests a negative spillover emerging on days 1 and 2, as additional information appears and the crash is given wider publicity. 30 For the CAR(0,2) equation, the switching effect offsets the externality (constant term) at PCTLAP = 73 percent; that is, rival airlines with higher overlap are forecast to gain because of the crash. Last, the TWA96 dummy is highly significant both economically and statistically, suggesting a special externality associated with this crash, reaching -6.54 percent for the (0,2) event window. Two observations regarding the spillover effect are in order. First, the crash airlines suffer from this in addition to switching, which also affects them negatively. This implies that the crash airline CARs of Table 2 should be greater in magnitude (more negative) than the corresponding constant terms of Table 5, which is indeed the case. Second, Jarrell and Peltzman31 on drug recalls and Mitchell32 on the Tylenol poisonings each report larger industry-wide effects, about -1.2 percent and -6.8 percent, respectively. Since they do not isolate switching effects, they do not measure a "pure" 13 spillover. Hence, an appropriate comparison is with our non-crash airline CAR(0,2) of - 0.48 percent in Table 3. The lower industry-wide impact for airlines may reflect the industry's overall excellent safety record.33 VII. CONCLUSIONS Previous work established that financial markets react to air crashes by reducing the market value of the crash airline, but did not establish the causal mechanism. We investigate whether a product market reaction is at work, in which consumers respond to crashes by switching to rival airlines and/or simply flying less. We find a positive relation between non-crash airline stock reactions and the degree of market overlap with the crash airline, supporting a switching effect despite likely mitigating strategies by the crash airline. This is consistent with the “brand name” effect observed by Mitchell and Maloney.34 We also find that non-crash airlines with little market overlap lose value, that is, a negative spillover exists. Previous studies finding little or no reaction may have been observing the net impact of these offsetting effects. Our results have public policy implications. The crash airline suffers significant financial losses from a crash, which appear to be related to consumer switching. While this suggests a traditional market incentive to "supply" safety, it can only apply to safety related factors under each airline's control. The evidence we find of a negative spillover suggests that consumers and/or insurers may be concerned about other elements of the commercial air travel system that are involved in the joint production of air safety. Perhaps regulatory concerns should be redirected from individual airlines toward system elements where market incentives are weak or absent.

The U.S. aviation industry is key to the economy

**Trupo 6/21**

Mary Trupo,  International Trade Administration's Director of the Office of Public Affairs, International Trade Administration, “Aerospace Industry is Critical Contributor to U.S. Economy According to Obama Trade Official at Paris Air Show,” 6/21/12.

PARIS – Francisco Sánchez, Under Secretary of Commerce for International Trade, addressed national and international groups at the 2011 Paris Air Show to reinforce the President’s National Export Initiative (NEI) and support the U.S. aerospace industry.

“The U.S. aerospace industry is a strategic contributor to the economy, national security, and technological innovation of the United States,” Sánchez said. “The industry is key to achieving the President’s goals of doubling exports by the end of 2014 and contributed $78 billion in export sales to the U.S. economy in 2010.” During the U.S. Pavilion opening remarks, Sánchez noted that the aerospace sector in the United States supports more jobs through exports than any other industry. Sánchez witnessed a signing ceremony between Boeing and Aeroflot, Russia’s state-owned airline. Aeroflot has ordered eight 777s valued at $2.1 billion, and the sales will support approximately 14,000 jobs. “The 218 American companies represented in the U.S. International Pavilion demonstrate the innovation and hard work that make us leaders in this sector,” said Sánchez. “I am particularly pleased to see the incredible accomplishments of U.S. companies participating in the Alternative Aviation Fuels Showcase, which demonstrates our leadership in this important sector and shows that we are on the right path to achieving the clean energy future envisioned by President Obama.” The 2011 Paris Air Show is the world’s largest aerospace trade exhibition, and features 2,000 exhibitors, 340,000 visitors, and 200 international delegations. The U.S. aerospace industry ranks among the most competitive in the world, boasting a positive trade balance of $44.1 billion – the largest trade surplus of any U.S. manufacturing industry. It directly sustains about 430,000 jobs, and indirectly supports more than 700,000 additional jobs. Ninety-one percent of U.S. exporters of aerospace products are small and medium-sized firms.

Economic Collapse causes Global War

**Mead 9**

[Walter Russel Mead Senior Fellowin U.S. Foreign Policy at the Council on Foreign Relations, 2009, http://www.tnr.com/politics/story.html?id=571cbbb9-2887-4d81-8542-92e83915f5f8&p=2]

None of which means that we can just sit back and enjoy the recession. History may suggest that financial crises actually help capitalist great powers maintain their leads--but it has other, less reassuring messages as well. If financial crises have been a normal part of life during the 300-year rise of the liberal capitalist system under the Anglophone powers, so has war. The wars of the League of Augsburg and the Spanish Succession; the Seven Years War; the American Revolution; the Napoleonic Wars; the two World Wars; the cold war: The list of wars is almost as long as the list of financial crises. Bad economic times can breed wars. Europe was a pretty peaceful place in 1928, but the Depression poisoned German public opinion and helped bring Adolf Hitler to power. If the current crisis turns into a depression, what rough beasts might start slouching toward Moscow, Karachi, Beijing, or New Delhi to be born? The United States may not, yet, decline, but, if we can't get the world economy back on track, we may still have to fight.

And, economic decline leads to war — unstable governments use external conflict as a distraction

Royal 10

Jedidiah Royal, Director of Cooperative Threat Reduction at the U.S. Department of Defense, M.Phil. Candidate at the University of New South Wales, 2010 (“Economic Integration, Economic Signalling and the Problem of Economic Crises,” *Economics of War and Peace: Economic, Legal and Political Perspectives*, Edited by Ben Goldsmith and Jurgen Brauer, Published by Emerald Group Publishing, ISBN 0857240048, p. 213-215)

Less intuitive is how periods of economic decline may increase the likelihood of external conflict. Political science literature has contributed a moderate degree of attention to the impact of economic decline and the security and defence behaviour of interdependent states. Research in this vein has been considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow. First, on the systemic level, Pollins (2008) advances Modelski and Thompson's (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, finding that rhythms in the global economy are associated with the rise and fall of a pre-eminent power and the often bloody transition from one pre-eminent leader to the next. As such, exogenous shocks such as economic crises could usher in a redistribution of relative power (see also Gilpin. 1981) that leads to uncertainty about power balances, increasing the risk of miscalculation (Feaver, 1995). Alternatively, even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflict as a rising power may seek to challenge a declining power (Werner. 1999). Separately, Pollins (1996) also shows that global economic cycles combined with parallel leadership cycles impact the likelihood of conflict among major, medium and small powers, although he suggests that the causes and connections between global economic conditions and security conditions remain unknown. Second, on a dyadic level, Copeland's (1996, 2000) theory of trade expectations suggests that 'future expectation of trade' is a significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behaviour of states. He argues that interdependent states are likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations. However, if the expectations of future trade decline, particularly for difficult [end page 213] to replace items such as energy resources, the likelihood for conflict increases, as states will be inclined to use force to gain access to those resources. Crises could potentially be the trigger for decreased trade expectations either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states.4 Third, others have considered the link between economic decline and external armed conflict at a national level. Blomberg and Hess (2002) find a strong correlation between internal conflict and external conflict, particularly during periods of economic downturn. They write, The linkages between internal and external conflict and prosperity are strong and mutually reinforcing. Economic conflict tends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn returns the favour. Moreover, the presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which international and external conflicts self-reinforce each other. (Blomberg & Hess, 2002. p. 89) Economic decline has also been linked with an increase in the likelihood of terrorism (Blomberg, Hess, & Weerapana, 2004), which has the capacity to spill across borders and lead to external tensions. Furthermore, crises generally reduce the popularity of a sitting government. “Diversionary theory" suggests that, when facing unpopularity arising from economic decline, sitting governments have increased incentives to fabricate external military conflicts to create a 'rally around the flag' effect. Wang (1996), DeRouen (1995). and Blomberg, Hess, and Thacker (2006) find supporting evidence showing that economic decline and use of force are at least indirectly correlated. Gelpi (1997), Miller (1999), and Kisangani and Pickering (2009) suggest that the tendency towards diversionary tactics are greater for democratic states than autocratic states, due to the fact that democratic leaders are generally more susceptible to being removed from office due to lack of domestic support. DeRouen (2000) has provided evidence showing that periods of weak economic performance in the United States, and thus weak Presidential popularity, are statistically linked to an increase in the use of force. In summary, recent economic scholarship positively correlates economic integration with an increase in the frequency of economic crises, whereas political science scholarship links economic decline with external conflict at systemic, dyadic and national levels.5 This implied connection between integration, crises and armed conflict has not featured prominently in the economic-security debate and deserves more attention. This observation is not contradictory to other perspectives that link economic interdependence with a decrease in the likelihood of external conflict, such as those mentioned in the first paragraph of this chapter. [end page 214] Those studies tend to focus on dyadic interdependence instead of global interdependence and do not specifically consider the occurrence of and conditions created by economic crises. As such, the view presented here should be considered ancillary to those views.

# Advantage 2: Terrorism

**Scenario 1: National Attacks**

Aviation terrorism empirically sparked massive retaliations — and critical threats remain today

Brandt 11

[Ben Brandt, Director at Lime, a political risk consultancy based in the United Arab Emirates, ex-threat analyst for a major U.S. airline and New Jersey Office of Homeland Security and Preparedness, “Terrorist Threats to Commercial Aviation: A Contemporary Assessment,” Combating Terrorism Center at West Point, 11/30/11, http://www.ctc.usma.edu/posts/terrorist-threats-to-commercial-aviation-a-contemporary-assessment]

Ten years ago, al-Qa`ida utilized four U.S. commercial airliners to destroy the World Trade Center’s towers, damage the Pentagon, and kill close to 3,000 people. This attack spurred the United States to convert its counterterrorism efforts into a sustained war on terrorism, resulting in the invasion of Afghanistan and Iraq, the capture or killing of hundreds of al-Qa`ida members, and the eventual death of al-Qa`ida chief Usama bin Ladin. There has been extensive reflection in recent months regarding the implications of Bin Ladin’s death and the Arab Spring to al-Qa`ida and its affiliated groups. Two critical issues, however, have been partially sidelined as a result. How has the terrorist threat to commercial aviation evolved since the events of 9/11? How have actions by the U.S. and other governments worked to mitigate this threat? This article offers a thorough review of recent aviation-related terrorist plots, subsequent mitigation strategies, and current terrorist intentions and capabilities dealing with commercial aviation. It concludes by offering three steps security experts can take to reduce the terrorist threat to commercial aviation. Aviation-Related Plots Since 9/11 and the Regulatory Response A number of al-Qa`ida-affiliated plots sought to target commercial aviation since 9/11. A sampling of these include the “shoe bomber” plot in December 2001, an attempt to shoot down an Israeli airliner in Kenya in 2002, the liquid explosives plot against transatlantic flights in 2006, the Christmas Day plot in 2009, and the cargo bomb plots in 2010. Other prominent operations attempted or executed by Islamist extremists during this period include a 2002 plot to hijack an airliner and crash it into Changi International Airport in Singapore, the 2002 El Al ticket counter shootings at Los Angeles International Airport, the 2004 bombings of two Russian airliners, the 2007 Glasgow airport attack, a 2007 plot against Frankfurt Airport by the Sauerland cell, a 2007 attempt by extremists to target fuel lines at JFK International Airport in New York, the 2011 suicide bombing at Moscow’s Domodedovo International Airport, and the 2011 shootings of U.S. military personnel at Frankfurt International Airport. In response to these incidents, the U.S. government and many other countries have dramatically increased aviation security measures to prevent or deter future attacks. Many of these measures are well known to the public, including: the hardening of cockpit doors; federalization of airport security screening staff and the creation of the Transportation Security Administration (TSA); deployment of federal air marshals (FAMs) and federal flight deck officers (FFDOs) aboard aircraft; implementation of new detection equipment and methods, such as advanced imaging technology (AIT), often referred to as “body scanners”; increased amounts of screening for cargo; explosive trace detection (ETD), full body “patdowns,” and behavioral detection officers (BDOs); enhanced scrutiny for visa applicants wanting to travel to the United States; and the use of watch lists to screen for terrorists to prevent them from boarding flights or from gaining employment in airports or airlines. Certain measures—such as invasive patdowns, AIT scanning, inducing passengers to remove jackets, belts, and shoes for inspection, and requiring them to travel with minimal amounts of liquid in their possession—have drawn widespread complaints regarding their inconvenience, as well as questions about their supposed efficacy. The reactive nature of many such measures has been widely noted as well, with some security practices designed to counter highly specific attack techniques utilized in past terrorist plots. Al-Qa`ida in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP) sarcastically commented on this tendency in its online magazine Inspire, rhetorically asking the U.S. government whether it thought the group had no other way to conceal explosives after the TSA prohibited passengers from carrying printer cartridges. Current Threats to Aviation Despite the strenuous efforts by governments to harden commercial aviation in the post-9/11 era, the number of plots illustrates that al-Qa`ida core, its affiliates, and numerous other Islamist extremist groups and self-radicalized individuals maintain a high level of interest in attacking aviation. Despite the organizational disruptions caused by the deaths of numerous senior al-Qa`ida leaders in 2011, and the current preoccupation of several al-Qa`ida affiliates with local conflicts, this ongoing interest in attacking aviation is unlikely to dissipate in the long-term. Furthermore, the evolving tactics utilized in these various plots lend weight to AQAP’s contention that government regulators suffer from a lack of imagination in anticipating and mitigating emergent and existing threats. As indicated by numerous accounts, including the description of the cargo plot contained in Inspire, terrorists constantly seek to analyze existing aviation security measures to probe for weaknesses and develop countermeasures. Terrorists’ ongoing efforts to study and defeat security are further exemplified by the arrest of Rajib Karim, a former information technology employee at British Airways; prior to his arrest, Karim maintained an ongoing dialogue with AQAP operative Anwar al-`Awlaqi and attempted to provide al-`Awlaqi with information on aviation security procedures.[1] Therefore, despite government efforts to improve aviation security, a number of critical tactical threats remain.

NextGen prevents and mitigates aviation attacks

Joint Planning and Development Office, 4

[“Next Generation Air Transportation System: Integrated Plan,” Department of Transportation, 2004, http://www.jpdo.aero/pdf/NGATS\_v1\_1204r.pdf]

The system is already showing signs of stress and it is clear that projected demand will soon surpass the system’s capacity. The U.S. aviation system must transform itself and be more responsive to the tremendous social, economic, political, and technological changes that are evolving worldwide. We are entering a critical era in air transportation, in which we must either find better, proactive ways to work together or suffer the consequences of reacting to the forces of change. The consequence of a do- nothing approach to this public policy problem is staggering. As the Commission on the Future of the United States Aerospace Industry noted, consumers stand to lose $30B annually due to people and products not reaching their destinations within the time periods we expect today. We are nearing a time when we will have to develop a new approach to air transportation. The current approach – ground based radars tracking congested flyways and passing information from control center to control center on the ground throughout the flight of an aircraft – is becoming operationally obsolete. The density of air traffic is making the current system increasingly inefficient. Bottlenecks are showing up now, and large increases in air traffic will cause mounting delays and increased need for structuring or limiting service in many parts of the nation. Driven by the increasing pace of change, the old evolving approach is insufficient for system modernization. In terms of improving the system over the next 25 years, it is clear that business as usual will not succeed.1 Technology is giving us opportunities for an entirely new approach—one that utilizes modern communication techniques, advanced computers, precision plotting through GPS and modern computer-based decision assistance programs. This new approach to air navigation could open up the sky to much greater and more efficient utilization of airspace. It also holds great promise for improved aviation security. For example, this system opens the possibility for automated protection zones around critical infrastructure sites, where computers would take control of an unauthorized aircraft approaching a critical facility and divert it to land at a nearby airfield where security personnel can take control of the situation.

NextGen protects America from terrorist attacks

Joint Planning and Development Office, 4

[“Next Generation Air Transportation System: Integrated Plan,” Department of Transportation, 2004, http://www.jpdo.aero/pdf/NGATS\_v1\_1204r.pdf]

In light of the continuing threat of terrorism, new defense tactics and technologies must be put in place without compromising efficiency. These measures must address a wider range of threats, while at the same time lowering the cost and impact of these measures on pilots and the traveling public. Growth in air travel and air cargo will challenge our ability to manage security risks while ensuring efficiency of operations. The advent of increased operations at thousands of small airports will increase ease of access to the system and the difficulty of securing it. Similarly, UAVs will be used to aid security monitoring, but could also create a new threat as they become more widely available to commercial users. An integrated, multi-layered security approach for air transportation will help ensure the security of U.S. borders and airspace and minimize risks associated with an expanding range of potential security threats. Effective, seamless countering of these terrorist threats and mitigating their risk will demand the full cooperation and partnership of all air transportation stakeholders. Additionally, security measures will benefit from consolidated threat information and workforce response to protect the system itself from hostile actions without limiting personal liberty. Future air transportation screening and detection systems will enable positive identification of travelers while minimizing unauthorized access. Baggage and cargo screening systems will not only reveal explosives and weapons, but will also detect chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear threats. The future system will be highly resistant to disruptions, incidents, and false positive alarms. Therefore, in spite of increases in demand for the air transportation system, security systems will process travelers, baggage, and cargo with greater speed, accuracy, and efficiency.

NextGen will integrate with Europe’s aviation systems

EUROPEAN COMMISSION 2011 [4/2, In Brussels“a Memorandum of Cooperation between the European Union and the United States of America in civil aviation research and development”

http://eur-lex.europa.eu/Notice.do?mode=dbl&lang=en&ihmlang=en&lng1=en,en&lng2=bg,cs,da,de,el,en,es,et,fi,fr,hu,it,lt,lv,mt,nl,pl,pt,ro,sk,sl,sv,&val=556632:cs&page=]

In the USA, the FAA has also launched an ATM modernization programme, known as NextGen. Considering the parallelism of SESAR and NextGen, the European airspace users have raised a strong requirement to secure interoperability between SESAR and NextGen to ensure safe and seamless operations worldwide, to increase market opportunities for the European industry and to avoid costly duplication of equipment on board aircrafts. US companies already have access to European research and development programmes such as SESAR. It is therefore, essential to guarantee reciprocal opportunities for European industry. The Commission considers that strengthening technical and operational cooperation with the FAA is an urgent and necessary action for the civil aviation sector in general. In fact, more efficient and sustainable air transport systems can be better achieved through a holistic approach addressing all aspects of civil aviation. This motivated the Commission to recommend the extension of the scope of the cooperation framework to the broader civil aviation domain. The proposed Memorandum of Cooperation with the USA provides a sound and legally binding basis for establishing cooperative research and development activities, while duly addressing sensitive issues such as liability, Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) and reciprocity. In addition, the Memorandum has the potential to set the international standards in aviation providing a worldwide interoperability in response to aviation stakeholders' expectations and providing the European industry with wider market opportunities. 1.3. Existing provisions in the area of the proposal The European Commission and the FAA initially signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) on 18 July 2006 establishing a framework for cooperation to contribute to more global ATM by facilitating joint global operations. The MoU was updated on 17 March 2009 to take into account the SJU's key role in the technical cooperation with the FAA under the authority of the European Commission. However, because of its declarative nature, the MoU does not provide the required legally binding framework to adequately address liability, intellectual property rights and reciprocity issues. The proposed Memorandum of Cooperation, and in particular its Annex on SESAR-NextGEN interoperability, will replace the existing MoU. 1.4. Consistency with the other policies and objectives of the Union The proposed Memorandum of Cooperation will contribute to achieve the objectives of the SES policy as it supports the SESAR programme, its technological pillar. The timely development and deployment of new ATM technologies and procedures will, in fact, boost Europe's innovation capacity and the competitiveness of its industry worldwide allowing the EU to have a strong voice in standardisation bodies. The draft Memorandum will stimulate the technical and operational cooperation between the parties through the provision of a clear legal framework. Such a stimulus is in line with the research policy of the EU and will contribute to the achievement of 7th Framework Programme. 2. CONSULTATION OF INTERESTED PARTIES AND IMPACT ASSESSMENT 2.1. Consultation of interested parties The aviation industry supports the perspectives offered by a binding Memorandum of Cooperation between the EU and the USA. The European industry expects that through the implementation of reciprocity principles underlying the Memorandum, it will be able to take advantage of comparable opportunities to engage in cooperative activities with the USA on the basis of transparency, mutual benefits, equitable and fair treatment.

Aviation cooperation unites U.S., European, and Russian systems against airborne terrorism

Loukianova , Research Associate at the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies, 11

Anya Loukianova , Research Associate at the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies, graduate assistant at the Center for International and Security Studies at Maryland, 5-11, [“Cooperative Airspace Security in the Euro-Atlantic Region ,” CISSM Working Paper, www.cissm.umd.edu/papers/display.php?id=547]

This paper offers an overview of existing arrangements and provides a discussion of policy challenges involved in constructing a regional Euro‐Atlantic capability to jointly monitor and counter common airspace threats through the networking of military and civil air traffic control systems.i It argues that a strengthened political, financial, and technical commitment to build a cooperative airspace security system is a “win‐win” area for NATO‐ Russian engagement that would promote regional military transparency, deepen cooperation against airborne terrorism, and enhance regional crisis stability. Deeper and broader regional airspace security arrangements would also foster the culture of cooperation, transparency, and confidence built between all Euro‐Atlantic states—large and small—through practical civil‐military cooperation. In a May 2010 op‐ed, U.S. Vice President Joseph Biden wrote of the “vital” need to “adapt” Euro‐Atlantic security institutions “to the challenges—and opportunities—of a new era.”1 He noted the importance of “reciprocal transparency” of military forces, called for improved cooperative means to deal with “external challenges,” argued for more “effective conflict‐prevention, conflict‐management, and crisis‐resolution” mechanisms to enhance stability, and reaffirmed the importance of territorial integrity and the indivisibility of regional security. “We seek an open and increasingly united Europe in which all countries, including Russia, play their full roles,” Biden stated.2 A careful examination of “bottom‐up” cooperative opportunities in airspace security in line with this vision is in order at a time when policy makers in Washington, Brussels, and Moscow seek to design and agree on a common capability to defend the Euro‐Atlantic against missile threats.3 Toward this end, an expansion of ongoing cooperative airspace security projects is a cost‐effective and technically feasible undertaking that could promote both agreement and action on the rules of engagement, as well as on the sharing of information, technology, and costs in regional missile defense that involves Russia.

Terrorist attacks tank the economy

Balvanyos 5

[Tunde Balvanyos, Post-doctoral research engineer at the University of California Berkeley based Partners for Advanced Transit and Highways research institute, “The Economic Implications of Terrorist Attack on Commercial Aviation in the USA,” Homeland Security Center, Create Research Archive, 9/4/05, http://research.create.usc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1162&context=nonpublished\_reports]

In addition to the airlines, other businesses would suffer losses. Even short disruption in cargo delivery could result in significant economic losses due to perishable goods and because of the time-sensitive nature of many air shipments. In our air transportation dependent economy, even short airport closures can cause major disruptions in just-in-time delivery businesses. Airport businesses, such as terminal shops and in-flight services would have to close immediately and could not reopen until the airport is reopened. Until the airport reopens, even postal services would be affected. DRAFT 24 ￼￼￼Hotels, taxi cabs and rent-a-car businesses would experience a short-term gain due to stranded passengers. However, once these passengers are gone, these industries suffer continuing losses until travel demand returns to pre attack levels. Short run reduction in stock market wealth As a result of the attack on 9/11 the US stock market closed between September 10 and 21. The NYSE and the NASDAQ indexes suffered double digit drops. Other markets around the world also suffered losses. In case of an attack on commercial aircraft, the US stock market need not close down. However, it is likely that the markets would suffer losses. We accept the stock markets response to a natural crash as a lower bound to the loss. However, it is hard to establish an upper bound. It is reasonable to assume that the markets would react stronger to another attack on a commercial aircraft than to a natural crash. Psychological impact of terrorism Navarro and Spencer use contingency valuation to think about how much people would be willing to pay for eliminating the terrorist threat of 9/11. We need to ask the same question as Navarro and Spencer asked: “How much would we pay to be able to fly without fear?” They estimate that if “each of the 100 million households not living in poverty would give up a mere $1000 to be able to forget” about Osama Bin Laden and the threat his personifies, the emotional damage of 9/11 would be measured at $100 billion. The terrorist attack we discuss here would be smaller then that on 9/11. It would only affect those who travel by air or whose jobs are related to the industry. If, for example, all air travelers were willing to pay 1 cent more per mile traveled to eliminate this threat, then the impact would be $6.6 billion per year. LONGER TERM MICROECONOMIC IMPACT Microeconomic impact of airport closure Airport closures can have serious economic impact on each regional economy and disrupt urban services. While there will be federal decisions, regional governments also need to understand the economic and social implications of an airport closure. In this section, we discuss the potential impacts of closure of a major airport due to a terrorist attack; the length of closure and other restrictions would be determined by the federal DRAFT 25 ￼government. Our discussion is mainly based on Chang, Ericson, and Pearce4 in their paper prepared for the Office of Critical Infrastructure Protection and Emergency Preparedness, Government of Canada.

Terrorist attacks cause panic and scapegoating through massive retaliation

Jenkins 2012 [Brian Michael, July “New Challenges to U.S. Counterterrorism Efforts” Testimony presented before the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee on July 11, 2012

http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/testimonies/2012/RAND\_CT377.pdf]

Americans have come to hold unrealistic expectations about security, believing that risk can be abolished. We are too ready to seek someone to blame when security fails. Instead of the stoicism needed for a long fight, Americans remain vulnerable to overreaction. A terrorist attack of even modest scale could provoke paroxysms of panic. Whatever one thinks about the wisdom, or the folly, of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, the sacrifices of war have been borne unequally. Our sense of community has eroded. 14 Terrorists did not create America’s anxieties. Terrorism acted as their condenser. Nor will America’s homeland be secured in the mountain passes of Afghanistan, the Arabian Peninsula, or the sands of the Sahara.

Only the federal government has the authority to enact the plan.

Court of Appeals 98

(137 F.3d 81, National Helicopter Corp. of America, Plaintiff-Appellee-Cross-Appellant, v. the CITY OF NEW YORK; The Council of the City of New York; The City Planning Commission of the City of New York; The New York City Economic Development Corporation, Defendants-Appellants-Cross-Appellees. Dockets 97-7082, 97-7142, United States Court of Appeals, Second Circuit, argued Sept. 8, 1997, decided Feb. 17, 1998, http://bulk.resource.org/courts.gov/c/F3/137/137.F3d.81.97-7142.97-7082.html)

The City claims the invasive nature of helicopter noise justifies the condition restricting sightseeing routes to the East River and the Hudson River. This argument, as the trial court recognized, evidences a misunderstanding of federal aviation law. Congress, the Supreme Court, and we have consistently stated that the law controlling flight paths through navigable airspace is completely preempted. See, e.g., Concorde I, 558 F.2d at 83 ("[L]egitimate concern for safe and efficient air transportation requires that exclusive control of airspace management be concentrated at the national level."); City of Burbank, 411 U.S. at 626-27, 93 S.Ct. at 1856-57 (recognizing the federal government's possession of exclusive national sovereignty in U.S. airspace); 49 U.S.C. § 40103(a)(1) (stating that the federal government has "exclusive sovereignty of airspace of the United States"). The proprietor exception
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International Cooperation—2ac

NextGen will integrate with Europe’s aviation systems

EUROPEAN COMMISSION 2011 [4/2, In Brussels“a Memorandum of Cooperation between the European Union and the United States of America in civil aviation research and development”

http://eur-lex.europa.eu/Notice.do?mode=dbl&lang=en&ihmlang=en&lng1=en,en&lng2=bg,cs,da,de,el,en,es,et,fi,fr,hu,it,lt,lv,mt,nl,pl,pt,ro,sk,sl,sv,&val=556632:cs&page=]

In the USA, the FAA has also launched an ATM modernization programme, known as NextGen. Considering the parallelism of SESAR and NextGen, the European airspace users have raised a strong requirement to secure interoperability between SESAR and NextGen to ensure safe and seamless operations worldwide, to increase market opportunities for the European industry and to avoid costly duplication of equipment on board aircrafts. US companies already have access to European research and development programmes such as SESAR. It is therefore, essential to guarantee reciprocal opportunities for European industry. The Commission considers that strengthening technical and operational cooperation with the FAA is an urgent and necessary action for the civil aviation sector in general. In fact, more efficient and sustainable air transport systems can be better achieved through a holistic approach addressing all aspects of civil aviation. This motivated the Commission to recommend the extension of the scope of the cooperation framework to the broader civil aviation domain. The proposed Memorandum of Cooperation with the USA provides a sound and legally binding basis for establishing cooperative research and development activities, while duly addressing sensitive issues such as liability, Intellectual Property Rights (IPR) and reciprocity. In addition, the Memorandum has the potential to set the international standards in aviation providing a worldwide interoperability in response to aviation stakeholders' expectations and providing the European industry with wider market opportunities. 1.3. Existing provisions in the area of the proposal The European Commission and the FAA initially signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) on 18 July 2006 establishing a framework for cooperation to contribute to more global ATM by facilitating joint global operations. The MoU was updated on 17 March 2009 to take into account the SJU's key role in the technical cooperation with the FAA under the authority of the European Commission. However, because of its declarative nature, the MoU does not provide the required legally binding framework to adequately address liability, intellectual property rights and reciprocity issues. The proposed Memorandum of Cooperation, and in particular its Annex on SESAR-NextGEN interoperability, will replace the existing MoU. 1.4. Consistency with the other policies and objectives of the Union The proposed Memorandum of Cooperation will contribute to achieve the objectives of the SES policy as it supports the SESAR programme, its technological pillar. The timely development and deployment of new ATM technologies and procedures will, in fact, boost Europe's innovation capacity and the competitiveness of its industry worldwide allowing the EU to have a strong voice in standardisation bodies. The draft Memorandum will stimulate the technical and operational cooperation between the parties through the provision of a clear legal framework. Such a stimulus is in line with the research policy of the EU and will contribute to the achievement of 7th Framework Programme. 2. CONSULTATION OF INTERESTED PARTIES AND IMPACT ASSESSMENT 2.1. Consultation of interested parties The aviation industry supports the perspectives offered by a binding Memorandum of Cooperation between the EU and the USA. The European industry expects that through the implementation of reciprocity principles underlying the Memorandum, it will be able to take advantage of comparable opportunities to engage in cooperative activities with the USA on the basis of transparency, mutual benefits, equitable and fair treatment.

Aviation cooperation unites U.S., European, and Russian systems against airborne terrorism

Loukianova , Research Associate at the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies, 11

Anya Loukianova , Research Associate at the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies, graduate assistant at the Center for International and Security Studies at Maryland, 5-11, [“Cooperative Airspace Security in the Euro-Atlantic Region ,” CISSM Working Paper, www.cissm.umd.edu/papers/display.php?id=547]

This paper offers an overview of existing arrangements and provides a discussion of policy challenges involved in constructing a regional Euro‐Atlantic capability to jointly monitor and counter common airspace threats through the networking of military and civil air traffic control systems.i It argues that a strengthened political, financial, and technical commitment to build a cooperative airspace security system is a “win‐win” area for NATO‐ Russian engagement that would promote regional military transparency, deepen cooperation against airborne terrorism, and enhance regional crisis stability. Deeper and broader regional airspace security arrangements would also foster the culture of cooperation, transparency, and confidence built between all Euro‐Atlantic states—large and small—through practical civil‐military cooperation. In a May 2010 op‐ed, U.S. Vice President Joseph Biden wrote of the “vital” need to “adapt” Euro‐Atlantic security institutions “to the challenges—and opportunities—of a new era.”1 He noted the importance of “reciprocal transparency” of military forces, called for improved cooperative means to deal with “external challenges,” argued for more “effective conflict‐prevention, conflict‐management, and crisis‐resolution” mechanisms to enhance stability, and reaffirmed the importance of territorial integrity and the indivisibility of regional security. “We seek an open and increasingly united Europe in which all countries, including Russia, play their full roles,” Biden stated.2 A careful examination of “bottom‐up” cooperative opportunities in airspace security in line with this vision is in order at a time when policy makers in Washington, Brussels, and Moscow seek to design and agree on a common capability to defend the Euro‐Atlantic against missile threats.3 Toward this end, an expansion of ongoing cooperative airspace security projects is a cost‐effective and technically feasible undertaking that could promote both agreement and action on the rules of engagement, as well as on the sharing of information, technology, and costs in regional missile defense that involves Russia.

International Cooperation—Inherency

NextGen budget reductions prevents harmonization with Europe’s ATM, or Air Traffic Management systems

Dillingham, Director, Physical Infrastructure Issues, 11

Gerald L. Dillingham, Director, Physical Infrastructure Issues , 10-5-11, [“FAA Has Made Some Progress in Implementation, but Delays Threaten to Impact Costs and Benefits ,” Testimony Before the Subcommittee on Aviation, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, House of Representatives, www.gao.gov/products/GAO-12-141T] E. Liu

Delays to NextGen programs, and potential reductions in the budget for NextGen activities, could delay the schedule for harmonization with Europe’s air traffic management modernization efforts and the realization of these benefits. FAA officials indicated that the need to address funding reductions takes precedence over previously agreed upon schedules, including those previously coordinated with Europe. For example, FAA officials responsible for navigation systems told us that FAA is restructuring plans for its ground-based augmentation system (GBAS) because of potential funding reductions.7 While final investment decisions concerning GBAS have yet to be made, these officials said that FAA might have to stop its work on GBAS while Europe continues its GBAS development, with the result that Europe may have an operational GBAS, while FAA does not.8 A delay in implementing GBAS would require FAA to continue using the current instrument landing system which does not provide the benefits of GBAS, according to these officials. Such a situation could again fuel stakeholder skepticism about whether FAA will follow through with its commitment to implementing NextGen, and in turn, increase airlines’ hesitancy to equip with NextGen technologies.

International Cooperation—FAA key

The FAA cooperates internationally

FAA 2012 [Federal Aviation Administration FY 2012 President’s Budget Submission,

<http://www.dot.gov/budget/2012/budgetestimates/faa.pdf>]

Introduction The FAA’s $1,237 million total request for NextGen programs and activities in Fiscal Year 2012 will continue the development and implementation of transformative improvements in how safely and efficiently we operate the National Airspace System (NAS), and in how well we fulfill our responsibilities as stewards of the environment. This request consists of $1,037 million in discretionary spending plus an additional $200 million in mandatory spending from the President's $50 billion infrastructure initiative. This funding is needed to support the continuing effort that began in previous years. NextGen is not a single program. It encompasses many programs, systems, and procedures, at different levels of maturity. Some are being deployed now, some are in development and nearing deployment, and still more are being defined as the technology necessary for them becomes available-all are being coordinated to complement each other. As the number of international passengers and aviation activities across the globe increase every year, it becomes even more important for the United States to continue to be the gold standard for aviation safety. To make this happen, the FAA actively builds partnerships and shares knowledge to create a safe, seamless and efficient global aviation system. Our premise is simple: national boundary lines should not be impediments to safety. The global aviation system moves more than 6.2 million people and tons of cargo to their destinations everyday. Through the Office of Policy, International Affairs and Environment (APL), the FAA collaborates with our domestic and international partners to improve aviation safety, efficiency and the environment. People across the globe benefit from the work we do.

International Cooperation—K2 attack prevention

Aviation cooperation key to prevent global terrorist threats

Loukianova , Research Associate at the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies, 11

Anya Loukianova , Research Associate at the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies, graduate assistant at the Center for International and Security Studies at Maryland, 5-11, [“Cooperative Airspace Security in the Euro-Atlantic Region ,” CISSM Working Paper, www.cissm.umd.edu/papers/display.php?id=547]

A common concern for Euro‐Atlantic policy officials and military planners is the timely detection, tracking, communication, and coordination of a response to threats to and from the region’s airspace. Airborne terrorism is a high‐impact threat that knows no borders and comes in many forms. Terrorist attempts to exploit passenger aviation and related infrastructure through hijacking, explosive attacks, attacks with shoulder‐launched weapons, as well as the potential “seizure of civil aircraft for use as ‘manned missiles’” are permanent fixtures on the landscape of threats.17 In the future, the possibility of terrorist attacks with radar‐evading Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAV) and cruise missiles with explosive or unconventional payloads is also set to bedevil security bureaucracies. The “manned missile” scenario is a threat that has attracted significant policymaker attention since the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on New York and Washington.18 Strengthened airport security measures have made it difficult to plan and execute an attack with a hijacked aircraft, known as “renegade” in NATO parlance. Yet, these measures are unlikely to eliminate it completely.19 The preparedness level of national authorities—both civil and military—and their ability to cooperate are frequently tested by the incidents of the loss of voice communication (COMLOSS) between air traffic controllers and aircraft.20 In one infamous case in 2002, an unscheduled Tupolev Tu‐154 aircraft from Central Asia entered the airspace of the Czech Republic, which was heavily guarded at that time due to a NATO summit in Prague.21 This aircraft intended to land at a restricted airport. But, the Tu‐ 154 was unable to communicate with Czech air traffic monitors that had attempted to reroute it to another airfield.22 Thankfully, a special U.S. Air Force F‐16 Air Patrol that worked jointly with Czech air defense and NATO for the duration of the summit was able to escort the aircraft to an alternate airfield for landing. It later turned out that the aircraft was ferrying the Minister of Defense of Kazakhstan.vi This sequence of events highlights the complexity that would be involved in tracking and scrambling assets to chase a potential “renegade” or a UAV across the “patchwork” Euro‐ Atlantic skies, while simultaneously coordinating a response between political and military authorities on the ground.vii In turn, the absence of tested and trusted arrangements and data sharing channels that would enable the timely detection and the adequate tracking of a potential “renegade” between Russia and its NATO neighbors makes all parties— populations on the ground as well as aircraft passengers transiting through airspace— vulnerable. vi Comparable ad hoc arrangements involving NATO states require intricate rules of engagement and transfer of authority procedures as well as ample joint training. In this case, Czech legislation assigned engagement authority to the Czech Air Force and air defense. Thus, for the 2002 summit, NATO worked out procedures by which NATINADS would detect the threat and transfer the authority to the Czechs. Both sides also had to work out the rules of engagement that would involve U.S. Air Force aircraft that participated in the special Air Patrol. See James Smith, “Operation Summit CAP,” Air & Space Power Journal, Fall 2004, http://www.airpower.maxwell.af.mil/airchronicles/apj/apj04/fal04/smith.html. vii It should be noted that “renegade” is a civilian threat in accordance with NATO policy. As briefly noted above, Russia and NATO view ballistic missile defense cooperation as the pinnacle of their cooperative security engagement in the region. Yet, projects that build capacity to respond to more immediate threats such as airborne terrorism or regional instability can also promote the demilitarization of regional relationships. Mutual challenges require the negotiation of detailed crisis management arrangements and prudent information sharing agreements—political, military, and technical—especially between Russia, its insecure neighbors, and NATO states.

Cooperation helps combat global terrorism

Thomas and Benel 2004 [9/14-16, Thomas and Russel, “Improving Coalition Interoperability Through Networking Military/Civil Air Traffic Control Systems” The MITRE Corporation, www.dodccrp.org/events/9th\_ICCRTS/CD/papers/072.pdf]

Regional Security and Air Sovereignty Security must be cultivated in the spirit of close regional cooperation. In recent years this has been evidenced in Central and Eastern Europe (CEE). Regional security in CEE is a necessary precondition to the overall security of Europe and NATO. CEE countries must ensure their own national sovereignty and regional stability as part of the larger goal of strengthening global security and to provide support for international operations to combat global terrorism. One important aspect of regional stability and security is having complete and up-to-date knowledge of all military and civil air traffic (a common air picture) within the region. If you can know with improved certainty where all the expected friendly aircraft are, the job of identifying potential threats is greatly simplified. In addition, the problem of knowing when to provide civil access to military airspace is reduced and additional capacity returned to the global airspace system has commercial value.

U.S. aviation cooperation increases responses to global terrorist threats

Loukianova , Research Associate at the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies, 11

Anya Loukianova , Research Associate at the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies, graduate assistant at the Center for International and Security Studies at Maryland, 5-11, [“Cooperative Airspace Security in the Euro-Atlantic Region ,” CISSM Working Paper, www.cissm.umd.edu/papers/display.php?id=547]

This paper offered an overview of existing airspace arrangements and discussed the policy challenges involved in constructing a regional Euro‐Atlantic capability to monitor and counter common airspace threats through the networking of military and civil air traffic control systems. At present, air traffic control systems and data‐sharing capabilities within continental Europe are loosely integrated through both civil and military—chiefly NATO—channels. The politics and mechanics of this integration presently exclude Russia (and the Commonwealth of Independent States) from the regional airspace security architecture. This exclusion is an unfortunate Cold War legacy practice. It is also potentially the architecture’s greatest weakness—the inability to share sensor data makes the neighboring states opaque to one another and inhibits cooperation in situations where innocent lives and mutual security might be threatened. To date, Russia and NATO have viewed ballistic missile defense cooperation as the pinnacle of their cooperative security engagement in the region. Yet, projects that build capacity to respond to more immediate threats such as airborne terrorism or regional instability are better suited for promoting the demilitarization of regional relationships. Mutual challenges require the negotiation of detailed crisis management arrangements and prudent information sharing agreements—political, military, and technical—especially between Russia, its insecure CEE neighbors, and NATO states. In an effort to make Euro‐ Atlantic security “indivisible,” past U.S. policy successes set useful precedents. During the 1990s, Washington pursued a Regional Airspace Initiative (RAI) program that “establish[ed] a region‐wide civil‐military airspace management and air sovereignty system” and “incrementally enhance[d] operational and conflict prevention capabilities” within the Central and Eastern European states. At a later date, the implementation of these non‐NATO RAI projects promoted the integration of some of these states into NATO air defense. At every step of the way, Russia was concerned about NATO’s intentions. Partnership for Peace states also received ample Western technical and financial assistance through the channels of the Atlantic Alliance. The Air Situation Data Exchange (ASDE) 14 projects have since provided transparency and predictability in the airspaces shared by NATO and non‐NATO member states. These initiatives could today be used to promote a common air picture over conflict‐prone areas with disputed borders, particularly those that have seen an increased use of unmanned technologies.

International Cooperation—Attacks cause retaliations

Terrorism is a global threat and it causes international responses

CFR, 7/9 [Council on Foreign Relations, “The Global Regime for Terrorism” 2012 <http://www.cfr.org/asia/global-regime-terrorism/p25729>]

September 11, 2001, shocked the international system, changing global perspectives on both the threat of terrorism and the tools required to prevent it. Although multilateral instruments against terrorism have existed since the 1960s, the unprecedented reach and potential of terrorist networks such as al-Qaeda and its affiliates constitute a new danger that challenges standing tools and institutions. Despite the death of al-Qaeda leader Osama bin Laden in May 2011, the world is still—a decade after September 11—looking for an effective way to respond to the global terrorist threat. In recent years, terrorist networks have evolved, moving away from a dependency on state sponsorship; many of the most dangerous groups and individuals now operate as nonstate actors. Taking advantage of porous borders and interconnected international systems—finance, communications, and transit—terrorist groups can reach every corner of the globe. While some remain focused on local or national political dynamics, others seek to affect global change. At the forefront of this trend is al-Qaeda. From its base in the borderlands between Afghanistan and Pakistan, the al-Qaeda network has spread widely, establishing branches or affiliates elsewhere, including in North Africa, Yemen, and Southeast Asia. Driven by an extreme salafi ideology—characterized by opposition to Western influence and the goal of creating a global Islamic caliphate—al-Qaeda operatives have killed thousands—from Madrid to Bali to Baghdad. What is more, the group's alluring ideology extends its reach, prompting some individuals outside its direct command to take violent action. The threat from al-Qaeda has proven global, multifaceted, and difficult to track and contain. It continues to pose the most prominent terrorist threat. Other groups, however, have also emerged, and operate, with their own distinct goals, outside traditional networks and hotspots. Europe and the United States are not immune from terrorism within their borders. This global diffusion of the threat requires a comprehensive response that provides solutions on national, regional, and international levels—and addresses not only the methods but also the factors that can contribute to the spread of terrorism. Since September 11, generating such a comprehensive response has proven difficult.

America fights terrorism through overseas conflicts

Armitage 2007 [May 17-19, David, “US and EU Efforts to Fight Terrorism: Same Ends, Different Means – Or Same Means, Different Ends?” European Union Studies Association Conference, http://aei.pitt.edu/7683/1/armitage-d-04a.pdf]

US Approach: War, External, Proactive The American approach may be described by three words: war, external, and proactive. Each of these will be briefly examined. First, the US sees the fight against terrorism as a “war.” The National Security Strategy starts off by saying that “America is at war.” Consequently, there has been a heavy input from the Defense Department and armed forces in disrupting terrorist networks. Al-Qaida is considered a non-state actor, and American officials have been consistent in describing the war as different from a conventional military conflict between nation states, but an armed conflict nonetheless. As the State Department’s legal advisor has argued: [The United States was] clearly justified in using military force in self- defense against al-Qaida. Al-Qaida is not a nation state, but it planned and executed violent attacks with an international reach, magnitude, and sophistication that could previously be achieved only by nation states. Its leaders explicitly declared war against the United States, and al-Qaida members attacked our embassies, our military vessels, our financial center, our military headquarters, and our capital city, killing more than 3,000 people in the process. In our view, these facts fully supported our determination that we were justified in responding in self-defense, just as we would have been if a nation had committed these acts against us.11 Second, the US approach places an emphasis on the external. For the United States, the extraterritorial nature of the al-Qaida network (not to mention the Taliban government in Afghanistan, which harbored al-Qaida terrorists) led the Americans to view the threat’s external dimension. Consequently, the US approach consistently has been to “take the fight” to the enemy and push the borders out. Such a “forward defense” approach is consistent with US national security policy since the end of the Cold War. As Dan Hamilton writes, “Despite the impact of September 11 on the United States, the natural instinct in a nation bounded by two oceans is still to fight one’s enemies abroad so one doesn’t need to fight them at home.”12

Terror attacks lead to rapid EU securitization

Armitage 2007 [May 17-19, David, “US and EU Efforts to Fight Terrorism: Same Ends, Different Means – Or Same Means, Different Ends?” European Union Studies Association Conference, http://aei.pitt.edu/7683/1/armitage-d-04a.pdf]

Finally, counterterrorism at the EU level may be characterized as reactive, with Europeans engaged in furious activity shortly after an attack, followed by a slowdown as measures become bogged down in their implementation by politics and sovereignty concerns. The EU has made progress primarily as a result of the shock of actual or attempted terrorist attacks. The most notable are: the 9/11 attacks, the Madrid bombings in 2004, the London bombings in 2005, and the August 2006 plot in the UK. Before the September 2001 attacks, the EU had no common definition or penalties for terrorism. The Tampere Agenda, which was introduced under the Finnish Souveränität – Mehr Sichereit (Hamburg: Verlag E.S. Mittler & Sohn, 2004). Also, see Daniel Hamilton, Bengt Sundelius, and Jesper Grönvall, eds., Protecting the Homeland: European Approaches to Societal Security – Implications for the United States (Washington, DC: Center for Transatlantic Relations, 2005). 25 Meeting with FRONTEX officials, Warsaw, October 17, 2006. 26 Renata Goldirova, “EU Cross-border Police Pursuits Blocked,” EUObserver.com (February 15, 2007), [Available at http://euobserver.com], (Accessed February 16, 2007). ￼￼ DRAFT –DO NOT QUOTE WITHOUT AUTHOR’S PERMISSION 12 EU presidency in 1999, had stalled.27 The main focus at the time was how best to allow EU citizens to take full advantage of the Single Market and the Schengen area.28 However, 9/11 was a wake-up call for EU member states. The power of external shock revealed how vulnerable the EU was internally. In response, the EU acted with relative speed. Member states agreed to a common definition of terrorism. They created a common list of terrorist organizations and clearinghouse for freezing terrorist assets. They agreed to strengthen the European Police Office (Europol) and introduce a common European arrest warrant (EAW). The manner in which the Europeans negotiated the EAW was different from past practices. EU member states consulted with the US early and often.

International Cooperation—Terrorists attack internationally

Terrorists attack European transportation infrastructure

Armitage 2007 [May 17-19, David, “US and EU Efforts to Fight Terrorism: Same Ends, Different Means – Or Same Means, Different Ends?” European Union Studies Association Conference, http://aei.pitt.edu/7683/1/armitage-d-04a.pdf]

The terrorist risk varies among sectors. To date, the major terrorist attacks in Europe had been against transportation infrastructure. As one security expert commented recently in Brussels, “While the transport infrastructure was the most vulnerable, it was almost impossible to protect, as it was an ‘open system’ with 5,000 km. of track.”65 Information systems, energy distribution networks, and food supply also are critical sectors. The Internet also is an open system, which terrorists have been keen to exploit (through recruitment, communication, fund raising, and operational planning). Layered approaches may represent one answer. Going beyond best practices also will need to be emphasized. The US should continue to pursue avenues of cooperation with Europe, at the national, and through the EU and NATO.66 Dialogue has the potential of building trust among stakeholders – both public and private – that is key to taking effective actions to fight terrorism.

Terrorists threaten both Russia and Europe

Jenkins 2012 [Brian Michael, July “New Challenges to U.S. Counterterrorism Efforts” Testimony presented before the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee on July 11, 2012

http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/testimonies/2012/RAND\_CT377.pdf]

Since 9/11, terrorists have attempted on a number of occasions to bring down airliners with bombs smuggled on board. They succeeded in bringing down two planes in Russia, killing 88 persons. Had the shoe bomber succeeded in bringing down the plane in 2001, 197 people would have been killed; 290 persons were on board the flight targeted by the underwear bomber in 2009. The 2006 Heathrow plot envisioned bringing down several wide-bodied jets flying across the Atlantic, which could easily have pushed fatalities past a thousand.

International Cooperation—NextGen cooperation increases relations

NextGen enhances relationships with Europe and Russia

FAA 2009

 [“FAA International Strategies 2010 to 2014 Africa, Europe, and Middle East Region” Federal Aviation Administration http://www.faa.gov/about/office\_org/headquarters\_offices/apl/international\_affairs/eau/media/international\_priorities\_aeu.pdf[

The European region continues to be the leading international destination for U.S. citizen air travel, outpacing the fast-growing Asia market by a factor of two. In Western Europe, we continue to focus on strengthening our long-standing relationships with the European Commission (EC) and associated authorities such as the European Aviation Safety Agency (EASA), EUROCONTROL, North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and individual national governments. We are using these relationships to enhance and streamline the exchange of safety information and data, and we are working to bring a Bilateral Aviation Safety Agreement (BASA) into force. Our efforts also focus on promoting harmonized regulatory standards by supporting the interoperability of air navigation systems and the harmonization of air traffic control (ATC) procedures, requirements, and routes. This includes an aviation focus towards ensuring the interoperability of U.S. Position, Navigation and Timing (PNT) services with Europe’s Galileo and Russia’s Global Navigation Satellite System (GLONASS) systems. We promote cooperative working-level efforts to mitigate aviation’s impact on the environment, such as the Atlantic Interoperability Initiative to Reduce Emissions (AIRE), and pursue greater mutual understanding of our respective regulatory and policy approaches.

US-Europe cooperation on ATM sets a global common standard that builds relations

Lewis, Senior Fellow and Director for Technology and Public Policy at the Center for Strategic and International Studies and Witkowsky 04

James A. Lewis, Senior Fellow and Director for Technology and Public Policy at the Center for Strategic and International Studies and Anne Witkowsky, senior fellow with the CSIS Technology and Public Policy Program, 4-04, [“TRANSFORMING AIR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT,” CSIS, csis.org/files/media/csis/pubs/040501\_air\_traffic\_management.pdf] E. Liu

There could be several benefits to an approach that emphasizes international cooperation, not only at the technical level but also at the policy planning level. First, FAA and Eurocontrol may benefit in terms of winning funding from making common cause. Second, the transatlantic region (the United States and Europe) remains the most modern and most active aerospace industry sector, so common changes there will set the course for the rest of the world. Progress in recent talks on compatibility between Galileo and GPS could serve as a model. There could also be. e political benefits from finding new ground for cooperation with Europe as it continues to reconstitute itself into a single entity. ATM modernization is a relatively neutral subject where both sides of the Atlantic have incentives to cooperate. There may be trade implications concerning opening domestic markets, but efforts to resolve these are best held in abeyance until further progress is made on ATM modernization. The key issues are refining that common vision into an implementable plan and finding the political will and resources to execute it.

NextGen improves bilateral partnerships throughout east asia

FAA 2009

 [“FAA International Strategies 2010 to 2014 Asia Pacific Region” www.faa.gov/about/office.../international\_priorities\_apc.pdf]

The FAA promotes several aviation safety and efficiency initiatives in the region. Many activities are focused on key growth markets, like China and India, where we have entered into numerous agreements supporting the development and implementation of new air traffic management (ATM) procedures and improvements in operational safety, as well as early assistance in aircraft certification programs. FAA is also a strategic U.S. partner in the region working to ensure the compatibility and interoperability of U.S. Position, Navigation and Timing (PNT) services with Japan’s Quazi Zenith Satellite System (QZSS), India’s Indian Regional Navigational Satellite System (IRNSS) and China’s Compass systems, with a goal of creating a robust worldwide Global Navigational Satellite System (GNSS) service for civil aviation. The FAA was instrumental in establishing aviation cooperation programs (ACPs) in both China and India. These two programs improve coordination between government and industry, encourage increased financial support, and improve bilateral partnerships by promoting key safety initiatives. The FAA has entered into agreements with China and Japan to promote NextGen and the future harmonization of aviation systems in the region and has BASAs in place with Australia, China, Malaysia, New Zealand, Singapore and South Korea. Similar to Europe, the Asia South Pacific Initiative to Reduce Emissions (ASPIRE) was developed to promote operational efficiency initiatives across the region to mitigate aviation’s impact to the environment. The FAA has long established technical working relationships with Australia, Japan, New Zealand, Singapore and South Korea and continues to work strategic safety and capacity initiatives with them. We are working with other key aviation authorities to improve safety oversight capabilities in Indonesia, Philippines and Thailand. Lastly, the 1 FAA continues to provide technical assistance in Afghanistan focused on reconstruction of the civil aviation system.

Global ATM cooperation increases transparency and builds relations

Lewis, Senior Fellow and Director for Technology and Public Policy at the Center for Strategic and International Studies and Witkowsky 04

These factors work against progress, but two interrelated developments will compel the United States to place a higher priority on reconsidering air traffic management. Both of these developments are occurring outside this country. The most important of these is ATM consolidation and modernization in Europe. Europe’s airspace is more crowded than the United States’ and far less efficiently managed. The existing ATM architecture utilizes ground-based technologies and fundamentally takes a national approach to ATM. This approach is expensive, inefficient, and as several tragic accidents have demonstrated, increases safety risks. As part of the political consolidation underway in Europe, ATM is moving from a national to a continental approach, which will be guided at the political level by the European Commission. Politics, budgets, inefficiencies, and safety-of- flight issues are driving the Europeans to reorganize their ATM. They want not only to harmonize and standardize technologies and processes across Europe, but over the longer term, they are looking ahead to take advantage of new technologies to build a continent-wide, satellite-enhanced ATM system. Change in Europe is complemented by changes in Asia. New markets in Asia need to upgrade ATM systems. China’s ATM system infrastructure is limited in areas where demand for air service is growing rapidly. As China builds an infrastructure to deal with this demand, it will be making important decisions about architecture and systems required to accommodate rapidly growing domestic demand. Lacking a heavy investment in legacy ATM systems, China has an opportunity to “leapfrog” to more advanced communication, navigation, and surveillance technologies. As Europe and Asia move toward new ATM systems, the United States will be compelled to change if its airlines are to be competitive in these markets. The worst outcome would be three incompatible approaches, using different systems, requiring airlines to load cockpits with duplicative equipment, creating battles over radio spectrum, and losing potential gains in efficiency and safety. However, changes in the three major ATM markets (North America, Europe, and Asia) also offer an opportunity. Since 2000, a common vision about what a new ATM system would look like has emerged within the ATM community. This vision is a seamless global air traffic system, satellite based, highly automated, using networked data systems to enhance information sharing and to move functions from the ground to the aircraft. The new approach would take advantage of advances in technology to integrate now-separate information systems, provide for greatly increased air traffic situation awareness, allow more aircraft to share the sky, and could increase capacity, security, and safety. The leading ATM organizations—the FAA, Eurocontrol, and the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO)—are coalescing around this common vision. Technology is not the obstacle to modernization. The technology for network- centric operations is here. The challenge is creating the new levels of institutional, political, and industrial cooperation that globalization—and an ATM overhaul— demands. Whether these cooperative efforts are formal or loosely gathered partnerships, it is clear that some additional level of agreement on planning, which affects the management, operations, and avionics equipage of aircraft, will be necessary for transition to the future. Moving from a fragmented, ground-based system that tracks sovereign national borders to a “seamless” and “global” system creates a new set of political and coordination challenges. It requires a degree of political coordination among nations that will be difficult to achieve. The use of new satellite and information technologies will increase situational awareness for flight, increasing capacity and safety, but it also raises sovereignty issues that did not exist before—a seamless global network will result in the integration of information and greater transparency for commercial, military, and private flights.

NextGen increases global cooperation

Lewis, Senior Fellow and Director for Technology and Public Policy at the Center for Strategic and International Studies and Witkowsky 04

Two major government efforts are underway to help realize ATM transformation at the strategic level. The FAA has begun developing a plan for a “Next Generation Air Transportation System.” The plan, due in December 2004, will address the U.S. air transportation system broadly, of which ATM will most likely be a significant part. It is to look out to the next 20 years with a goal of significantly increasing air traffic capacity and efficiency to meet anticipated demand. Europe has been engaged on these ATM issues for several years already, and as a result, in February 2004, the European Union (EU) passed a package of James A. Lewis and Anne Witkowsky 3 4 Transforming Air Traffic Management proposals on air traffic management that will realize a “Single European Sky.” They are now developing the regulations that flow from the legislation, in order to begin implementation of the Single Sky initiative by the end of 2004. These regulations, while focused on reducing inefficiencies in the European airspace, also include a series of goals for transformation over the next 15 years. The advantages could be enormous if new systems make Europe’s use of airspace more efficient and more secure. A new ATM architecture based on technologies that expand situational awareness and increase capacity will require a greater degree of political coordination among nations, which will be difficult to achieve and which historically has been absent from the ATM arena. Moving from a fragmented, ground-based system that closely tracks sovereign national borders to a “seamless” and “global” system

Opening airspace and missile defense cooperation between America, Europe, and Russia

Loukianova , Research Associate at the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies, 11

Anya Loukianova , Research Associate at the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies, graduate assistant at the Center for International and Security Studies at Maryland, 5-11, [“Cooperative Airspace Security in the Euro-Atlantic Region ,” CISSM Working Paper, www.cissm.umd.edu/papers/display.php?id=547]

This paper offers an overview of existing arrangements and provides a discussion of policy challenges involved in constructing a regional Euro‐Atlantic capability to jointly monitor and counter common airspace threats through the networking of military and civil air traffic control systems.i It argues that a strengthened political, financial, and technical commitment to build a cooperative airspace security system is a “win‐win” area for NATO‐ Russian engagement that would promote regional military transparency, deepen cooperation against airborne terrorism, and hance regional crisis stability. Deeper and broader regional airspace security arrangements would also foster the culture of cooperation, transparency, and confidence built between all Euro‐Atlantic states—large and small—through practical civil‐military cooperation. In a May 2010 op‐ed, U.S. Vice President Joseph Biden wrote of the “vital” need to “adapt” Euro‐Atlantic security institutions “to the challenges—and opportunities—of a new era.”1 He noted the importance of “reciprocal transparency” of military forces, called for improved cooperative means to deal with “external challenges,” argued for more “effective conflict‐prevention, conflict‐management, and crisis‐resolution” mechanisms to enhance stability, and reaffirmed the importance of territorial integrity and the indivisibility of regional security. “We seek an open and increasingly united Europe in which all countries, including Russia, play their full roles,” Biden stated.2 A careful examination of “bottom‐up” cooperative opportunities airspace security in line with this vision is in order at a time when policy makers in Washington, Brussels, and Moscow seek to design and agree on a common capability to defend the Euro‐Atlantic against missile threats.3 Toward this end, an expansion of ongoing cooperative airspace security projects is a cost‐effective and technically feasible undertaking that could promote both agreement and action on the rules of engagement, as well as on the sharing of inmation, technology, and costs in regional missile defense that involves Russia. In an effort to make Euro‐Atlantic security “indivisible,” it might also be useful to learn from past experience with using this type of functional engagement for the purposes of reassurance.

International Cooperation—NextGen Coop Now—MOU

MOU was enacted – NextGen is getting integrated with SESAR

COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION, 2011 [2/22, “Memorandum of Cooperation Nat-I-9406 between the United States of America and the European Union” http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/11/st06/st06458.en11.pdf]

The purpose of this Annex is to implement the Memorandum of Cooperation NAT-I-9406 between the United States of America and the European Union (the Memorandum) by setting forth the terms and conditions under which the Parties shall establish cooperation to ensure global interoperability between their respective Air Traffic Management (ATM) modernization programmes, NextGen and SESAR, taking into account the interests of civil and military airspace users. ARTICLE II DEFINITIONS For the purpose of this Annex, the term "validation" means to confirm, throughout the development lifecycle, that the proposed solution, including concept, system, and procedures, complies with stakeholders' needs. ARTICLE III PRINCIPLES Within the framework of the NextGen and SESAR programmes and in accordance with the principles set out in Article I.C of the Memorandum, the Parties shall: A. as appropriate, allow participation by each other's governmental and industrial entities in their relevant consultative bodies and industrial initiatives, in accordance with applicable laws and regulations, and the governing rules of such bodies and initiatives; B. endeavour to provide opportunities to each other's industry stakeholders to contribute to work programs and access information on, and results of, equivalent research and development programs and projects; and C. through the High Level Committee established under Article V of this Annex, mutually identify, in attachments to this Annex ("Attachments"), the domains that allow specific opportunities for participation in each Party's consultative bodies, initiatives, and research programs and projects, in particular those domains that provide for a contribution to high level system definition, such as interoperability, architecture definition, and technical baseline. The High Level Committee shall monitor the implementation of this Article and shall update the Attachments as necessary. ARTICLE IV SCOPE OF WORK A. The scope of the work is to contribute to ATM research, development, and validation for global interoperability. The work may include, but is not limited to, the activities set out in paragraphs 1 to 5 of the present Article. 1. Transversal Activities Transversal activities cover those tasks that are not specific to any one operational or technical development, but have interdependencies across the SESAR and NextGen Programs. These activities are of particular importance to the cooperation, as any diverging approach potentially has wide-reaching material implications for harmonization and interoperability. In this area, the Parties intend to address: a. Operations concept and roadmap; b. Separation provision; c. Road-mapping including standardization and regulation with a view to facilitate implementation synchronization; d. Business case and investment planning; e. Environment; f. The coordination of technical efforts in support of global and ICAO standardization activities in the field of ATM modernization; g. The synchronization and consistency of avionics roadmaps, in order to ensure best economic efficiency for airspace users; and h. Co-ordinated delivery of technical and operational changes that achieve/maintain seamless operations from an airspace user's perspective. 2. Information Management The key focus on Information Management is to ensure timely distribution of accurate and relevant ATM-related information across the stakeholder community in a manner that is seamless (interoperable), secure and supportive of collaborative decision making. In this area, the Parties intend to address: a. System Wide Information Management (SWIM) interoperability; b. Aeronautical Information Management (AIM) interoperability; and c. Meteorological information exchange. EU/US/Annex 1/en 6 3. Trajectory Management Trajectory Management encompasses air/air and air/ground exchange of four-dimensional (4D) trajectories requiring a consistent approach to terminology, definition and exchange of flight information at all times and in all flight phases. In this area, the Parties intend to address a. Common trajectory definition and exchange; b. Flight planning and dynamic flight plan updates; c. Traffic management (including trajectory integration and prediction); d. Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS) integration into ATM; and e. The convergence of the SESAR and NextGen concepts of operations, the service definitions and their applications including the 4D trajectory definition and exchange format operations. EU/US/Annex 1/en 7 4. Communications, Navigation, Surveillance (CNS) & Airborne Interoperability CNS and airborne interoperability includes planning airborne equipage and the development of mutually interoperable air/air and air/ground applications and systems. In this area, the Parties intend to address:

International Cooperation—Russia Scenario

Russia is excluded from European aviation cooperation

Loukianova , Research Associate at the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies, 11

Anya Loukianova , Research Associate at the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies, graduate assistant at the Center for International and Security Studies at Maryland, 5-11, [“Cooperative Airspace Security in the Euro-Atlantic Region ,” CISSM Working Paper, www.cissm.umd.edu/papers/display.php?id=547]

For the purposes of this paper, it is useful to imagine the current Euro‐Atlantic airspace security architecture as a “patchwork” that consists of state groupings—like the Baltic three. The ATC systems and data‐sharing capabilities within this “patchwork” are loosely integrated through both civil and military—chiefly NATO—channels.v Another organization, the European Organization for the Safety of Air Navigation (EUROCONTROL), works with both members and non‐members of the European Union on operational and technical solutions for civil‐military air traffic coordination and air traffic management (ATM). At present, the politics and mechanics of this integration exclude Russia (and the Commonwealth of Independent States) from this regional airspace security architecture. This exclusion is another unfortunate legacy practice that prevails despite the institutionalized ability of NATO and Russia to resolve disputes through diplomatic channels. It is also potentially the architecture’s greatest systemic weakness—the inability to share sensor data makes the neighboring states opaque to one another and inhibits cooperation in situations where innocent lives and mutual security might be threatened.

U.S. aviation technology prevents border war between Abkhazia and South Ossetia

Loukianova , Research Associate at the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies, 11

Anya Loukianova , Research Associate at the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies, graduate assistant at the Center for International and Security Studies at Maryland, 5-11, [“Cooperative Airspace Security in the Euro-Atlantic Region ,” CISSM Working Paper, www.cissm.umd.edu/papers/display.php?id=547]

In today’s conflict‐prone regions, disputed borders shouldn’t necessarily imply airspace opacity. To the contrary, cooperative airspace projects allowing all parties equal access to a common source of information about the activities in their airspace would promote transparency and confidence‐building. In retrospect, a CAP of the air situation over Georgia, Abkhazia, and South Ossetia that was shared between Russia, Georgia, and third parties could have also served as an enforcement mechanism for treaty obligations. While resolving the conflict involving Abkhazia and South Ossetia requires political will, a creative implementation of additional airspace security arrangements involving Russia and either NATO or U.S. technology could buttress regional stability by decreasing information asymmetries to all regional actors.

Russia is excluded now from ATM – Sharing and integration of systems is key

Loukianova , Research Associate at the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies, 11

Anya Loukianova , Research Associate at the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies, graduate assistant at the Center for International and Security Studies at Maryland, 5-11, [“Cooperative Airspace Security in the Euro-Atlantic Region ,” CISSM Working Paper, [www.cissm.umd.edu/papers/display.php?id=547](http://www.cissm.umd.edu/papers/display.php?id=547)]

For the purposes of this paper, it is useful to imagine the current Euro‐Atlantic airspace security architecture a “patchwork” that consists of state groupings—like the Baltic three. The ATC systems and data‐sharing capabilities within this “patchwork” are loosely integrated through both civil and military—chiefly NATO—channels.v Another organization, the European Organization for the Safety of Air Navigation (EUROCONTROL), works with both members and non‐members of the Europe Union on operational and technical solutions for civil‐military air traffic coordination and air traffic management (ATM). At present, the politics and mechanics of this integration exclude Russia (and the Commonwealth of Independent States) from this regional airspace security architecture. This exclusion isnother unfortunate legacy practice that prevails despite the institutionalized ability of NATO and Russia to resolve dispus through diplomatic channels. It is also potentially the architecture’s greatest systemic weakness—the inability to share sensor data makes the neighboring states opaque to one another and inhibits cooperation in situations where innocent lives and mutual security might be threatened.

Growth Good—Biodiversity

Growth promotes biodiversity and prevents species extinction

ASAFU-ADJAYE, 03

(John Asafu-Adjaye, Associate professor at the school of Economics, April 2003, “Biodiversity Loss and Economic Growth: A Cross-Country Analysis”, http://espace.library.uq.edu.au/eserv.php?pid=UQ:10744&dsID=jaa\_03.pdf)

The study results indicate that while improvement in economic freedoms can be associated with improvement in mammal and bird species numbers, the effect on biodiversity is much stronger in low-income countries compared to high-income countries. The main implication here is that there is a need to develop appropriate institutional and macroeconomic policies that allow biodiversity values to be internalised in decision-making processes at the individual and national levels.

Growth Good—Creative Destruction

Economic growth leads to creative destruction

Cox & Alm ‘08

(W. Michael Cox, senior vice president and chief economist at the Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas, Richard Alm, Economics writer at the Dallas Fed, 2008, “Creative Destruction”, The Concise Encyclopedia Of Economics 2nd Edition, http://www.econlib.org/library/Enc/CreativeDestruction.html#abouttheauthor)

Schumpeter and the economists who adopt his succinct summary of the free market’s ceaseless churning echo capitalism’s critics in acknowledging that lost jobs, ruined companies, and vanishing industries are **inherent parts of the growth system**. The saving grace comes from recognizing the good that comes from the turmoil. Over time, societies that allow creative destruction to operate grow more productive and richer; their citizens see the benefits of new and better products, shorter work weeks, better jobs, and higher living standards.

High correlation between economic growth and creative destruction

Reynolds ’99

(Paul D. Reynolds, 2004 winner of the International Award for Entrepreneurship and Small Business Research, 1999, “Creative Destruction: Source or Symptom of Economic Growth?”, Edited by Zoltan J. Acs et al, Entrepreneurship small and medium-sized enterprises and the macroeconomy, chapter 4

Is a higher level of “creative destruction” associated with economic growth? The short answer is yes. This is illustrated, in Table 4.1, in the correlations between measures of establishment and job volatility with job growth for 382 US. labor market areas. Correlations between twelve creative destruction measures and six indices of business volatility are presented in relation to concurrent, subsequent, and economic growth two years in the future. “No-year time periods are used in all cases. Each correlation in Table 4.1 is the average of six correlations over a twelve-year period. The speciﬁc analyses by year are presented in Appendixes 4.] and 4.2. There are some year to year variations. The inter-correlations among all measures are provided in Table 4.Dl (see Addenda D). Measures of “creative destruction" and the business volatility indices are discussed below. The result is an array of positive correlations with two exceptions, rates ratio; population based establishment birth and death rates total; establishment based establishment death rates; and establishment based birth and death rates total. Among the creative destruction measures, however, those associated with job or ﬁrm birth rates tend to have a greater presence in these models, eight times for establishment based establishment birth rate measures; four times for the job birth rate measure; and three times for the population based establishment birth rate measure. Inspection of Table 4.2 indicates that the six business dynamic indices are much more prevalent in the models, compared to the twelve creative destruction measures At least one of these measures appears in every model, and four or more in six of the twelve. For this reason, the business dynamics indices are utilized in the following analysis of the relative impact on general models of economic growth. This preliminary regression analysis indicates that creative destruction and business volatility have a very substantial relationship - on their own - with economic growth. And for most indices it is a positive relationship - more volatility or turbulence is associated with more growth.

Growth Good—Democracy

Growth key to democracy

Barro, ‘99

(Robert J. Barro, an American classical macroeconomist and the Paul M. Warburg Professor of Economics at Harvard University, 1999. “Determinants of democracy.” Journal of Political Economy, http://dash.harvard.edu/handle/1/3451297)

Inspection of the cross-country data suggests that countries at low levels of economic development typically do not sustain democracy. For example, the political freedoms installed in most of the newly independent African states in the early 1960s did not tend to last. Conversely, nondemocratic places that experience substantial economic development tend to become more dramatic. Examples include Chile, South Korea, Taiwan, Spain, and Portugal. Moreover, the countries of central and eastern Europe—which have been reasonably advanced economically for some time, especially in terms of education—eventually became more democratic.

Growth Good—Disease

Growth key to preventing chronic disease

World Health Organization ‘05

(World Health Organization, WHO is the directing and coordinating authority for health within the United Nations system, 2005, “preventing chronic diseases designing and implementing effective policy”, Policy Brief, http://www.who.int/chp/advocacy/policy.brief\_EN\_web.pdf)

Poverty and economic stagnation are important causes and consequences of chronic disease in low and middle income countries. Eighty per cent of all chronic disease deaths occur in low and middle income countries, and people in these countries develop diseases at younger ages, suffer longer, and die sooner than those in high income countries. Chronic disease has serious economic consequences for individuals and families, is a major cause of poverty, and impedes national economic development. The main causes of chronic diseases are well known and are the same in all regions of the world. It is possible to prevent and control chronic disease through a wide range of interventions, many of which are highly cost-effective and inexpensive to implement. Development agencies can contribute to this effort by helping governments to build a solid political and financial infrastructure that allows for economic development and effective chronic disease prevention and control.

Growth Good—Environment

**Growth helps to prevent environmental damage**

Adler 8 (Jonathan H. Adler, Professor of Law and Director of the Center for Business Law and Regulation at Case Western Reserve University School of Law, Fall 2008, “Green Bridge to Nowhere,” The New Atlantis, online: http://www.thenewatlantis.com/publications/green-bridge-to-nowhere)

According to Speth, “most environmental deterioration is a result of systemic failures of capitalism.” This is an odd claim, as the least capitalist nations of the world also have the worst environmental records. The ecological costs of economic statism are far worse than those of economic liberty. The environmental record of the various Soviet regimes amply bears this out: The West’s ecological nightmares were the Soviet bloc’s environmental realities. This is not due to any anomaly of the Soviet system. Nations with greater commitment to capitalist institutions experience greater environmental performance. While Speth occasionally acknowledges pockets of environmental progress, he hardly stops to consider the reasons why some environmental resources have been conserved more effectively than others. Fisheries are certainly declining throughout much of the world—some 75 percent of fisheries are fully or over-exploited—but not everywhere. It is worth asking why. Tropical forests in less-developed nations are declining even as most temperate forests in industrialized nations are rebounding. Recognizing these different trends and identifying the key variables is essential to diagnosing the real causes of environmental deterioration and prescribing a treatment that will work. Speth acknowledges that much of the world is undergoing “dematerialization,” such that economic growth far outpaces increases in resource demand, but seems not to appreciate how the capitalist system he decries creates the incentives that drive this trend. Were it not for market-driven advances in technological capability and ecological efficiency, humanity’s footprint on the Earth would be far greater. While modern civilization has developed the means to effect massive ecological transformations, it has also found ways to produce wealth while leaving more of the natural world intact. Market competition generates substantial incentives to do more with less—thus in market economies we see long and continuing improvements in productive efficiency. This can be seen everywhere from the replacement of copper with fiber optics (made from silica, the chief component in sand) and the light-weighting of packaging to the explosion of agricultural productivity and improvements in energy efficiency. Less material is used and disposed of, reducing overall environmental impacts from productive activity. The key to such improvements is the same set of institutional arrangements that Speth so decries: property rights and voluntary exchange protected by the rule of law—that is, capitalism. As research by Wheaton College economist Seth Norton and many others has shown, societies in which property rights and economic freedoms are protected experience superior economic and environmental performance than those societies subject to greater government control. Indeed, such institutions have a greater effect on environmental performance than the other factors, such as population growth, that occupy the attention of Speth and so many other environmental thinkers.

**Growth is good; provides innovation and technology that solves the environment and disease – and low growth exacerbates environmental issue**

**Reich 2010** (Robert Bernard, August 17th served as the 22nd United States Secretary of Labor under President Bill Clinton, from 1993 to 1997. Reich is currently Chancellor's Professor of Public Policy at the Goldman School of Public Policy at the University of California, Berkeley, a former Harvard University professor and the former Maurice B. Hexter Professor of Social and Economic Policy at the Heller School for Social Policy and Management at Brandeis University, <http://robertreich.org/post/968048444>)

Economic growth is slowing in the United States. It’s also slowing in Japan, France, Britain, Italy, Spain, and Canada. It’s even slowing in China. And it’s likely to be slowing soon in Germany. If governments keep hacking away at their budgets while consumers almost everywhere are becoming more cautious about spending, global demand will shrink to the point where a worldwide dip is inevitable. You might ask yourself: So what? Why do we need more economic growth anyway? Aren’t we ruining the planet with all this growth — destroying forests, polluting oceans and rivers, and spewing carbon into the atmosphere at a rate that’s already causing climate chaos? Let’s just stop filling our homes with so much *stuff.* The answer is economic growth isn’t just about more stuff. Growth is different from consumerism. Growth is really about the capacity of a nation to produce everything that’s wanted and needed by its inhabitants. That includes better stewardship of the environment as well as improved public health and better schools. (The Gross Domestic Product is a crude way of gauging this but it’s a guide. Nations with high and growing GDPs have more overall capacity; those with low or slowing GDPs have less.)Poorer countries tend to be more polluted than richer ones because they don’t have the capacity both to keep their people fed and clothed and also to keep their land, air and water clean. Infant mortality is higher and life spans shorter because they don’t have enough to immunize against diseases, prevent them from spreading, and cure the sick.In their quest for resources rich nations (and corporations) have too often devastated poor ones – destroying their forests, eroding their land, and fouling their water. This is intolerable, but it isn’t an indictment of growth itself. Growth doesn’t depend on plunder. Rich nations have the capacity to extract resources responsibly. That they don’t is a measure of their irresponsibility and the weakness of international law. How a nation chooses to use its productive capacity – how it defines its needs and wants — is a different matter. As China becomes a richer nation it can devote more of its capacity to its environment and to its own consumers, for example. The United States has the largest capacity in the world. But relative to other rich nations it chooses to devote a larger proportion of that capacity to consumer goods, health care, and the military. And it uses comparatively less to support people who are unemployed or destitute, pay for non-carbon fuels, keep people healthy, and provide aid to the rest of the world. Slower growth will mean even more competition among these goals. Faster growth greases the way toward more equal opportunity and a wider distribution of gains. The wealthy more easily accept a smaller share of the gains because they can still come out ahead of where they were before. Simultaneously, the middle class more willingly pays taxes to support public improvements like a cleaner environment and stronger safety nets. It’s a virtuous cycle. We had one during the Great Prosperity the lasted from 1947 to the early 1970s. Slower growth has the reverse effect. Because economic gains are small, the wealthy fight harder to maintain their share. The middle class, already burdened by high unemployment and flat or dropping wages, fights ever more furiously against any additional burdens, including tax increases to support public improvements. The poor are left worse off than before. It’s a vicious cycle. We’ve been in one most of the last thirty years. No one should celebrate slow growth. If we’re entering into a period of even slower growth, the consequences could be worse.

Growth Good—Famine

Growth Prevents Famine

Timmer ’04

(Peter Timmer PhD, Professor of Development Studies, *emeritus,* at Harvard University, November 22, 2004, “Food Security and Economic Growth: an Asian perspective”, http://www.crawford.anu.edu.au/acde/publications/publish/ArndtLecture\_Timmer2004.pdf)

 Food security and economic growth interact in a mutually reinforcing process over the course of development. It is only in modern times that entire societies have achieved food security. Earlier, only privileged members of society were able to escape from chronic hunger and the constant threat of famine (Fogel 1991). Many countries in the developing world, especially in Africa and South Asia, have not managed this escape. In these countries, understanding the factors that cause widespread hunger and vulnerability to famines, and the mechanisms available to alleviate their impact, remain important intellectual challenges (Ravallion 1987, 1997; Sen 1981; Dreze and Sen 1989). There is a different way to pose the question, however. Rather than asking how to cope with hunger and famine, the question might be how to escape from their threat altogether. As Fogel (1991) has emphasised, this is a modern question that is only partly answered by the institutional and technological innovations that are at the heart of modern economic growth (Kuznets 1966). Without these innovations, the modern escape from hunger to food security would not have been possible. But the record of economic growth for the developing countries since the 1950s shows that, even in countries with relatively low levels of per capita income, government interventions to enhance food security can lift the threat of hunger and famine. The countries most successful at this task are in East and Southeast Asia, although the experience in South Asia has been instructive as well (Timmer 2000).

**Transportation infrastructure and economic growth solves famine**

**The Independent 05** [“The Solution to Famine in Africa is Organic Farming Not GMOs,” Posted 6/27/05, pg. http://www.organicconsumers.org /ge/ famine062705.cfm]

He maintains that genetically modified organisms (GMOs) remove control from local farmers. He speaks for a growing number who believe that Africa should return to natural, sustainable methods of agriculture better suited to its people and environment.

Can one man hope to stand against governments and the huge multinationals? Visiting London, Berhan appears to be a frail - if nattily dressed - sexagenarian. But our conversation reveals his determination, intelligence and encyclopedic memory, combining to create an indomitable force.

Asked why bad harvests seem to have a greater impact on Ethiopia than its neighbours, he has a simple yet stark response. "It's largely because of the lack of infrastructure," he says. "The road system in Ethiopia has doubled in the past 10 years, but is still very poor.

"Ethiopia is still an agrarian society, and there isn't one such country that hasn't had famines," he adds. "The reasons are clear: some years you have plenty and others not enough. If you don't have the technological and financial capacity and the infrastructure to store in good years, you can't make provision for the bad. People here depend entirely on the crops they produce in their fields, so when one season fails, the result is famine." Born in 1940, Berhan graduated in 1963 from Addis Ababa University and took a doctorate at the University of Wales in 1969. Later posts as dean of science at Addis Ababa, keeper of the National Herbarium and director of the Ethiopian Conservation Strategy Secretariat kept him in touch with the agricultural needs of Ethiopia's people.

Growth Good—Heg

Growth key to heg - empirics prove

Pietroburgo ‘9

(Anthony Pietroburgo, Political Scientist, April 15 2009, “The End of American Hegemony”, <http://ezinearticles.com/?The-End-of-American-Hegemony&id=2207395>)

However we can learn from past hegemonic states, all of which, withered away with time just as the American one is currently in the process of doing. Great Britain was perhaps the last true hegemon before that of the United States. Back in 1890 the collapse of their empire had just began. David A. Lake's research on the issue is work that should be greatly analyzed due to the illustrious similarities between the British recession in to retirement and the United States' as well. For much of the 19th century Great Britain was dominating in the same fields as the U.S. did so in the 1950's through the late 1970's. Soon in the later 1800's The United States and Germany moved to a protectionist system to plant their economic seeds and soon after were surpassing British industries and abilities. The industrial base of Great Britain crumbled and forced them to invest heavily in the service, shipping and insurance sectors of the economy just to break-even when concerning their balance of payment statistics. For the time being the British were able to carry on with the pound as the dominant world currency. The frail system was already on the thinnest of ice, when WWI confounded the weak British economy (Lake 122). At the time of Great Britain's reign of power they also pursued operations to completely open up and liberalize the world economy. This did lead to substantial brief economic abundance but eventually the struggles of remaining a strong enough power to be considered an absolute hegemon wore off. Hegemonic powers are only sustainable during periods of constant economic growth. When growth is no longer the complete and utter status of the hegemony's economic functionality the power ceases to be consistent. We see this to be the case with Great Britain, as other world powers emerged and caught up in terms of economic status and influence, British power that was exerted was much more explicit and coercive, just like it was during the American hegemonic era under President Nixon (Lake 121).

**Economic growth is key to heg — Empirics prove**

Pietroburgo 9 (Anthony, Political Scientist, “The End of American Hegemony,” April 10, 2009, http://ezinearticles.com/?The-End-of-American-Hegemony&id=2207395: Ad 7-6-9)

However we can learn from past hegemonic states, all of which, withered away with time just as the American one is currently in the process of doing. Great Britain was perhaps the last true hegemon before that of the United States. Back in 1890 the collapse of their empire had just began. David A. Lake's research on the issue is work that should be greatly analyzed due to the illustrious similarities between the British recession in to retirement and the United States' as well. For much of the 19th century Great Britain was dominating in the same fields as the U.S. did so in the 1950's through the late 1970's. Soon in the later 1800's The United States and Germany moved to a protectionist system to plant their economic seeds and soon after were surpassing British industries and abilities. The industrial base of Great Britain crumbled and forced them to invest heavily in the service, shipping and insurance sectors of the economy just to break-even when concerning their balance of payment statistics. For the time being the British were able to carry on with the pound as the dominant world currency. The frail system was already on the thinnest of ice, when WWI confounded the weak British economy (Lake 122). At the time of Great Britain's reign of power they also pursued operations to completely open up and liberalize the world economy. This did lead to substantial brief economic abundance but eventually the struggles of remaining a strong enough power to be considered an absolute hegemon wore off. Hegemonic powers are only sustainable during periods of constant economic growth. When growth is no longer the complete and utter status of the hegemony's economic functionality the power ceases to be consistent. We see this to be the case with Great Britain, as other world powers emerged and caught up in terms of economic status and influence, British power that was exerted was much more explicit and coercive, just like it was during the American hegemonic era under President Nixon (Lake 121). It is safe to say that the U.S. is headed down the same path that will eventually end up being the ultimate de-throning of the American empire and it's hegemonic capabilities. If you think back to all the complications that the United States is experiencing in this very moment concerning obvious financial difficulties and others in the areas of education, technological innovation and healthcare respectively. Other nations have clearly started their own catch up phase and are impeding on American power as we speak. The irony between the situations leading up to the collapse of the British hegemonic state and the current burdens that are being placed upon a contemptuous American hegemon are too similar for coincidence. It took the disaster of WWI to finally destabilize the British hegemon and the United States is one major crisis away from experiencing the same fate (Bartilow Lecture).

Growth Good—HIV/AIDS

Economic growth key to fight aids/hiv

Tren ‘02

(Richard Tren, Richard Tren is Director of Africa Fighting Malaria, an analyst for the Free Market Foundation, and a Research Fellow of the Environment Unit at the Institute of Economic Affairs, 11/28/02, “Economic growth key to tackling AIDS”, http://www.europeanvoice.com/article/imported/economic-growth-key-to-tackling-aids/46159.aspx)

PEOPLE with HIV/AIDS are dying in vast numbers in Botswana, Uganda, Zimbabwe, Namibia and Mozambique – denied treatment because of appalling levels of poverty, a complete lack of health infrastructure, prejudice, ignorance and stigmatisation. This was the overwhelming message of presentations at Botswana's recent ‘Hands Across the Divide' health conference. Drug patents and drug prices, which were barely mentioned, have little impact when governments lack the political will to address the problem. But though the situation seems bleak, there is cause for much hope, and it comes in part from the drug companies that have been accused of denying people access to drugs.
Indeed, at a mini-ministerial for the World Trade Organization (WTO) in Australia at the very same time, trade ministers from 25 developed and developing countries seemed intent on blaming pharmaceutical companies for the current crisis. They view efforts to allow poor countries to import generic versions of any drug, in violation of intellectual property rights, as essential to combating disease in the developing world and critical if the ‘development round' of trade talks begun in Doha last November is to succeed. They are wrong on both counts. How can countries build successful programmes to combat AIDS and other diseases? There is no simple answer, but Botswana offers an encouraging example of what works: a combination of essential government infrastructure, access to drugs, and adequate funding.With more than 30% of its adult population living with HIV/AIDS, Botswana's government launched the African Comprehensive HIV/AIDS Partnership, an ambitious anti-retroviral treatment programme in partnership with the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and the US drugs giant, Merck. The Gates Foundation and Merck are both providing $50 million over the next five years and Merck is providing free anti-retroviral therapies. Though only 2,200 people are currently enrolled in the programme, it will have the capacity to treat almost 100,000 people. This contrasts with the failure of programmes in Zimbabwe and Nigeria, which shows that patent protection is not the problem. Activists hailed Zimbabwe for its decision to declare an AIDS emergency six months ago, which would have allowed the importation of generic versions of patented AIDS drugs. Thanks to years of misrule and corruption, however, Zimbabwe simply does not have the financial resources to purchase any drugs, patented or generic.The German drugs company Boehringer Ingelheim has tried to give Zimbabwe free HIV/AIDS drugs for some time with negligible government response. The problem seems to be that the health infrastructure is unable to deliver any form of anti-retroviral treatment.If a country can't even afford to accept free donations of drugs, it seems unlikely that they could purchase generic copies of the same drugs. It's easier to blame and shame corporations than corrupt governments. Undermining the rights of the rich western drug companies through the emergency provisions was a display of power that did nothing to change the dire realities of the situation.Anyone who still believes that the solution to the drug access problem lies in generic medicines should simply look at India. The country has over 22,000 producers of generic drugs, yet it is widely estimated that only 1% of those that need anti-retroviral therapies actually get them. India has no system of drug patenting, and yet for all diseases, the UN development programme estimates that only 30% of the population has access to essential drugs.Cut-price drugs from India or elsewhere cannot build the essential health infrastructure. Only economic growth and development can do that.

**Econ Crisis causes poverty—and this increases mental illness**

**WHO, 11**—World Health Organization (“Impact of Economic Crisis on Mental Health”,http://www.euro.who.int/\_\_data/assets/pdf\_file/0008/134999/e94837.pdf)//JL

The current economic crisis is increasing poverty in the European Region. The economic crisis will hit people with low income – and those made poor through loss of income or housing – the hardest **(24)**. The economic crisis has increased the number of households in high debt, repossession of houses and evictions. The current economic crisis is probably increasing the social exclusion of vulnerable groups, low-income people and people living near the poverty line in the European Region **(23)**. Such vulnerable groups include children, young people, single-parent families, unemployed people, ethnic minorities, migrants and older people. Economic pressure, through its influence on parental mental health, marital interaction and parenting, affects the mental health of children and adolescents **(25–27)**. The effects of extreme poverty on children include deficits in cognitive, emotional and physical development, and the consequences on health and well-being are lifelong **(28)**. Social gradients of health exist in Europe, and moving down the socioeconomic ladder due to loss of jobs and income affects people’s health **(29)**. During recessions, social inequality in health can widen **(30,31)**. The least well-educated people are at greatest risk of ill health after job loss **(24)**. Unsurprisingly, substantial research has revealed that people who experience unemployment, impoverishment and family disruptions have a significantly greater risk of mental health problems, such as depression, alcohol use disorders and suicide, than their unaffected counterparts **(32–41)**. Especially men are at increased risk of mental health problems **(42)** and death due to suicide **(17)** or alcohol use **(43)** during times of economic adversity. Unemployment contributes to depression **(32)** and suicide **(44–46)**, and young unemployed people have a higher risk of getting mental health problems than young people who remain employed. Evidence indicates that debt, financial difficulties and housing payment problems lead to mental health problems **(47–50)**. The more debt people have, the more likely they are to have mental disorders overall (Fig. 3) **(51).** The crisis will increase mortality linked to mental health problems. *In the EU, increases in national unemployment rates are associated with increases in suicide rates* **(3,52)**. *In the Russian Federation, the societal change after the dissolution of USSR in 1991 and the collapse of the trouble in 1998 have been followed by increases in alcohol related deaths* **(53).** Likewise, great increases in unemployment have been linked to a 28% rise in deaths from alcohol use in the EU **(3)**. It can be concluded that the economic crisis is likely to negatively affect health, especially mental health. The next sections outline possible measures to mitigate the mental health effects of the current crisis.

**Poverty causes conflict---multiple scenarios**

**Brainard 7** February 2007, \*LAEL BRAINARD, NGOZI OKONJO-IWEALA, DEREK CHOLLET, SUSAN RICE, JANE NELSON: Brookings Global Experts, “CONFLICT AND POVERTY,” http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/reports/2007/2/globaleconomics/200702\_02poverty.pdf, AJ

In a world where boundaries and borders have blurred, and where seemingly distant threats can metastasize into immediate problems, the fight against global poverty has become a fight for global security. American policymakers, who traditionally have viewed security threats as involving bullets and bombs, are increasingly focused on the link between poverty and conflict; for instance, the Pentagon’s 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review focuses on fighting the “long war,” declaring that the U.S. military has a humanitarian role in “alleviating suffering, ... [helping] **prevent disorder from spiraling into wider conflict or crisis**.” Such assertions have a compelling logic. **Extreme poverty literally kills: Hunger, malnutrition, and disease claim the lives of millions each year**. Poverty exhausts governing institutions, depletes resources, weakens leaders, and crushes hope—fueling a volatile mix of desperation and instability. **Poor, fragile states can explode into violence or implode into collapse**, imperiling their citizens, neighbors and the wider world as livelihoods are crushed, investors flee and ungoverned territories become a spawning ground for **terrorism, trafficking, environmental devastation and disease**. Yet if poverty leads to insecurity, it is also true that the destabilizing effects of conflict make it harder for leaders, institutions and outsiders to promote human development. Civil wars may result in as many as 30 percent more people living in poverty—and as many as one-third of civil wars ultimately reignite. Tragically, poverty and insecurity are mutually reinforcing, leading to what Brookings scholar Susan Rice evocatively calls a “doom spiral.” Conflict increases infant mortality, creates refugees, fuels trafficking in drugs and weapons, and wipes out infrastructure. It also makes it harder for outside players to deliver assistance and less attractive for the global private sector to invest. Thus, once a country has fallen into the vortex, **it is difficult for it to climb out**—as the world has witnessed with the ongoing catastrophe in Democratic Republic of Congo, a crisis that has claimed nearly 4 million lives and sparked a massive humanitarian emergency, where most people today are killed not by weapons but by easily preventable and treatable diseases. Violent conflict also produces considerable economic spillover for neighboring countries, as refugees flow in, investment pulls out and supply chains and trade routes are disrupted.

Growth Good—Poverty

Economic growth reduces poverty

Roemer & Gugerty ’97

(Michael Reomer, Harvard Institute for International Development Writer, Mary Kay Gugerty, PhD associate professor of Public Affairs at Harvard University, March 1997, “DOES ECONOMIC GROWTH REDUCE POVERTY?”, http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf\_docs/PNACA656.pdf)

The study examines the question of whether economic growth tends to reduce poverty, where poverty is measured by the incomes of the poorest 20% and 40% of a population. Using the most recent data available, the paper shows that an increase in the rate of GDP growth translates into a direct one-for-one increase in the rate of growth of average incomes of the poorest 40%. GDP growth of ten percent per year is associated with income growth of ten percent for the poorest 40% of the population. For the poorest 20% the elasticity of response is 0.921; GDP growth of 10% is associated with income growth of 9.21%. These results give strong support to the proposition that growth in per capita GDP can be and usually is a powerful force in reducing poverty.

Economic growth correlates to large decreases in poverty

Romer and Gugerty 97

DOES ECONOMIC GROWTH REDUCE POVERTY? Technical Paper Michael Roemer and Mary Kay Gugerty Harvard Institute for International Development March 1997 <http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PNACA656.pdf>

Even early studies found that increases in poverty and economic growth were a very exceptional combination. A 1979 study of 12 growth periods in various countries found no increase in poverty and the real per capita income of the poorest 20% rose in every period of growth. A more recent study by Fields (1989) indicates that of 18 countries with data on poverty over time, in only one case was economic growth not accompanied by a fall in poverty. Moreover, Fields found that more rapid economic growth tends to bring greater declines in poverty. While this preliminary evidence was encouraging, more conclusive results were precluded by the lack of data. In 1996, however, a new database was compiled by Klaus Deininger and Lyn Squire at the World Bank. This database contains the most comprehensive data that exist on income distribution across countries. The data cover 58 countries, beginning in 1960, and for each country give the distribution of income by quintile. In compiling the database, every effort was made to ensure that only reasonably high quality data based on comprehensive household surveys were included. Of the 58 countries included in the database, 26 are developing countries. The database makes it possible for the first time to test propositions about the Kuznets curve and the relationship between growth and poverty over time. We used the Deininger-Squire data set to identify 61 intervals, covering 26 developing countries, for which growth in national average and quintile incomes could be identified. We used relatively restrictive criteria in defining our sample: intervals should be at least 5 years in length, but as long as a decade if possible, and based on consistently defined household surveys. Our aim in this study was to measure the growth of average income for both the poorest 20% and the poorest 40% of the population, then to compare these to the growth of GDP per capita. For example, to calculate the growth in income for the poorest 20% of the population we took the share of income held by the poorest 20% and used the level of GDP for each year to calculate the dollar amount of income held by the poor. The GDP figures were taken from the Summers and Heston Penn World Tables, which calculates a cross-nationally comparable GDP, adjusted for differences in purchasing power in different countries. The data and the calculations used to derive them are given in Appendix A. From these calculations, we regressed the growth of income for the poorest two groups against the growth of GDP per capita for the entire population. The results are summarized in Table 4 and in Figures 3 and 4 below. Larger versions of these figures are given in Appendix B. The regressions reported in Table 4 show that an increase in the rate of per capita GDP growth translates into a one-for-one increase in average income of the poorest 40%. GDP growth of 10% per year is associated with income growth of 10% for the poorest 40% of the population. For the poorest 20% the elasticity of response is 0.921; GDP growth of 10% is associated with income growth of 9.21%. These regressions indicate that on average the poor do benefit from economic growth. Figure 3 shows the data for the poorest 20% of the population and indicates that there is a clear relationship between growth of the incomes of the bottom 20% and growth in GDP per capita. All the data points in the upper right quadrant are examples of periods where economic growth increased the incomes of the poorest 20%. The cases where increases in per capita GDP were accompanied by decreases in the income of the bottom 20%, are located in the bottom right quadrant and are discussed below. In the vast majority of cases, economic growth is accompanied by a reduction of poverty, as indicated by the large number of observations in the upper right hand quadrant of the graph.

Growth Good—Terrorism

Growth solves terrorism-theoretically and empirically

Gries et al ’09

(Thomas Gries, University of Paderborn, Department of Economics, February 17 2009, “Causal Linkages Between Domestic Terrorism and Economic Growth”, http://groups.uni-paderborn.de/fiwi/RePEc/Working%20Paper%20neutral/WP20%20-%202009-02.pdf)

Economic theory argues that terrorists are rational individuals which choose their levels of violent activity according to the costs and benefits arising from their actions (cf., e.g., Sandler and Enders, 2004). Because of terrorists presumed rationality, the opportunity costs of terror also matter. Intuitively, low opportunity costs of violence that is, few prospects of economic activity lead to elevated terrorist activity, whereas high opportunity costs result in the opposite (cf., e.g., Freytag et al., 2008). Times of economic success mean, inter alia, more individual economic opportunities and economic participation. Higher levels of overall growth should coincide with higher opportunity costs of terror and thus less violence. Conversely, in periods of economic downturn should be accompanied by fewer economic opportunities and participation and thus by more economic dissatisfaction. In times of economic crisis, dissidents are more likely to resort to violence as the opportunity costs of terror are low, while the potential long-run payoffs from violence ñ a redistribution of scarce economic resources which is to be enforced by means of terrorism are comparatively high (cf. Blomberg, Hess and Weerapana, 2004). To some extent, empirical evidence suggests that economic performance and terrorism are linked along the lines discussed before. The Endings of Collier and Hoeer (1998) indicate that higher levels of economic development coincide with lower likelihoods of civil war, providing initial evidence that economic success and conáict are diametrically opposed. Considering economic development and terrorism, several studies Önd that higher levels of development are obstacles to the production of transnational terrorism (cf., e.g., Santos Bravo and Mendes Dias, 2006; Lai, 2007; Freytag et al., 2008). Blomberg and Hess (2008) also Önd that higher incomes are a strong deterrence to the genesis of domestic terrorism. Furthermore, there is evidence connecting solid short-run economic conditions with less political violence (cf. Muller and Weede, 1990; Freytag et al., 2008). In general, the evidence indicates that terrorism and economic conditions are linked. Here, economic success seems to impede the genesis of terrorism, presumably due to higher opportunity costs of conáict. In other words, in times of stronger economic performance individuals simply have more to lose.

**Growth solves terrorism**

Gries, Kriegery, Meierrieksz 09-[Causal Linkages Between Domestic Terrorism and Economic Growth; Thomas Gries, Tim Kriegery, Daniel Meierrieksz; February 17, 2009;http://groups.uni-paderborn.de/fiwi/RePEc/Working%20Paper%20neutral/WP20%20-%202009-02.pdf]

Possible E¤ects of Economic Performance on Terrorism Economic theory argues that terrorists are rational individuals which choose their levels of violent activity according to the costs and benefits arising from their actions (cf., e.g., Sandler and Enders, 2004). Because of terrorists’ presumed rationality, the opportunity costs of terror also matter. Intuitively, low opportunity costs of violence –that is, few prospects of economic activity –lead to elevated terrorist activity, whereas high opportunity costs result in the opposite (cf., e.g., Freytag et al., 2008). Times of economic success mean, inter alia, more individual economic opportunities and economic participation. Higher levels of overall growth should coincide with higher opportunity costs of terror and thus less violence. Conversely, in periods of economic downturn should be accompanied by fewer economic opportunities and participation and thus by more economic dissatisfaction. In times of economic crisis, dissidents are more likely to resort to violence as the opportunity costs of terror are low, while the potential long-run payo¤s from violence –a redistribution of scarce economic resources which is to be enforced by means of terrorism are comparatively high (cf. Blomberg, Hess and Weerapana, 2004). To some extent, empirical evidence suggests that economic performance and terrorism are linked along the lines discussed before. The findings of Collier and Hoe­ er (1998) indicate that higher levels of economic development coincide with lower likelihoods of civil war, providing initial evidence that economic success and con‡ict are diametrically opposed. Considering economic development and terrorism, several studies …nd that higher levels of development are obstacles to the production of transnational terrorism (cf., e.g., Santos Bravo and Mendes Dias, 2006; Lai, 2007; Freytag et al., 2008). Blomberg and Hess (2008) also …and that higher incomes are a strong deterrence to the genesis of domestic terrorism. Furthermore, there is evidence connecting solid short-run economic conditions with less political violence (cf. Muller andWeede, 1990; Freytag et al., 2008).6 In general, the evidence indicates that terrorism and economic conditions are linked. Here, economic success seems to impede the genesis of terrorism, presumably due to higher opportunity costs of con‡ict. In other words, in times of stronger economic performance individuals simply have more to lose.

Growth Good—War

Growth solves global conflict

Marquardt, 5

(Michael J. Marquardt, Professor of Human Resource Development and International Affairs at George Washington University, “Globalization: The Pathway to Prosperity, Freedom and Peace,” Human Resource Development International, March 2005, Volume 8, Number 1, pg. 127-129, http://org8220renner.alliant.wikispaces.net/file/view/Marquardt.pdf)

Perhaps the greatest value of globalization is its potential for creating a world of peace. Economic growth has been identiﬁed as one of the strongest forces that turn people away from conﬂict and wars among groups, tribes, and nations. Global companies strongly discourage governments from warring against countries in which they have investments. Focusing on economic growth encourages cooperation and living in relative peace (Marquardt, 2001, 2002)

#### Economic growth is key to prevent conflict

Bernauera 10-[Climate Change, Economic Growth, and Conflict Thomas Bernauera, Anna Kalbhenna, Vally Koubia,b and Gabriele Ruoffa a ETH Zurich Center for Comparative and International Studies (CIS) and Institute for Environmental Decisions (IED) and b University of Bern Department of Economics and Oeschger Institute for Climate Change Research;<http://ncgg.princeton.edu/IPES/2010/papers/S1115_paper1.pdf>]

Economic growth and conflict

Previous research has shown that reduced levels of domestic economic activity tend to create incentives for increased conflict.6 Drawing on this research, we posit that climate change, by reducing economic growth (that is, reducing the ability of the economy to grow), affects the utility of individuals and groups to engage in civil conflict. It does so in two ways. First, negative climatic conditions, via their negative effect on economic growth, can reduce resources available to the government (e.g. by reducing tax revenue). The government thus has fewer resources to “invest in people”, for instance to provide better nutrition, schooling, and on-the-job training that would lead to improved living conditions. It also has fewer resources to “provide for the people” in terms of sustaining peace through the maintenance of law and order – the latter, for instance, lowers the probability of rebel victory by increasing the cost of rebellion. Second, climate related phenomena such as lower precipitation, higher temperature, and extreme weather events lead to lower personal income from production and also decrease the opportunity for future employment. Consequently, the opportunity cost of rebellion decreases because the expected returns from peaceful employment, say farming, compared to joining criminal and insurgent groups are lower. In situations like these, when individuals expect to earn more from criminal or insurgent activity than from lawful and peaceful activity, predatory behavior becomes more likely. The latter implicates conditions in which each individual or group’s effort to increase its own welfare reduces the welfare of others and also increases the probability of mutual attacks (Jervis & Snyder, 1999). The argument that poverty breeds conflict and war is supported by several empirical studies (e.g. Hidalgo et al., 2010; Dube & Vargas, 2008; Hegre & Sambanis, 2006; Collier & Hoeffler, 2004; Fearon & Laitin, 2003). For example, Collier and Hoeffler (2004) find that low economic growth, which is a proxy for foregone earnings, has considerable explanatory power in their intrastate conflict regression. They conclude that rapid economic growth reduces the risk of conflict. Dube and Vargas (2008) examine whether violent actions in Colombia in the 1994-2005 period are linked to low opportunity costs of agricultural labor, using crop prices as a proxy for such costs. They show that a drop in the price of coffee substantially increased the incidence and intensity of intrastate conflict in coffee-intensive areas. They attribute this result to the lowering of opportunity costs of joining a rebel movement (via depressed wages) in coffee growing areas. Hidalgo et al. (2010), using a panel data set with over 50,000 municipality-year observations, show that land invasions by the rural poor in Brazil occur immediately after adverse economic shocks, which in the statistical analysis are instrumented by rainfall. Consequently, our argument that reduced economic growth can impact on the likelihood of civil conflict is well supported by the existing literature.

Wealth prevents wars from occurring- liberal economics prove

Gat, professor of national security in the Department of Political Scence at Tel Aviv University, 2005 (“The Democratic Peace Theory Reframed”, *World Politics*, Project Muse)

Throughout history, rising prosperity has been associated with decreasing willingness to endure the hardships of war. Freedom from manual labor and luxurious living conditions achieved by the rich in prosperous premodern societies conflicted with the physical hardship of campaigning and life in the field, which thereby became more alien and unappealing. As the industrial-technological age unfolded and wealth per capita rose exponentially, the wealth, comfort, and other amenities formerly enjoyed by only the privileged elite spread throughout society. Thus, increasing wealth has worked to decrease war not only through the modern logic of expanding manufacturing and trading interdependence but also through the traditional logic that affluence and comfort affect society's willingness to endure hardship. Because new heights of affluence and comfort have been achieved in the developed world in the post–World War II era, when practically all the world's affluent countries have been democracies, it is difficult to distinguish the effects of comfort from those of democracy in diminishing belligerency. Obviously, as already noted, the two factors have to some degree been interrelated.¶ It is difficult for people in today's liberal, affluent, and secure societies to visualize how life was for their forefathers only a few generations earlier and largely still is in poor countries. Angst may have replaced fear and physical pain in modern societies; yet, without diminishing the merits of traditional society or ignoring the stresses and problems of modernity, this change has been nothing short of revolutionary. People in premodern societies struggled to survive in the most elemental sense. The overwhelming majority of them endured a lifetime of hard physical labor to escape hunger, from which they were never secure. The tragedy of orphanage, of child mortality, of premature death of a spouse, and of early death in general was an inescapable fact of life. People of all ages were afflicted with illness, disability, and physical pain, for which no effective remedies existed. Even where state rule prevailed, violent conflict between neighbors was a regular occurrence and, [End Page 89] therefore, an ever-present possibility, putting a premium on physical strength, toughness, honor, and a reputation for all of these. Hardship and tragedy tended to harden people and make them fatalistic. In this context, the suffering and death associated with war were endured as just another nature-like affliction, together with Malthus's other grim reapers: famine and disease.¶ By comparison, by contrast even, life changed dramatically in affluent liberal societies. The decline of physical labor has already been mentioned. Hunger and want were replaced by societies of plenty, where food, the most basic of needs, became available practically without limit, with overweight rather than starvation becoming a major problem, even and, indeed, sometimes especially, among the poor. Infant mortality fell to roughly one-twentieth of its rate during preindustrial times. Annual general mortality declined from around thirty per thousand people to between seven and ten per thousand.34 Infectious diseases, the number one killer of the past, were mostly rendered nonlethal by improved hygiene, vaccinations, and antibiotics. Countless bodily irritations and disabilities—deteriorating eyesight, bad teeth, skin disease, hernia—that used to be an integral part of life, were alleviated by medication, medical instruments, and surgery. Anesthetics and other drugs, from painkillers to Viagra, dramatically improved the quality of life. People in the developed world live in well-heated and air-conditioned homes, equipped with all manner of electrical appliances. They have indoor bathrooms and lavatories. They wash daily and change clothes as often. They drive rather than walk. They are flooded with popular media entertainment with which to occupy their spare time. They take vacations in faraway places. They embrace "postmodern," "postmaterialistic" values that emphasize individual self-fulfillment. In an orderly and comfortable society, rough conduct in social dealings decreases, while civility, peaceful argument, and humor become the norm. Men are more able to "connect to their feminine side." Whereas children and youth used to be physically disciplined by their parents and fought among themselves at school, on the playground, and in the street, they now encounter a general social abhorrence of violence. Social expectations and psychological sensitivity have risen as dramatically as these changes. People in affluent liberal societies expect to live, to control their lives, and to enjoy life rather than merely endure it, with war scarcely fitting into their life plan.

**Economic growth stops war**

**Gjelten 09** (Tom Gjelten is a correspondent for National Public Radio news. Gjelten has worked for NPR since 1982, when he joined the organization as a labor and education reporter. Feb 18 2009 “Economic Crisis Poses Threat To Global Stability” <http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=100781975)//> CG

More Cooperation Needed Throughout history, wars have often been preceded by serious economic crises. World War II followed the Great Depression, for instance. With such concerns in mind, Democratic Sen. John Kerry of Massachusetts, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, invited several experts to testify last week at a roundtable on the foreign policy implications of this economic crisis. "The biggest single step the U.S. could take to send a message abroad and try to restore confidence would be what?" he asked. The answers were not encouraging. The steps that most need to be taken, the panel agreed, are the ones that are probably most difficult politically: Troubled U.S. banks, they all said, need to be nationalized, at least temporarily (that's probably a non-starter). The United States should lead the way in resisting protectionist pressures (but the U.S. stimulus package includes a Buy American provision). And governments around the world need to work together (the opposite has happened). "What we've seen is a lack of coordination [among countries] of economic policy to address what is truly a global crisis," says Desmond Lachman of the American Enterprise Institute. "Otherwise, you're going to have countries very much at cross-purposes, and the danger is you're getting beggar-thy-neighbor policies pretty much in evidence." In times of economic stress, governments may protect their own national companies from foreign competition, even if it means the global economy suffers. The World Bank is predicting that trade this year could shrink by more than 2 percent. Some analysts even say the world is going through a period of deglobalization after years of increasing economic integration. That's a trend that could aggravate international tensions. It's the job of intelligence agencies to focus on risk and prepare their governments for what could happen, which is why they are now rehearsing all the worrisome scenarios that could result from the international financial crisis.

Growth Good—Solves CCP Instability

**Growth is vital to stop CCP instability**

**Long, 10** (Yang, Ph.D. from Jilin University, professor at Nankai University in Tianjin, “Potential Instability Caused by the Financial Crisis – Measures Taken by the Chinese,” Duisburg Working Papers On East Asian Studies, Number 86, pg. 22-29, <http://www.uni-due.de/in-east/fileadmin/publications/gruen/paper86.pdf>, Tashma)

The global **financial crisis** stemming **from the U**nited **S**tates **has led to** the **decline of China’s** economic **growth**, caused rising unemployment, stock market declines, business failures, and reduced import and export trade. History and international experience have shown that an economic crisis or recession and a shift from a period of growth are prone to cause problems of political and social stability. Once economic growth slows down significantly, social contradictions and conflicts easily intensify. Alexis de Tocqueville found that social unrest was infrequent in places which experienced long-term economic stagnation, but was more likely to happen after a certain amount of economic growth. It most likely happens at a point when an economy has stopped growing and begun to decline. The French Revolution, for example occurred in just such circumstances. 2 Thus deterioration of a stable economic environment leads to explosive social contradictions. When the deterioration is slight, it will cause local social tensions; but when an economy deteriorates seriously, it will cause severe problems in political stability, such as social turmoil, political crisis or even a regime change. Conversely, political instability will cause the government to respond to an economic crisis feebly, thus deepening the economic crisis and initiating a vicious circle. Influenced by the U.S. financial crisis, **China is** now **facing** the **risk of** social **instability** from two sides. First, former potential instability was intensified by the economic downturn, including a class conflict of interest resulting from the large gap between rich and poor and an urban and rural confrontation caused by a gap between urban and rural areas. To this was added a lack of security on the part of low-income groups caused by poor coverage from the social security system and government corruption. Second, the financial crisis could still lead to further instability issues, including panic resulting from the failure of personal investments, asset shrinkage, currency devaluation, dissatisfaction triggered by unemployment and non-employment of peasant workers and university students, lack of confidence in the government because of a decline in living standards, and public discontent due to the unsuccessful government response to the crisis.

Growth Good—Solves China Miscalc

**US Economic failure kills SQ check on Chinese miscalc**

**Glaser 5/2/12** “China is Reacting to Our Weak Economy” Bonnie S. Glaser (senior fellow at the Center for Strategic and International Studies.) 5/2/2012 http://www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2012/05/02/are-we-headed-for-a-cold-war-with-china/china-is-reacting-to-our-weak-economy

**To maintain peace and stability in the Asia-Pacific region** and secure American interests, **the United States must sustain its leadership and bolster regional confidence in its staying power**. **The key** to those goals **is** reinvigorating **the U.S. economy**. Historically, the Chinese have taken advantage of perceived American weakness and shifts in the global balance of power. In 1974 China seized the Paracel Islands from Saigon just after the United States and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam signed the Paris Peace Treaty, which signaled the U.S. withdrawal from the region. When the Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev met one of Deng Xiaoping’s “three obstacles” requirements for better ties and withdrew from Can Ranh Bay, Vietnam, in 1988, China snatched seven of the Spratly Islands from Hanoi. Two decades later, as the United States-Philippines base agreement was terminated, China grabbed Mischief Reef from Manila. Beijing must not be allowed to conclude that an economic downturn means our ability to guarantee regional stability has weakened. **The Chinese assertive behaviors** against its neighbors in recent years in the East China Sea, the South China Sea and the Yellow Sea **were** in part **a consequence of** China’s assessment that the global financial crisis signaled **the beginning of U.S. decline** and a shift in the balance of power in China’s favor**. The Obama administration’s “rebalancing**” or “pivot” to **Asia will help prevent Chinese miscalculation** and increase the confidence of U.S. partners in U.S. reliability as the ballast for peace and stability in the region. **But failure to follow through with actions and resources would spark uncertainty** and lead smaller countries to accommodate Chinese interests in the region. Most important, **the United States must revive its economy**. China will inevitably overtake the United States as the largest economy in the world in the coming decade or two. **The United States must** **not let Beijing conclude that a relative decline in U.S. power means a weakened United States unable to guarantee regional peace and stability. The Chinese see the United States as mired in financial disorder**, with an alarming budget deficit, high unemployment and slow economic growth — **which**, they predict, **will lead to America's demise as the sole global superpower. To avoid Chinese miscalculation and greater United States-China strategic competition, the United States needs to restore financial solvency** and growth through bipartisan action.

**China rise exacerbates regional insecurities, if US sucked in means nuke war.**

**Lieven 6/12/2012** “Avoiding a US-China War” Anatol Lieven (Former associate at Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, editor at International Institute for Strategies, author of numerous books on foreign policy, doctorate in Political science, Senior Research Fellow for New America Foundation) 6/12/2012 http://www.nytimes.com/2012/06/13/opinion/avoiding-a-us-china-war.html?\_r=2

This month, Defense Secretary Leon Panetta announced that by **2020, 60 percent of the U.S. Navy will be deployed in the Pacific.** Last November, in Australia, President Obama announced the establishment of a U.S. military base in that country, and threw down an ideological gauntlet to China with his statement that the United States will “continue to speak candidly to Beijing about the importance of upholding international norms and respecting the universal human rights of the Chinese people.” The dangers inherent in present developments in American, Chinese and regional policies are set out in “The China Choice: Why America Should Share Power,” an important forthcoming book by the Australian international affairs expert Hugh White. As he writes, “**Washington and Beijing are already sliding toward rivalry by default**.” To escape this, White makes a strong argument for a “concert of powers” in Asia, as the best — and perhaps only — way that this looming confrontation can be avoided. The economic basis of such a U.S.-China agreement is indeed already in place. The danger of conflict does not stem from a Chinese desire for global leadership. Outside East Asia, Beijing is sticking to a very cautious policy, centered on commercial advantage without military components, in part because Chinese leaders realize that it would take decades and colossal naval expenditure to allow them to mount a global challenge to the United States, and that even then they would almost certainly fail. In East Asia, things are very different. For most of its history, China has dominated the region. When it becomes the largest economy on earth, it will certainly seek to do so. While China cannot build up naval forces to challenge the United States in distant oceans, it would be very surprising if in future it will not be able to generate missile and air forces sufficient to deny the U.S. Navy access to the seas around China. Moreover**, China is engaged in territorial disputes with other states in the region over island groups — disputes in which Chinese popular nationalist sentiments have become heavily engaged**. With communism dead, **the Chinese administration has relied** very heavily — and successfully — **on nationalism** as an ideological support for its rule. The problem is that if clashes erupt over these islands, Beijing may find itself in a position where it cannot compromise without severe damage to its domestic legitimacy — very much the position of the European great powers in 1914. In these disputes, Chinese nationalism collides with other nationalisms — particularly that of Vietnam, which embodies strong historical resentments. The hostility to China of Vietnam and most of the other regional states is at once America’s greatest asset and greatest danger. It means that **most of China’s neighbors want the United States to remain militarily present** in the region. As White argues, even if the United States were to withdraw, it is highly unlikely that these countries would submit meekly to Chinese hegemony. But **if the United States were to commit itself to a military alliance with these countries against China, Washington would risk embroiling America in their territorial disputes.** In the event **of a military clash between Vietnam and China**, Washington would be faced with **the choice of** either holding aloof and seeing its credibility as an ally destroyed, or **fighting China**. Neither the **United States nor China would “win”** the resulting war outright, **but they would certainly inflict catastrophic damage on each other and on the world economy. If the conflict escalated into a nuclear exchange, modern civilization would be wrecked. Even a prolonged period of military and strategic rivalry with an economically mighty China will gravely weaken America’s global position.** Indeed, U.S. overstretch is already apparent — for example in Washington’s neglect of the crumbling states of Central America. To avoid this, White’s suggested East Asian order would establish red lines that the United States and China would both agree not to cross — most notably a guarantee not to use force without the other’s permission, or in clear self-defense. Most sensitively of all, while China would have to renounce the use of force against Taiwan, Washington would most probably have to publicly commit itself to the reunification of Taiwan with China. Equally important, China would have to acknowledge the legitimacy of the U.S. presence in East Asia, since this is desired by other East Asian states, and the United States would have to acknowledge the legitimacy of China’s existing political order, since it has brought economic breakthrough and greatly enhanced real freedoms to the people of China. Under such a concert, U.S. statements like those of President Obama in support of China’s democratization would have to be jettisoned. As White argues, such a concert of power between the United States, China and regional states would be so difficult to arrange that “it would hardly be worth considering if the alternatives were not so bad.” But as his book brings out with chilling force, the alternatives may well be catastrophic.

Growth Good—Solves China War

**Economic growth is key to prevent U.S-China Conflict**

HSU 11-[“Economic Ties Could Help Prevent US-China War” Jeremy Hsu, Innovation NewsDaily Senior Writer; 01 November 2011 05:32 PM ET;

http://www.innovationnewsdaily.com/660-china-military-cyber-national-security.html]

As the U.S. faces China's economic and military rise, it also holds a dwindling hand of cards to play in the unlikely case of open conflict. Cyberattacks aimed at computer networks, targeted disabling of satellites or economic warfare could end up bringing down both of the frenemies**. That means ensuring the U.S. economy remains strong** and well-balanced, with China's economy possibly representing the best deterrent, according to a new report. The Rand Corporation's analysts put low odds on a China-U.S. military conflict taking place, but still lay out danger scenarios where the U.S. and China face greater risks of stumbling into an unwanted war with one another. They point to the economic codependence of both countries as the best bet against open conflict, similar to how nuclear weapons ensured mutually assured destruction for the U.S. and Soviet Union during the Cold War. War Militaria Collectors www.JCAmericana.comWe Buy War Artifacts & Militaria Free Appraisals for AuthenticityLearn German in 10 Days PimsleurApproach.com/Learn-GermanWorld-famous Pimsleur Method. As seen on PBS - $9.95 w/ Free S&H.VA Home Loan for Veterans www.VAMortgageCenter.comGet a Quote in 2 Minutes! VA Loans now Up to $729,000 with $0 Down. Ads by Google "It is often said that a strong economy is the basis of a strong defense," the Rand report says. "In the case of China, a strong U.S. economy is not just the basis for a strong defense, it is itself perhaps the best defense against an adventurous China." Such "mutually assured economic destruction" would devastate both the U.S. and China, given how China represents America's main creditor and manufacturer. The economic fallout could lead to a global recession worse than that caused by the financial crisis of 2008-2009. The U.S. still spends more than five times on defense compared with China, but Rand analysts suggest that China's defense budget could outstrip that of the U.S. within the next 20 years. The U.S. Air Force and Navy's current edge in the Pacific has also begun to shrink as China develops aircraft, ships, submarines and missiles capable of striking farther out from its coast. Existing U.S. advantages in cyberwar and anti-satellite capabilities also don't offset the fact that the U.S. military depends far more heavily on computer networks and satellites than China's military. That makes a full-out cyberwar or satellite attacks too risky for the U.S., but perhaps also for China. "There are no lives lost — just extensive harm, heightened antagonism, and loss of confidence in network security," Rand analysts say. "There would be no 'winner.'" Open military conflict between China and the U.S. could also have "historically unparalleled" economic consequences even if neither country actively engages in economic warfare, Rand analysts say. The U.S. could both boost direct defense in the unlikely case of war and reduce the risk of escalation by strengthening China's neighbors. Such neighbors, including India, South Korea, Japan and Taiwan, also represent possible flashpoints for China-U.S. conflict in the scenarios laid out by the Rand report. Other possible danger zones include the South China Sea, where China and many neighboring countries have disputes over territorial claims, as well as in the murkier realm of cyberspace. Understandably, China has shown fears of being encircled by semi-hostile U.S. allies. That's why Rand analysts urged the U.S. to make China a partner rather than rival for maintaining international security. They also pointed out, encouragingly, that China has mostly taken "cautious and pragmatic" policies as an emerging world power. "As China becomes a true peer competitor, it also becomes potentially a stronger partner in the defense as well as economic field," the Rand analysts say.

Growth Good—Warming

Growth solves warming- innovation and development

Bowman, head of research at the Adam Smith Institute, 2010 (Sam, October 14, “Economic growth will deliver us from the pessimism of WWF predictions”, http://www.telegraph.co.uk/earth/earthcomment/8064274/Economic-growth-will-deliver-us-from-the-pessimism-of-WWF-predictions.html)

The WWF says that humans are using more natural resources than the world can sustain, and that during this century resources will dwindle, harming biodiversity and the environment. This could not be more wrong.¶ The campaigning organisation has committed the zero-sum fallacy of thinking that one person’s gain can only be at the expense of somebody else. It has assumed that humans can only become rich by using natural resources – taking a share of the Earth’s pie to the cost of other species, so to speak. In fact, human progress has come from a smarter use of, and less reliance on, raw materials.¶ Economic growth comes in large part from being smarter about how we use the scarce resources available to us. This is achieved through human ingenuity, which the environmental economist Julian Simon called the "ultimate resource", and it is growing exponentially.¶ The sharpest declines in biodiversity since the 1960s, according to the WWF, have occurred in low-income countries. Incredibly, they blame the carbon emissions of high-income countries for this, and suggest that forced limits on carbon emissions are the way to better living standards.¶ It is partially correct in blaming carbon emissions on wealth: the world’s carbon footprint in prehistoric times was admittedly very small. And, no doubt, biodiversity was very high then too. But human living standards were miserable, and this should matter.¶ The way to promote biodiversity and reduce carbon emissions is not to retard economic growth but to encourage it. Tourism from wealthy countries has allowed countries like Kenya to afford wildlife preserves, and foreign investment and consumption is what allows the developing world to grow economically. Without this growth, luxuries like clean air will, for poor countries, remain unaffordable.

Growth Good—VTL

 **world without growth or capitalism kills value to life**

**Butters, 2007**- Ph.D., President – Nebraska Council on Economic Education, Assistant Professor of Economics – University of Nebraska at Lincoln (Roger B., “Teaching the Benefits of Capitalism”, http://www.hillsdale.edu/images/userImages/afolsom/Page\_6281/Butters.pdf)

When Thomas Hobbes made his now famous statement that the life of man was solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short he could not have been more correct. Indeed, the same pronouncement at any time in the previous 7,000 years of human history would have been accurate. Hobbes lived in a world of abject, grinding poverty, limited human rights, and stagnant societies. It is true that there had been several bright spots for the human race but these were generally short‐lived and quickly forgotten. And even the bright spots really only served to shine light on the wretched state of the majority of mankind. Hobbes could reflect on Classical Greece or the rise of Egypt or even reflect on the rise of Rome or the more recent voyages of the Spanish and Portuguese. He may or may not have known about the rise of the Chinese Empire and the great voyages of discovery that occurred from Asia to Africa and even the Americas. But he clearly understood that although small groups or classes of individuals had been able to escape poverty, the majority of mankind throughout history could only hope for a life of toil, sickness, privation and death.

Hobbes’s statement, although an accurate reflection of the past and present, was ill timed. As he spoke dramatic changes in the fabric of human existence were taking place. In the fourteenth century the Black Death left Europe with abundant amounts of capital and land and very few laborers to use it. With more resources per person, real wages and standards of living began to rise. As the real wage of labor rose, the traditional Lord‐Serf relationship was broken. Serfs began to acquire and improve property instead of simply farming it as tenants. As incomes and property ownership rose among the masses they began to demand improved property law and enforcement mechanisms. Along with rising wealth, cities began to grow and commerce began to flourish. With the advent of increased commerce and the entrepreneurial class, societies increasingly shifted to money-based transactions and away from traditional barter which made increased specialization in production possible. A little more than a hundred years after Hobbes, Adam Smith found himself sitting in Scotland amazed at the changes he was observing around him and throughout England. Put simply, people were getting rich and it was not just the connected or social elites that were getting rich, the commoner was becoming wealthy too.

Growth Good—VTL

**Capitalism ensures value to life, for it best evolves with human rights**

**Butters, 2007**- Ph.D., President – Nebraska Council on Economic Education, Assistant Professor of Economics – University of Nebraska at Lincoln (Roger B., “Teaching the Benefits of Capitalism”, http://www.hillsdale.edu/images/userImages/afolsom/Page\_6281/Butters.pdf)

Slavery, abuse, murder, and any other crime against a person is ultimately a violation of the right they have to security in themselves and their property. It is unsurprising that capitalist societies tend to be free societies where men and women of various races all enjoy a similar franchise. Capitalism ennobles the human spirit by protecting the individual from competitive violence and coercive force. It provides the structure for people to pursue their best interests. The concept of human rights has evolved in tandem with the concept of property rights. Being able to understand the ownership of a thing is straightforward due to the tangible nature of property. Once a society can develop the rights to something tangible it can progress to developing rights for intangibles. The intangible rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness are the natural outgrowth of understanding the universal right to security in one’s possessions, person and thoughts. Indeed, property rights are the only human rights because if we can arbitrarily deprive an individual of her possessions we can deprive her of everything else. It is interesting to note that intellectual property rights are not recognized in nations were private property is insecure. Tangible property must be secure before people can understand the need to secure intangible property.

**Collapse of capitalism results in poverty, ecological disasters, and eventually extinction**

**Butters, 2007**- Ph.D., President – Nebraska Council on Economic Education, Assistant Professor of Economics – University of Nebraska at Lincoln (Roger B., “Teaching the Benefits of Capitalism”, http://www.hillsdale.edu/images/userImages/afolsom/Page\_6281/Butters.pdf)

For a more practical comparison consider why private bathrooms are clean, and public ones are not. Better yet, why are Maine Lobsters plentiful and orange roughy aren’t? – Property rights. Why are cows thriving and tigers vanishing? Property rights. For cows people have a direct incentive to preserve, protect and improve. For tigers the only incentive is to use the resource before someone else does. Why are elephants and other endangered species on the rebound in some African countries? Property rights. By letting villages own the animals they have an incentive to preserve, protect and improve, and as a result the animals are thriving. Rather than calling poachers when a rhinoceros decimates your corn field, you care for the animal, make sure it has several young and then auction the right to shoot it to a wealthy game hunter. The animals are preserved, the population is maintained, the village receives increased wealth and a private individual has a unique experience. By defining the property right we have gone from extinction and poverty to trade and wealth and at the end of the day there are more, not fewer rhinoceroses. The tragedy of the commons is one of the most valuable and pervasive examples of what happens when property rights are poorly defined and unenforced. What is the benefit of capitalism? It provides us with property rights that create the incentives to preserve, protect and improve. It is not surprising that the greatest ecological disasters have all occurred in societies without strong social institutions that protect property.

UAS—Pyroterrorism—1

UAS systems are key to fight and contain forest fires

Moose, Major, USAF, 08

Robert G. Moose, Major, USAF, 12-08, [“COVERING THE HOMELAND: NATIONAL GUARD UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS SUPPORT FOR WILDLAND FIREFIGHTING AND NATURAL DISASTER EVENTS,” Naval Postgraduate School, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA493900] E. Liu

The benefit UAS assets can provide to the civil authorities in assessing the damage caused by a natural disaster is unparalleled in the commercial sector.15 There are also tangible benefits to using UAS assets to assist in fighting major wildfires. In the past, satellites have been used to assist firefighters battling large forest fires. The largest complaint from this usage was the revisit rate on data updates and classification issues.16 UAS assets can provide continuous near real-time data on the fire. This type of data allows the lead agency (firefighters) to use available assets most efficiently. This data could be in the hands of the deployed firefighters near the fire lines, giving them a view of the fire otherwise unavailable. This added capability makes it possible to fight the fire more efficiently and achieve containment sooner, reduce the severity of property damage, and reduce the risks to firefighters. UAS assets can also provide considerable benefit in a post-disaster environment similar to hurricanes Katrina and Rita. Using the senor suites of the UAS, it is possible to gather comprehensive damage assessment data over broad areas.17 This data makes it possible to determine the extent of the damage from flooding and wind damage. Based on this data, emergency planners can formulate a response and recovery plan, providing help to the most critical areas first. The UAS could also play a significant role in the search and rescue mission, helping locate survivors for rescue assets to recover.18 In this role, UASs would be a force multiplier – saving time, money and lives. The main area of friction in both of the two hypothetical scenarios listed above is the policy of using military assets to support civil government actions.19 A traditional sticking point for using intelligence type assets in support of civil authorities is the legality of military assets collecting “intelligence data” over the United States. In either of the above roles, the legal challenges are minimized due to the nature of the data collected. This restriction and potential challenges originate from the use of Title 10 assets and also from Executive Order (EO) 12333.20 An additional, but more minor legal issue is the end use of the data. Military collection of data used in support of law enforcement activities could violate the Posse Comitatus Act (PCA).21 Since there is no intention for the data to be used in any type of law enforcement role there should be not be any PCA challenges. C. PROBLEMS AND HYPOTHESES The main hypothesis of this thesis is to determine if UAS assets can and should be used to support civil authorities in response to wildfires or other major natural disasters. Of particular concern is where the assets are sourced as this has a significant impact on how they are employed. The research will show that National Guard UAS assets have fewer complications supporting civil authorities than do active duty assets.22 National Guard assets are also geographically better situated to support requests from civil authorities in response to natural disasters. This study also will show that using mission specific modular payloads for events such as wildfires provides significant benefit in support, while minimizing legal concerns. Crucial to the argument are the technical specifications of the baseline sensor suite integrated into the UAS. The limitations this sensor might produce for the firefighter will have to be mitigated. By looking at available commercial off the shelf (COTS) technology available, it is possible to integrate a sensor on the UAS to meet the firefighter’s requirements.23 It is envisioned that this data will allow firefighters to fight forest fires more efficiently, reducing costs, property damage, and personnel injury/death.

Pyroterrorism is coming now – It’s as bad as nuclear weapons, collapses the economy, readiness, and legitimacy – Preparedness is key

Bendle senior lecturer in History and Communications at James Cook University 08

Mervyn F. Bendle, PhD, is senior lecturer in History and Communications at James Cook University, Queensland Summer 08, [“Australia’s nightmare: bushfire jihad and pyroterrorism,” NATIONAL OBSERVER (Council for the National Interest, Melbourne), No. 79, Summer 2008/09, pages 8-22, http://www.nationalobserver.net/pdf/2009\_australias\_nightmare\_bushfire\_jihad\_and\_pyroterrorism.pdf] E. Liu

A recent review of the historical data reveals that pyroterrorism has been on the rise as a terrorist strategy. Globally, between 1968 and 2005, some 56 terrorist groups employed arson as their principal form of attack, while between 1994 and 2004 the total number of terrorist incidents involving arson increased significantly, with a major jump in deaths and injuries occurring between 2003 and 2004. Robert A. Baird observes: “Not only has the number of injuries increased from 3 to 37, more significantly, the number of fatalities has leaped from 7 to 254. [This] thirty-six-fold increase in fatalities in one year may indicate that terrorists have both the capability and intent to use arson as a terror tactic in the future”.41 This shift in preferred tactics follows the realisation amongst terrorist groups that technically elaborate and logistically complex terrorist attacks have become increasingly untenable following the broad range of effective counter-terrorism measures introduced globally since 9/11. Given the advantages that pyroterrorism has over more highly technical forms of terrorism it is regrettable that it has not received the analytical attention it demands. In fact, what is required is a theoretical and methodological paradigm shift from an emergency-services perspective to a counter-terrorism perspective that gives

Continued below
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Continued from above

proper recognition to the proposition that wild fires can be used as a central component of a terrorist campaign. Such a shift would reflect that already underway in the global jihad movement:42 While [Western societies focus] on the readily apparent scenarios of smuggled nuclear weapons and radiological bombs, al Qaeda is adapting to avoid security and screening systems and is seeking new operational tactics and destructive technologies. Instead of using expensive, complex, and readily detectable nuclear or radiological bombs, future terrorists can easily ignite several massive wildfires to severely damage regional economies, impact military forces, and terrorise the … population. A complementary shift in perspective in response to this shift by the global jihadi movement can provide illuminating insights into the nature of the threat we face. For example, “studies of wildfire conflagrations have shown that they can rival the destructive force of nuclear weapons, giving the terrorist a weapon with the same effect with a great deal less effort and risk”.43 Indeed, the accumulated biomass in the type of forest environment both promoted and protected in Victoria by government policies and by very active and influential conservationist organisations, contains a truly vast amount of latent energy. Consequently, as has recently been observed in connection with the American situation: “The potential destructive energy [that] already exists in the nation’s forests [is] waiting for an opportunistic terrorist to unleash a wildfire and create a conflagration potentially equal to a multi-megaton nuclear weapon”.44 Viewed from a counter-terrorism perspective, such heavily-forested areas, with their enormous fuel loads located in and around significant population centres, constitute, in effect, gigantic improvised explosive devices (IEDs), albeit in a latent form, whose potential destructive power just awaits release by pyroterrorists prepared to unleash the type of hell on earth witnessed in Victoria. Previous examples of this type of highly destructive potential were provided by the Canberra fires and the San Diego conflagration of 2003, both of which caught the attention of terrorist organisations and prefigured the Victorian fires:45 The San Diego Fire Storms of 2003 provide a contemporary example of how certain regions of the country are vulnerable to wildfire terrorism and provide a model to examine the effect of a future pyroterrorist attack on the local population, regionally based US military forces, and the communities that support them. Three arson-induced wildfires called the Cedar, Paradise, and Otay fires, converged in the San Diego area in late October 2003, overwhelming area fire resources. The fires, fuelled by the dry vegetation and fed by the Santa Ana winds, raged across southern California and killed 16 people, burned an estimated 750,000 acres, destroyed an estimated 2,500 homes, and threatened 70,000 other structures. Fortunately, some recent studies in the terrorism, counter-terrorism and related fields have recognised the need for a shift in perspective and have analysed the ways in which a society’s forests and related environmental systems can be made both the object and means of large-scale pyroterrorist attacks.46 Consequently, as one of these articles observes:47 Pyroterrorism has the potential to become a tactic of choice for terrorists…. By harnessing the environment as an operational platform, terrorists can avoid traditional security mechanisms designed to detect sophisticated bombs and biological or chemical agents. A reliance on existing vegetation ensures that both the cost and the inherent risk of a terrorist operation are mitigated. It takes little more than fuel and a combustible tool or a crude incendiary device to start a forest fire given the right environmental conditions. Tragically, such conditions were eminently present and on display in Melbourne on 7 February 2009 — indeed they were even advertised throughout Victoria in connection with the continual warnings in the media about total fire-ban days, and Premier John Brumby himself issued a virtually apocalyptic warning on Friday, 6 February. It is indicative of the shift in perspective required to fully understand the nature of pyroterrorism that such warnings can be seen as serving perversely to further alert and mobilise those groups already planning arson or pyroterrorist attacks, and awaiting the right stimulus and the optimum conditions.48 Therefore, as a hypothetical example, on that dreadful Saturday in Victoria, amid furnace-like heat, and searing, gale-force winds, all that any arsonists or pyroterrorists needed to do was load their incendiary devices, along with their timing or remote-control ignition mechanisms, into a nondescript van or utility, perhaps with one or two trail bikes to facilitate easy access and escape while setting the fires. They could wait until about 10:00am to ensure the weather was indeed as bad as predicted. Then they could head out along the road to places like Whittlesea, Murrindindi or some other ignition points, before turning into any one of the many side-roads that provide access to the mountainous forest areas where the fires can be set to take best advantage of the forest fuel-load, winds, and other conditions. And, of course, this type of activity would be facilitated if the pyroterrorists were familiar with such areas through their previous participation in paramilitary and related forms of training. As the fires tragically revealed, it is a feature of this type of strategy that pyroterrorists can capitalise on the high probability that the responsible authorities (e.g., fire brigade, emergency services, police, health, etc.) will display a low level of coordination and preparedness when faced with such a massive outbreak. In Victoria, this problem expressed itself in various ways, including a failure to implement an early-warning system,49 claims that communities were forgotten or abandoned by the authorities,50 and accusations that the state’s two fire-fighting bodies refused to work together, including claims that the Country Fire Authority refused to allow firefighters from the Metropolitan Fire Brigade to join the fight against the devastating bushfires.51 It is vital, in comprehending the nature of this type of threat, to realise that
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pyroterrorists can also rely on the assumption that such government agencies will be unable quickly to identify the true nature of the fire threat as a deliberate terrorist attack, as opposed to the more random bushfire outbreaks with which they are familiar, and for which they are trained and prepared. Consequently, they may be unable to respond effectively to what transpires to be a carefully planned campaign of destruction, perhaps one that even anticipates their reactions and even targets them. Consequently, authorities might, for example, inadvertently allow a series of fires to build quickly into an all-consuming fire-storm of the sort that ravaged Victoria on the night of 7-8 February, before they realise that the situation has been planned and coordinated to have this effect. This degraded response can be virtually guaranteed if sufficient pressure is also applied to prohibit consideration of such possibilities or to insulate any particular groups or communities from surveillance or suspicion of involvement in such activities. Of course, such an attack would not only be extremely destructive in terms of human life, physical destruction and economic costs, as we have seen. In fact, a successful pyroterrorist attack executed on a sufficiently large scale could also significantly destabilise the political and social systems of the target society, as has been observed in the American case:52 If terrorist organisations use pyroterrorism — publicly assuming responsibility for massive arson-induced firestorms — the devastation would overwhelm suppression resources, weaken regional economies, destroy critical infrastructure, affect readiness in military forces, erode the perception of Homeland Security among the population, and potentially exert political pressure on national leadership for policy change. Governments would be even more seriously compromised if responsibility could be traced back to extremist members of a specific group or community, particularly if that group or community had received, or was perceived as receiving, special treatment or protection by the government, its agencies and the media. Indeed, such action, however apparently well-intentioned it may be, could radically escalate tensions and accelerate the processes of de-legitimisation that could cause major and longterm damage to the society concerned, endangering its most fundamental values and institutions — precisely, in fact, as the pyroterrorists planned.

UAS—NextGen K2 UAV

NextGen Key to Civil UAV implementation

 **JPDO 11** – Joint Planning and Development Office “Operating Unmanned Aircraft Systems in 2018 and Beyond: NextGen Challenges and Opportunities” <http://www.jpdo.gov/newsarticle.asp?id=146>)

The integration of Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS) into the National Airspace System (NAS) is an integral part of the planning and implementation of the Next Generation Air Transportation System (NextGen), the multi-disciplinary effort that will offer a host of air transportation operational, technical, economic, and environmental advantages. Ultimately, NextGen will help the US achieve gains in efficiency and capacity for all users of the NAS. UAS is generally defined as a system whose components include the necessary equipment, communication links, and personnel to control and employ an unmanned aircraft. The UAS is composed of six elements: the UA element, communications element, control element, support element, human element, and payload element. UAS already play a unique role in the safety and security of many US military and civil missions, such as border surveillance, monitoring oil pipelines, and local law enforcement. They have evolved from simple drones and basic models to large sophisticated aircraft. In 2010, UAS access to the NAS, especially for commercial operations, remains restricted due to a lack of appropriate operational procedures, standards, and policies, because the NAS is tailored to accommodate manned aircraft. UAS operate solely under Visual Flight Rules (VFR) and in segregated airspace. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) allows UAS operations on a case-by-case basis. They are treated as aircraft and are required to comply with current Part 91 aircraft operating rules. Due to the diverse utility that UAS offer, their use will increase exponentially in a variety of key military and civil areas. Industry projections for 2018 forecast more than 15,000 UAS in service in the U.S., with a total of almost 30,000 deployed worldwide*[World Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Systems, Market Profile and Forecast 2009-2010; The Teal Group]*. From an operational, infrastructure, and safety perspective, this presents a number of challenges, the solutions to which will involve and impact all NAS constituencies, but ultimately enable a seamless integration of UAS into the NAS. In designing NextGen and planning for a substantial increase in the use of UAS, the FAA considers the most important technical challenge to be developing a safe and efficient way that they can operate in the same airspace as crewed aircraft without creating a hazard either to other aircraft or other objects on the ground. UAS also may not have the ability to respond to Air Traffic Control (ATC)-issued instructions as quickly as manned aircraft. In addition to communications latency, there is the possibility of a total loss of communications. Although current FAA plans for the mid-term dictate that UAS will operate under Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) in Class A, B, and E airspace, plans for the long-term -- beyond 2018 -- specify that they will operate in the NAS using "electronic" IFR.

NextGen helps to integrate UAS <http://www.jpdo.gov/library/20120315_UAS%20RDandD%20Roadmap.pdf>

“UAS today play an increasing role in many public missions such as border surveillance, wildlife surveys, military training, weather monitoring, and local law enforcement.”

Need nextgen to integrate UAS <http://www.faa.gov/about/initiatives/uas/media/uas_fact_sheet.pdf> - the last few paragraphs ( under the bottom Line header)

New NextGen sensors and communications solve UAV use

Goure, Vice President with the Lexington Institute, 11

Daniel Goure, Vice President with the Lexington Institute, held senior positions in both the private sector and the U.S. Government. Most recently, he was a member of the 2001 Department of Defense Transition Team. Dr. Goure spent two years in the U.S. Government as the director of the Office of Strategic Competitiveness in the Office of the Secretary of Defense. He also served as a senior analyst on national security and defense issues with the Center for Naval Analyses, Science Applications International Corporation, SRS Technologies, R&D Associates and System Planning Corporation, 1-20-11, [“Bringing Unmanned Aerial Vehicles To the Skies Over You,” Lexington Institute Early Warning Blog,

http://www.lexingtoninstitute.org/bringing-unmanned-aerial-vehicles-to-the-skies-over-you?a=1&c=1171] E. Liu

The explosive growth in the military’s use of UAVs overseas has not been matched by a similar increase in their use at home. The potential uses for UAVs at home are almost unlimited. Unfortunately, the agency responsible for formulating the regulations that would govern the flight of UAVs in the homeland, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has been excruciatingly slow in moving forward on this important issue. As a result, even the U.S. military and the Department of Homeland Security are severely restricted in their ability to employ UAVs for mission such as border surveillance or airspace security. The central issue is how to integrate UAVs into an already crowded airspace. This includes defining minimum performance standards for UAVs, establishing requirements for collision avoidance, determining the role and qualifications for UAV operators and figuring out the “rules of the road” when both manned and unmanned vehicles are near one another. This sounds like an overwhelming task. However, it is worthwhile remembering that we have established acceptable rules for the wide range of commercial and private air traffic, including jet and propeller-driven aircraft as well as helicopters. Still, according to the National Transportation Safety Board there were some 3,000 aviation-related accidents in the United States in 2009, not including those involving vehicles flown by federal, state and local governments. What is desperately needed is the development and validation of “sense and avoid” systems that would allow unmanned systems to operate safely when manned aviation platforms are present. The FAA needs to be much more aggressive in its testing of UAVs and current surveillance and safety systems and in developing rules that allow reasonable use of UAV in the skies over the United States. How many of the deaths and injuries associated with those 3,000 plus aviation accidents in 2009 could have been avoided by the use of UAVs? The FAA has a program called NextGen which will use advanced satellite-based technologies to allow improved surveillance and management of U.S. airspace. NextGen is primarily focused on managing manned aviation operations. The use of advanced sensor and communications technologies is intended to allow aircraft to operate with reduced separation, thereby enabling more aircraft to be in the air at the same time. The NextGen vision needs to be extended to encompass UAVs as well so that reasonable flight rules and advanced surveillance and response technologies can be used to exploit this revolution in aviation.

Agency coord is key to UAVs

GAO, 08

GAO, United States Government Accountability Office, 5-08, [“UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS Federal Actions Needed to Ensure Safety and Expand Their Potential Uses within the National Airspace System,” www.gao.gov/new.items/d08511.pdf] E. Liu

Coordinating the efforts of numerous federal agencies, academic institutions, and private-sector entities that have UAS expertise or a stake in routine access to the national airspace system is a challenge. As discussed above, several federal agencies are involved to varying degrees in UAS issues. Additionally, academic institutions have UAS expertise to contribute and UAS manufacturers have a stake in supplying the demand for UASs that routine access could create. FAA and experts referenced the Access-5 program that, in the past, served as an overarching coordinating body and provided a useful community forum. While some experts believe that Access-5’s focus on high-altitude, long-endurance UASs is no longer appropriate, the program’s institutional arrangements demonstrated how federal government and the private-sector resources could be combined to focus on a common goal. Stakeholders and experts we surveyed believe that coordination and focus are lacking among the diverse entities working on UAS issues, and expressed concerns that the potential public and economic benefits of UASs could be delayed while FAA develops the safety regulations required to enable routine UASs operations in the national airspace system. They noted the numerous potential uses in public safety, law enforcement, weather forecasting, and national security, discussed previously, stating that these benefits will be delayed until standards are developed. Some also noted that economic benefits realized through industry growth and productivity gains in the commercial sector would also be delayed. Additionally, some experts believe that, at the current pace of progress, the United States would lose its leadership position and manufacturers would move to other countries where the regulatory climate is more receptive. However, as previously noted, an industry forecast indicates that the United States will account for about two-thirds of the worldwide UAS research and development in the coming decade.

UAS—Squo Doesn’t Solve

UAS flights now cause accidents, collisions and hacking

Van Dyk, Department of Systems and Information Engineering in the School of Engineering and Applied Science at the University of Virginia, et al., 12

Ryan N. Van Dyk, Department of Systems and Information Engineering in the School of Engineering and Applied Science at the University of Virginia, et al., Pariseau, Daniel H. ; Dodson, Richard E. ; Martin, Brendan T. ; Radcliffe, Alexander T. ; Austin, Eni A. ; Haimes, Yacov Y. ; Andrijcic, Eva ; Guo, Zhenyu ; Werner, Jin H., 4-12, [“Systems Integration of Unmanned Aircraft into the National Airspace: Part of the Federal Aviation Administration Next Generation Air Transportation System,” Systems and Information Design Symposium (SIEDS), 2012 IEEE, http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/xpls/abs\_all.jsp?arnumber=6215142] E. Liu

UAS operations pose various threats to the stability of the NAS in terms of the safety of planes, passengers on the ground, and people and places near airports. Several riskscenarios could leave aircraft vulnerable to mid-air or runway collisions with other aircraft or collisions with stationary structures, leading to injuries, deaths, and property damage [5]. Although this risk is present with manned aircraft, it is expected to increase with UAS given the lack of an on-board human operator and the resulting inability to directly sense and avoid other aircraft [6]. Furthermore, UAS are susceptible to malicious hijackers who aim to perform terrorist attacks on communication networks, buildings, and people [7].

NAS: National Air Space

Current process for UAS is restrictive and slow – Can’t deal with coming demand

Roberts, directs MITRE's independent research and development programs in civil aviation and air traffic management,

11

Glenn Roberts, directs MITRE's independent research and development programs in civil aviation and air traffic management, 5-11, [“Research Challenge: The Next Generation Air Transportation System (NextGen),” The MITRE Corporation, www.mitre.org/work/tech\_papers/2011/11\_2464/11\_2464.pdf] E. Liu

Exploring Cooperative Airspace Concepts for UAS Integration (MSR)

Given projected increases in UAS utilization over the next 25 years, there is a compelling national need for a safe, secure, and scalable means of routinely integrating UAS into civil airspace. At present, UAS integration is neither routine nor scalable; it requires petitions to the FAA, issuance of FAA waivers, and the establishment, adherence to, and enforcement of segregated airspace and operational restrictions. While these temporary restrictions have succeeded in maintaining a high level of safety, the expected increase of both manned and unmanned aircraft in the NextGen timeframe suggests that seamless operation and integration of UAS and other aircraft within all domains of the NAS is a functional requirement that must be addressed.

UAS use now is case-by-case and non-commercial

Cox et al., 12

Vicki Cox, Senior Vice President, NextGen, et al., lots of people in the FAA, DoD, NASA, and other, 3-15-12, [“Next Generation Air Transportation System Unmanned Aircraft Systems Research, Development and Demonstration Roadmap,” Joint Planning and Development Office, http://www.jpdo.gov/library/20120315\_UAS%20RDandD%20Roadmap.pdf] E. Liu

UAS have evolved from simple radio controlled model airplanes to sophisticated aircraft that today play a unique role in many public missions such as border surveillance, weather monitoring, military training, wildlife surveys and local law enforcement, and have the potential to do so for many civil missions as well. However, the current NAS is designed around the use of manned aircraft, and UAS access to the NAS, especially for commercial operations, remains restricted. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) currently allows UAS operations on a case-by-case basis under an FAA Certificate of Approval or Waiver (COA), based on the capabilities of the particular UAS. Public entities—law enforcement, Department of Defense (DOD), Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and universities—may gain access to civil airspace for a UAS by applying for a COA. Special airworthiness certificates are available to civil operators for experimental purposes, which unfortunately precludes operations for compensation or hire.

UAS—Now is key for NextGen

Huge surge of UAS production is coming – NextGen is key to integration

Cox et al., 12

Vicki Cox, Senior Vice President, NextGen, et al., lots of people in the FAA, DoD, NASA, and other, 3-15-12, [“Next Generation Air Transportation System Unmanned Aircraft Systems Research, Development and Demonstration Roadmap,” Joint Planning and Development Office, http://www.jpdo.gov/library/20120315\_UAS%20RDandD%20Roadmap.pdf] E. Liu

According to industry forecasts, UAS operations will increase exponentially in a variety of key military and civil areas. About 50 U.S. companies, universities, and government organizations in the U.S. are developing over 150 different unmanned aircraft designs. Projections for 2010 to 2019 predict more than 20,000 UAS produced in the U.S., with a total of more than 35,000 2 produced worldwide2 . From an operational, infrastructure and safety perspective, this presents a number of challenges due to the diversity of aircraft, control stations, levels of autonomy, and communications methods. UAS span a wide spectrum of size, endurance, and performance characteristics, often different from manned aircraft. The solutions to these challenges will affect all NAS constituencies, but they will ultimately enable seamless integration of UAS in the NextGen NAS.

Massive civilian demand for UAs coming now, but new sensing is key to its success

Roberts, directs MITRE's independent research and development programs in civil aviation and air traffic management,

11

Glenn Roberts, directs MITRE's independent research and development programs in civil aviation and air traffic management, 5-11, [“Research Challenge: The Next Generation Air Transportation System (NextGen),” The MITRE Corporation, www.mitre.org/work/tech\_papers/2011/11\_2464/11\_2464.pdf] E. Liu

In recent years unmanned aircraft systems (UAS ) have become a critical component of our nation’s defense strategy. The Department of Defense’s (DoD’s) demand for UAS has grown exponentially, with the various branches of the military shifting their acquisition strategies strongly toward the use of unmanned aircraft for reconnaissance and other missions that are “dull, dirty or dangerous.” Industry experts see this military trend as presaging an even larger trend toward applying UAS to such domestic tasks as law enforcement, traffic monitoring, real estate sales, and crop dusting. Together, these emerging civilian applications and the needs of the military have produced a groundswell of interest in flying UAS intermingled with other civilian aircraft in the NAS. One major area of concern, however, is that all of the systems, rules, regulations, standards, concepts, tools, technologies, and procedures underpinning today’s air traffic management (ATM) systems were developed under the assumption of manned cockpit operations. In fact, the underlying concept of “see and avoid” assumes there is a pilot in the cockpit who is ultimately responsible for situational awareness and avoidance of surrounding aircraft. By contrast, in nearly all of today’s UAS operations the pilot operates the aircraft from a ground-based control station, using a command and control (C2) communications link to relay flight instructions in real time. A fundamental research question, therefore, concerns how to replace the traditional “see-and-avoid” function with an equally safe and effective “sense-and-avoid” function for UAS.

UAS—Solvency—Collision Avoidance

NextGen provides sensors and processes that allow automated UAS collision avoidance

Roberts, directs MITRE's independent research and development programs in civil aviation and air traffic management,

11

Glenn Roberts, directs MITRE's independent research and development programs in civil aviation and air traffic management, 5-11, [“Research Challenge: The Next Generation Air Transportation System (NextGen),” The MITRE Corporation, www.mitre.org/work/tech\_papers/2011/11\_2464/11\_2464.pdf] E. Liu

Present-day “sense-and-avoid” initiatives seek to mitigate collision risks through self-separation (i.e., the capability of UAS to remain “well clear” and safely separated from other traffic) and collision avoidance (i.e., the capability of both manned and unmanned aircraft to prevent collisions in cases where safe separation is lost by executing extreme maneuvers just prior to closest point of approach). Using sensors either on board the aircraft (i.e., airborne-based) or situated on the ground (i.e., ground-based), “sense and avoid” approaches obtain traffic-situational awareness information and then directly (via onboard automation) or indirectly (via remote pilot action) move to ensure self-separation and collision avoidance. This research explores the viability of cooperative airspace concepts through an initial focus on cooperative autonomous “sense-and-avoid” (CASA) applications. Through a progressive series of experiments and flight demonstrations, we intend to explore the technical and operational issues associated with autonomously ensuring a separation distance that both meets the “well clear” safety criteria and considers mission constraints and limitations in the presence of both cooperative and non-cooperative aircraft. The Next Generation Air Transportation System (NextGen) 13 CASA refers to an implementation alternative where airborne equipment receives position information for or from all local traffic and onboard automation then detects potential separation conflicts and/or collision hazards, determines the appropriate maneuver, executes the maneuver, and determines when to return to course. The remote pilot could override the autonomous maneuver if necessary; however, no direct pilot action is required to initiate it. This pilot-on-theloop architecture is not susceptible to vulnerabilities and latency in the C2 link, but the inherent complexity of assuring correct operation and certifying it for safety-of-life application introduces nontrivial development and safety risks. During the initial phase of this multiyear project, we intend to demonstrate the feasibility of cooperative autonomous separation assurance using small, lightweight (under 55 pound) UAS platforms in restricted airspace. Specifically, small UAS equipped with first-generation CASA algorithms and supported by currently available technologies (such as ADS-B, GPS/Wide Area Augmentation System [WAAS], and Universal Access Transceiver [UAT] Beacon Radio [UBR]) will (1) identify an imminent breach of “well clear” safety criteria; (2) determine a safe, platformappropriate maneuver; (3) execute the maneuver autonomously; and then (4) return to mission profile in an efficient manner without intervention from the ground station or other control facility. This initial phase will directly inform subsequent phases that focus on second-generation CASA algorithms and a surrogate UAS platform operating within non-exclusionary airspace. In both phases, flight demonstrations will show stakeholders how readily-available technology can be integrated to provide effective, affordable, cooperative, autonomous separation assurance. Furthermore, these efforts will enable an enhanced understanding of the relationship between different classes of UAS and “well clear” safety criteria, while providing an opportunity to investigate safe methods for communicating positional information for non-cooperative aircraft. Through these field deployments and evaluations, we will explore technical and operational issues. The data generated can help inform policy decisions in the aviation community, bring “sense and avoid” concepts and architectures to maturity, and realize the promise of NextGen avoidance systems.

UAS—Solvency—Communication

NextGen is key to UAS communication and deal with future increases in their use

Ayhan, Sr. Software Engineer at Boeing, et al., 11

Samet Ayhan, Sr. Software Engineer at Boeing, et al., Paul Comitz, David Sweet, Les Robinson, Pam Arkebauer, 11, [“THE NEO SPIRAL II PROGRAM: AN FAA/INDUSTRY EXPLORATION OF UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEM INTEGRATION IN THE NATIONAL AIRSPACE SYSTEM ,” www.hafnerengineering.com/papers/NEO\_DASC-2011\_Final.pdf] E. Liu

Unmanned Aircraft (UA) represent an increasingly important and relevant subset of NAS operators from a military, homeland security, research, and commercial perspective. Current access to the NAS is only given to UAs based on a case-bycase basis using Certificates of Authorization (COAs), which tend to follow a tedious and lengthy approval process. Given the expected increase in unmanned aircraft operations in the future NextGen NAS, more dynamic access procedures are needed that would allow UAS operators to file flight plans and be able to dynamically change routes and intent while in the air. As stated in the Joint Planning and Development (JPDO) Net-Centric Concept of Operations: “It is expected that the presence of UAS will increase substantially 33.. in the NextGen environment, including non-military UAS, which may be used for such activities as transporting goods, conducting scientific research, pipeline reconnaissance, forest-fire monitoring, and more. The net-centric environment of NextGen will be crucial for enabling the communications between UAS avionics and Ground Control Stations (GCS) and-or UAS crews, and between ATC and GCS.” [2]

UAS—Solvency—Information

NextGen provides more information that allows for UAS integration

Lacher, Unmanned Aircraft System (UAS) Integration Lead and Research Strategist in MITRE's Center for Advanced Aviation System Development, et al., 10

Andrew Lacher, Unmanned Aircraft System (UAS) Integration Lead and Research Strategist in MITRE's Center for Advanced Aviation System Development, et al., Andrew Zeitlin, David Maroney, Kelly Markin, Duane Ludwig, and Joe Boyd, 2-1-10, [“Airspace Integration Alternatives for Unmanned Aircraft ,” Presented at AUVSI's Unmanned Systems Asia-Pacific 2010, www.mitre.org/work/tech\_papers/2010/10\_0090/] E. Liu

While accommodating new types of aircraft is an explicit goal of NextGen [54], so far the concepts do not directly address the integration of unmanned aircraft in the NextGen timeframe. Some specific concepts envisioned for NextGen may be particularly suited for facilitating the integration of unmanned aircraft into civil airspace, including [56]:  Trajectory-Based Operations (TBO): In the TBO concept each aircraft’s expected flight profile and time information (such as departure and arrival times) is the basis for air traffic management and ATC. The specificity of four-dimensional trajectories (4DTs) matches the mode of operations and the requirements of the airspace in which an aircraft operates. A major benefit of 4DT is that it enables service providers and operators to assess the effects of proposed trajectories and resource allocation plans, allowing both service providers and operators to understand the implications of demand and identify where constraints need further mitigation.  Equivalent Visual Operations (EVO): Improved information availability allows aircraft to conduct operations without reliance on visibility or direct visual observation. For aircraft, this capability, in combination with position, navigation, and timing information, enables increased accessibility, both on the airport surface and during arrival and departure operations. This capability also enables those providing services at airports (such as ATM or other ramp services) to provide services in all visibility conditions, leading to more predictable and efficient operations. [16] Work in the aviation community is needed to ensure that unmanned aircraft unique operational capabilities and integration requirements are included in the NextGen concept development and evolution.

UAS—Solvency—Interagency Cooperation

### NextGen creates interagency cooperation that’s also key to UAS integration

GAO, 08

GAO, United States Government Accountability Office, 5-08, [“UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS Federal Actions Needed to Ensure Safety and Expand Their Potential Uses within the National Airspace System,” www.gao.gov/new.items/d08511.pdf] E. Liu

In addition to FAA, DOD, TSA, and GSA, other federal agencies, academia, and the private sector also have UAS expertise or a stake in obtaining routine UAS access to the national airspace system. For example, RTCA notes that developing standards will require collaboration with DOD’s joint integrated product team and technical expertise from staff in MITRE’s Center for Advanced Aviation System Development. DOD seeks expanded access to the national airspace and, as previously discussed, has extensive experience with operating its own UASs. Beyond DOD and FAA, other entities also have UAS expertise or a stake in achieving routine UAS access to the national airspace system. For example, DHS’s CBP and Coast Guard need UAS access to the national airspace system to perform their missions. Several academic institutions have been involved in developing UAS technology in areas such as vehicle design and detect, sense, and avoid capability. Additionally, the private sector has a stake in being ready to respond to the anticipated market that could emerge when FAA makes routine access available to most UASs. Although FAA’s UAPO serves as a focal point within FAA, the office has no authority over other agencies’ efforts. Experts and stakeholders suggested that an overarching body might facilitate progress toward integrating UASs into the national airspace system. DOD, as the major user of UASs, is taking such an approach. DOD has recognized the need for coordination of UAS activities within its own sphere of influence, as each service has recognized the value of UASs for its respective missions. Consequently, DOD established an Unmanned Aircraft Systems Task Force to coordinate critical issues related to UAS acquisition and management within DOD. According to DOD, the task force will establish new teams or lead or coordinate existing Army, Navy, and Air Force teams to enhance operations, enable interdependencies, and streamline acquisitions. FAA is participating in a joint integrated product team that is part of this task force, and DOD has invited DHS to join the task force. The European Defense Agency has also recognized the challenge of channeling diverse entities, as well as multiple nation-states, toward the common goal of UAS access to non-segregated airspace. In January 2008, the agency announced that it had awarded a contract to a consortium of defense and aerospace companies to develop a detailed roadmap for integrating, by 2015, UASs into European airspace. The project is intended to help European stakeholders such as airworthiness authorities, air traffic management bodies, procurement agencies, industry, and research institutes to develop a joint agenda for common European UAS activities. The consortium held its first workshop in February 2008 and has since prepared a roadmap outline based on the needs and requirements expressed by the stakeholders. The consortium has also identified as a baseline, key actions to be undertaken and key topics for further investigation. The consortium has invited stakeholders to discuss this common baseline at a second workshop, scheduled for May 2008. Congress addressed a similar coordination challenge in 2003 when it passed legislation to create JPDO to plan for and coordinate a transformation of the nation’s current air traffic control system to the next generation air transportation system (NextGen) by 2025. NextGen involves a complex mix of precision satellite navigation; digital, networked communications; an integrated weather system; layered, adaptive security; and more. NextGen’s coordination and planning challenges are similar to those posed by UASs. For example, as required for UAS integration, the expertise and technology required for NextGen resides in several federal agencies, academia, and the private sector. DOD has expertise in “network centric” systems, originally developed for the battlefield, which are being considered as a framework to provide all users of the national airspace system with a common view of that system. JPDO’s responsibilities include coordinating goals, priorities, and research activities of several partner agencies, including DOD, FAA, the Department of Commerce, DHS, and NASA with aviation and aeronautical firms. Congress directed JPDO to prepare an integrated plan that would include, among other things, a national vision statement and a multiagency research and development roadmap for creating NextGen. The legislation called for the roadmap to identify obstacles, the research and development necessary to overcome them, and the roles of each agency, corporations, and universities.

UAS—A2 No Integration Solutions Now

Research through ConOps identifies and solves gaps in implementation

Cox et al., 12

Vicki Cox, Senior Vice President, NextGen, et al., lots of people in the FAA, DoD, NASA, and other, 3-15-12, [“Next Generation Air Transportation System Unmanned Aircraft Systems Research, Development and Demonstration Roadmap,” Joint Planning and Development Office, http://www.jpdo.gov/library/20120315\_UAS%20RDandD%20Roadmap.pdf] E. Liu

The FAA is developing a ConOps for the integration of UAS operations in the NextGen NAS, which will provide the vision of how these aircraft will be integrated with other NAS operations in the NextGen environment. Following a standard system engineering process, the ConOps should be used to derive a set of technical, operational, regulatory, and other requirements. These concept-level requirements will aid in prioritizing research activities as well as identifying any research gaps that may exist. In addition, a ConOps provides decisionmakers a reference for assessing the feasibility of candidate concepts and their relationship to other aspects of the operational environment. The FAA’s Civil UAS Integration Roadmap will define a transition from today to the integrated vision described in the ConOps, supported with R&D that will be identified through the NextGen UAS RD&D Roadmap activities. The NASA UAS in the NAS project has provided documentation of its initial UAS Concept of ConOps to the FAA, as a prospective starting point for the FAA’s development of a ConOps. The DOD has also provided operational scenarios to the FAA from the DOD UAS ConOps effort to assist with development of the FAA UAS ConOps. NASA is currently executing a five-year, multidisciplinary UAS in the NAS research project. UAS in the NAS research activities address many of the challenges presented in this NextGen UAS RD&D Roadmap, and NASA is fully engaged in the Roadmap activity as a means of leveraging the research of other agencies and fully engaging the R&D community to accomplish program objectives.

\*\*\*Case

Case—Inherency

NextGen could cost a hundred billion dollars or more, but the government has only funded enough money for a “drop in the bucket.” They won’t provide the big investment that’s ultimately necessary – that’s Holeywell and Lippman 12.

Aviation operators’ reluctance to invest in incomplete infrastructure renders the project useless

Salam 12

Sakib bin Salam, Policy Intern at Eno Center for Transportation, “NextGen: Aligning Costs, Benefits, and Political Leadership,” April 2012.

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

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

Budget cuts are causing NextGen cut backs

GAO, 2011 [“NEXT GENERATION AIR TRANSPORTATION

Collaborative Efforts with European Union Generally Mirror Effective Practices, but Near-Term Challenges Could Delay Implementation” Report to Congressional Requesters, <http://www.gao.gov/assets/590/581393.pdf>]

Delays in program implementation, as described above, and budget constraints have also affected FAA’s capital budget planning. The Administration has proposed reducing FAA’s capital budget by a total of $2.8 billion, or 20 percent, for fiscal years 2012 through 2015 largely due to governmentwide budget constraints. Most of this proposed reduction is on NextGen and NextGen-related spending, as reflected in FAA’s revised 5-year Capital Investment Plan for fiscal years 2012 through 2016. Congress has not completed FAA’s appropriation for fiscal year 2012, but current House and Senate appropriation bills propose to fund the agency near or above 2011 levels. FAA will have to balance its priorities to ensure that NextGen implementation stays on course while also sustaining the current infrastructure—which is needed to prevent failures and maintain the reliability and efficiency of current operations. To maintain credibility with aircraft operators that NextGen will be implemented, FAA must deliver systems and capabilities on time so that operators have incentives to invest in the avionics that will enable NextGen to operate as planned. As we have previously reported, a past FAA program’s cancellation contributed to skepticism about FAA’s commitment to follow through with its plans. That industry skepticism, which we have found lingers today, could delay the time when significant NextGen benefits—such as increased capacity and more direct, fuel- saving routing—are realized. A number of NextGen benefits depend upon having a critical mass of properly equipped aircraft. Reaching that critical mass is a significant challenge because the first aircraft operators to equip will not obtain a return on their investment until many other operators also equip.
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Case—Inherency—Ext

Despite FAA reauthorization, NextGen is still underfunded and faces congressional obstacles.

Carey 12 (Bill Carey is senior editor with Aviation International News, based in Washington, D.C. He covers the airline and defense industries as well as business aviation.)

The FAA reauthorization legislation passed by Congress and signed by the President in February after more than four years of delay and 23 temporary extensions is a good-news-and-bad news story, Jones said. The good news: it finally provides the FAA with funding stability of $63 billion over four years, with $11 billion directed to ATC modernization. It moves forward “discrete” NextGen programs such as ADS-B and DataComm, and provides a “first framework” for the introduction of unmanned aircraft into civilian airspace. “The bad news,” Jones said, “is that out of the $11 billion designated for modernization of the ATC system in February, only about one-third, or $4 billion, will likely be dedicated to NextGen programs and will require four years of annual Congressional appropriations.” He then begged the question: did anybody in the room really believe our broken, ineffectual Congress could make that happen?

Government budget cuts and industry skepticism could derail NextGen

GAO, 2011 [“NEXT GENERATION AIR TRANSPORTATION

Collaborative Efforts with European Union Generally Mirror Effective Practices, but Near-Term Challenges Could Delay Implementation” Report to Congressional Requesters, <http://www.gao.gov/assets/590/581393.pdf>]

The continuing skepticism among industry stakeholders about FAA’s commitment to follow through on its plans elevates the importance of providing these stakeholders with more detailed information on the agency’s efforts toward interoperability and in particular, on the structure and processes laid out in the 2011 MOC’s Annex 1. These details could allow stakeholders to judge for themselves whether interoperability efforts are moving ahead deliberately, as planned, and provide assurances that FAA is serious about collaborating on interoperability and implementing NextGen. Providing this assurance could help to mitigate stakeholders’ skepticism about whether or when NextGen and SESAR benefits will be realized and alleviate airlines’ hesitancy to equip with new technology. As Congress works to reduce the federal debt, we believe that it will be important for FAA to provide current information on how budget decisions will affect the progress of NextGen, as well as for stakeholders to understand how any changes in planned funding will affect their realization of NextGen benefits.

 Budget cuts put NextGen implementation at risk.

Turner 7/18

(Aimee Turner, Staff writer, Air Traffic Management, “Sequestration’s ‘crippling’ effect on NextGen: AIA,” 7/18/12, http://www.airtrafficmanagement.net/2012/07/sequestrations-crippling-effect-on-nextgen-aia/)

The devastating cuts to US defence spending set to impact in a matter of months could cripple a number of non-defence programmes including the Next Generation Air Transportation System, according to a US aerospace industry expert.

Richard Efford, a legal affairs chief at the US industry group Aerospace Industries Association insists that US attempts to balance the budget through the 2011 Budget Control Act could mean a potential loss of $1 billion or more from the Federal Aviation Administration’s (FAA) budget to overhaul its air traffic control system. “The FAA – the agency responsible for monitoring and safely guiding 85,000 aircraft each day through our nation’s skies – has never faced a budget cut of this magnitude,” said Efford. “Because the NextGen portfolio provides state-of-the-art capabilities, it will be hit the hardest. AIA believes that as a result of sequestration, NextGen could lose 30-50 per cent of its funding, not the eight per cent many believe,” said Efford who reasons that to protect the operating accounts, FAA could be forced to slash the budgets of its procurement and research programmes. At a US Congressional hearing on aviation to  to review the FAA’s Contract Tower programme today, the chief operating office of the Air Traffic Organization David Grizzle was grilled on the likely impact of the budget cuts – or sequestration – on the FAA service. “We have received no specific direction as to the impact of sequestration on the FAA. We have done a great deal of internal planning looking at different scenarios and how we would be required to shift our priorities in the event that different sequestration scenarios came into place,” he told the hearing. “We have not begun sharing those with anyone because we are not far enough along in designing those priorities. But suffice it to say that it would require a significant re-prioritisation of what we currently do. It could be a large impact, we just don’t know. We are in communication with various parts of the Administration and our perceptions are developing.” Efford points to Congressional Budget Office estimates that non-defence agencies would suffer an immediate 7.8 per cent budget cut from sequestration with Center for Budget and Policy Priorities’ estimates coming in even higher at 9.1 per cent.“Two-thirds of FAA’s budget is allocated to operating expenses – most of which pays the salaries of air traffic controllers, safety inspectors and other federal employees whose skills are required each day to ensure safe flights of aircraft through US airspace,” said Gifford. “The House Appropriations Committee’s Democratic staff estimated that sequestration would cause the layoff of 1,200 air traffic controllers, the closure of almost 250 airport control towers and the loss of 600 safety inspectors and certification staff.” Efford said it is unlikely that senior officials will allow a nationwide layoff of air traffic controllers that will have a large negative impact on the US economy. “An option the agency could exercise to prevent this from happening is the ‘transfer authority’ provided in its annual appropriations bills that could be used to modify sequestration’s across-the-board cuts,” he said. Even so, Efford argues that forcing today’s air travellers to choose between today’s flight and tomorrow’s safety and efficiency is a poor choice. “The shock wave of sequestration will rattle windows far beyond the Pentagon’s walls, shaking our vital domestic programmes and technologies to their core,” he said. The FAA’s David Grizzle told the aviation hearing: “We are committed to maintaining the highest level of safety and we will not undertake any change that will diminish that.”

NextGen is losing investor confidence due to cost overruns and delays.

Salam 12

Sakib bin Salam, Policy Intern at Eno Center for Transportation, “NextGen: Aligning Costs, Benefits, and Political Leadership,” April 2012.

On-board equipage could allow improved decision-making capabilities and accessibility during adverse weather, as well as better data communications between cockpit and ATC. This more precise system has the potential to reduce the minimum aircraft separation standard and allow more direct flight patterns, thus decreasing fuel consumption, carbon emissions, and congestion.

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

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

Congress won’t enact NextGen

Salam, April [Sakib bin, Policy Intern at Eno Center for Transportation, “NextGen: Aligning Costs, Benefits, and Political Leadership,” April 2012.]

A fifth problem facing NextGen is lack of Congressional political leadership in prioritizing a project of such potential value. In July 2011 the House of Representatives passed a short-term extension bill that failed to pass the senate, resulting in a shutdown that lasted a fortnight. The AATF received no tax revenues during the shutdown. As Con­gressional leaders argued over the Essential Air Services program, the trust fund lost over $400 million in foregone tax revenues. Those are funds that could have potentially been used towards an investment like NextGen. Further­more, according to the FAA some of the NextGen program delays can be attributed to the furlough of some of the FAA employees in July 2011 and a freeze on contractor funding which resulted in work stoppage orders for several projects.3 This impact of the impasse on NextGen was also docu­mented on the GAO report on the FAA’s NextGen cost-management.4 In order for NextGen to succeed, there must be greater certainty about potential benefits and costs. In the highly competitive low profit-margin airline industry, few want to take on the burden of paying for something that spreads speculative benefits so widely. It will also be essential to have a mechanism that raises sufficient capital for NextGen infrastructure in a transparent and equitable manner, while imposing minimal burdens on those who pay for it. Without a sustainable, stable, and reliable strategy for both continued infrastructural improvements and incentives for equipage, there is no guarantee that NextGen can be implemented in a timely and cost-effective manner. Without strong politi­cal leadership, a clear and unbiased delineation of costs and benefits, a transparent source of funds, and incentives for operators to equip, it is unlikely that NextGen benefits can be delivered in a timely manner if at all.

NextGen’s funding won’t be continued.

Dorgan and Hunter 6/4

Byron Dorgan, Arent Fox LLP senior policy adviser and co-chair of the firm’s Government Relations Department, and James Hunter, Government Relations Director at the firm. “Federal Aviation Administration Bill Will Help the Economy,” 6/4/12.

Like the highway bill, the FAA bill is a multiyear infrastructure bill that authorizes federal funding and user-fee derived revenue to support our national transportation system. It helps fund runways, airport expansions, technology upgrades, surveillance systems, and other parts of our aviation infrastructure. This, in turn, helps employ engineers, construction workers, technology specialists, researchers, and many other Americans in jobs tied directly and indirectly to aviation. To be sure, there are limits to what the FAA bill will accomplish. Funding for the FAA through 2015 will likely be flat, or at best achieve minimal growth, and there are major regulatory and financial hurdles to overcome before NextGen can be completed. Still, the bill makes significant changes to aviation policy that will have positive consequences for the aviation industry and the economy at large, and it stands as a good example of what lawmakers can accomplish if they work together cooperatively.

Case—Growing Aviation Demand

America can’t meet growing aviation demand

Pearce 2006 [Robert A., Mr. Pearce is a NASA executive serving as the Acting Director of the Next Generation Air Transportation System Joint Planning and Development Office. For the past two years, Mr. Pearce served as the Deputy Director of the office.

Previously, Mr. Pearce was responsible for strategy and program development for NASA’s Aeronautics Research Mission Directorate. January- March, ATCA Journal of Air Traffic Control.“The Next Generation Air Transportation System: Transformation Starts Now” <http://www.jpdo.gov/library/ngats_transformation.pdf>]

There is already consensus on our starting point. The current U.S. aviation system cannot meet 21st century needs. That was the conclusion of numerous studies and blue ribbon panels, including most recently, the National Research Council and the Walker Commission on the Future of the United States Aerospace Industry. And if we do not quickly take action, things could get much worse and the effect on our economy and global leadership in aviation could be devastating. We already have a capacity tinder box, not just at traditional hot spots like O’Hare, but throughout the entire system. Think of new choke points like Atlanta, Phoenix and even Ft. Lauderdale. The list keeps growing. Most forecasts show that 20 years from now there will be two to three times the passengers, flights and cargo. The FAA predicts that even more airports will be congested in the 2020 time frame. By then, eight metro areas and 19 airports will need more capacity, and an additional 23 may need more. Meanwhile, low-cost carriers, which use smaller aircraft that carry fewer passengers, are now major players, and are sending the number of daily domestic operations through the ceiling at airports like Dulles. Throw in a mix of new aircraft such as very light jets, jet taxis and unmanned aerial vehicles and there is the making of gridlock in our skies. We could even lose the cherished ability to fly anywhere on the same day. Clearly, the existing system was not designed to meet this growing demand for air service. It was not designed to handle all of the new security enhancements that were layered over old ones. It was not designed to allow for anything the future can throw at us. The paradigms we have relied upon for almost 50 years cannot accommodate the massive change that has already begun.
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Case—Growing Aviation Demand—Ext

**NGATS must be enacted**

**Arbuckle et al, 06** [Doug, January-March Issue of the ACTA Journal of Air Traffic Control, <http://www.jpdo.gov/library/vision_2025_air_trans.pdf>]

Today’s U.S. air transportation system1 is under stress. The demands on air transportation are outpacing our ability to increase system capacity. Operating and maintenance costs of the air traffic system are outpacing revenues and the air carrier industry is going through a period of dramatic change. Security requirements established in the wake of the 9-11 attacks significantly impact costs and the ability to efficiently move people and cargo. In addition, growth in air transportation is provoking community concerns over aircraft noise, pollution, and congestion. Adapting our current air transportation paradigm will not be sufficient to meet these challenges. Instead, transformation of today’s system is required to ensure a healthy, environmentally friendly, globally interoperable air transportation system for 2025. Over the past two years, the Joint Planning and Development Office has developed strategies for developing the Next Generation Air Transportation System (NGATS). The NGATS vision for 2025 enables the safe, efficient and reliable movement of large numbers of people and goods throughout the air transportation system in a way that is consistent with national security objectives. Our NGATS vision is founded upon an underlying set of principles and enabled by a series of key capabilities that will free the U.S of many current system constraints, support a wider range of operations, and deliver an overall system capacity up to 3 times current operating levels.

Case—Economy—Congestion Now

Airport congestion crushes American economy – NextGen is key to solve

Schank 6/23/12

[Joshua L. Schank President & CEO Eno Center for Transportation http://www.enotrans.org/eno-brief/the-federal-role-in-transportation-four-ideas-for-greater-federal-involvement]

We often think of airports as local economic generators, and they are that, but some also have substantial national importance. The aviation network is dependent on large hub airports for the efficient and timely movement of passengers across the country and the world. A safe and reliable aviation network is essential for maintaining our competitiveness in the global economy. Unfortunately, we are in danger of losing our edge in this area because of congestion. Successful NextGen implementation could greatly alleviate the problem, but even if that happens airlines could take advantage of the new capacity and provide more frequent flights. Once economic growth picks up again we are likely to see airport congestion and delays increase as well. Airports such as Newark, San Francisco, and Chicago O’Hare already have approximately 30-40 percent of their flights delayed. Airports face substantial challenges in trying to tackle this issue on their own. The most widely recommended solution is pricing airport runways by time of day. But this politically unpopular solution has faced substantial opposition from communities such as smaller cities flying into hubs, or general aviation aircraft that are concerned about being effectively priced out of the market for a given airport. Congested airports would have a much greater chance of success if they were trying to tackle congestion in partnership with the federal government and other local transportation agencies. The federal role could be improved by dedicating a portion of the Airport Improvement Program (AIP) to provide grants to airports in regions that have a plan to work collaboratively to reduce congestion and overcome some of the political barriers to more effective pricing. Or the AIP could be retooled to set specific performance goals for airports and rewarding achievement. However it is done, there is a clear national interest at play here and the federal government needs to be more involved.

Next Gen is key to the aviation industry – increased capacity is vital to economic growth

Kramer 5/22

[Hillary Kramer, renound stock broker, financial contributor to forbes and several other news organizations, BA from Wellesley College, 5/22/12, http://www.forbes.com/sites/hilarykramer/2012/05/22/building-the-runway-to-the-skies-of-tomorrow/]

It seems that these days, the general public is a bit weary of commercial air travel – and who can blame them? We hear countless stories of TSA screeners taking their jobs perhaps too seriously, to say nothing of the general unpleasantness and inconvenience of arriving 90 minutes early to your flight, removing your shoes and getting full-body scanned. Despite these admitted irritations, I think it’s important to take a step back and realize just how complex and technologically sophisticated an achievement it is – even a miracle, you might say – that we, the traveling public, make it safely from departure gate to arrival gate day-in and day-out. It’s really quite impressive, especially considering that today’s air traffic network is based on systems developed more than 60 years ago. This is both good news (that the network is resilient) and bad (the network is old). Demand for air travel – and the resulting pressure this demand places on the existing aviation network – is imminently on the verge of exceeding our system’s limits. Consider that in 1995, our air-traffic management system accommodated 580 million passengers per year on 30,000 flights per day. Just 15 years later, in 2010, those numbers jumped to 712 million passengers per year on 43,000 flights per day. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) estimates that, if left unaddressed, increased air congestion could cost the American economy $22 billion annually in lost market activity by 2022. The reason for this is simpl**e: Aviation is now the premier enabler of global commerce.** $562.1 billion in goods were transported in 2008 alone; $249.2 billion was spent on direct expenditures by air travelers in 2009, the same year in which aviation made up 5.2 percent of total U.S. GDP. This is a staggering reality. If technology cannot keep up, the entire industry will face massive economic and logistical difficulties that will affect millions of travelers and businesses annually. The entire fabric of global connectivity is at risk. Thankfully, though, innovation and technology are advancing at a rate faster than any previous generation thought possible. We now live in a world whose aviation technology needs are light-years ahead of those in which our current systems were first implemented. The landscape has changed, and our aviation technology must change with it if we are to address the aviation challenges of tomorrow – not only for the airlines and the air travel market, but for the traveling consumer as well. The technology is there, in the form of what the FAA calls the Next Generation Air Transportation System, or NextGen. NextGen is unique in that it represents an incremental but innovative and integrated system that will vastly improve efficiencies for both the traveling public and the aviation industry. It moves air-traffic management systems away from ground-based radar, instead relying on more advanced satellite-based technology to accommodate continued growth and increased safety. By switching to GPS-based systems, airlines can get more planes in the air; these planes can fly, safely, in closer proximity to each other; and the airlines can run more routes, getting more people to more places more quickly. According to the FAA, “This evolution is vital to meeting future demand, and to avoiding gridlock in the sky and at our nation’s airports.” If fully implemented, FAA analysts indicate that NextGen is expected to save $123 billion in costs by 2030. And, as a bonus, NextGen is expected to significantly reduce aviation’s impact on the environment by allowing for more direct routes. In fact, according to the International Air Transport Association, cutting flight times by just one minute per flight on a global basis – something that NextGen technology would easily make a reality – would save 4.8 tons of carbon dioxide emissions every year. The private sector has a role to play here as well, particularly companies like Boeing, Booz Allen Hamilton, Exelis and Raytheon. Ultimately, NextGen’s success will depend on the leadership and contribution of these and a handful of other companies that are playing a central role in its development and the overall evolution of air-traffic management. But while technology is the inanimate core of NextGen, the benefits of these new systems and technologies will never be realized without air traffic controllers and other aviation industry professionals who undergo efficient and successful training, which is arguably the most critical element to NextGen. (After all, the new technology is rather useless if no one knows how to properly operate it.) At first, training does seem to be a huge challenge as we look forward to the implementation of this next generation of global air traffic technology. But, it actually won’t be so ominous and will ultimately be a very beneficial process integrally woven into NextGen. In fact, Raytheon (RTN), in particular, comes to mind for its role in providing training. Active in air-traffic management for over 60 years, Raytheon is a major player in providing both systems and training for all dimensions of air-traffic control. Currently, Raytheon trains allU.S.air-traffic controllers, in addition to providing 60 percent of all air-traffic control training worldwide. Raytheon has delivered more than 350 air-traffic management systems to more than 60 countries, and companies like Raytheon will be critical partners for the FAA as the agency continues to implement (and require training for) NextGen technologies. Of course, while all of this sounds great in theory, NextGen has had its bumps in the road along the way. Cost has been one of the more contentious issues, with the FAA and the airlines currently embroiled in a tug-of-war when it comes to picking up the $29 – 42 billion check. Despite challenges in its development and execution, it is vital that NextGen be implemented as rapidly as possible in order to ensure the ability ofU.S.aviation systems to meet traveler and cargo demand, achieve efficiencies and minimize the impact of aviation on the environment. Simply put, NextGen will succeed if it can equip the talented individuals who manage and oversee America’s airspace to meet the growing demands of tomorrow’s aviation challenges – all while ensuring you and I make it safely, happily and more efficiently to our arrival gate.

NextGen eases air transportation’s stress

Joint Planning and Development Office, 04 [2004, “Next Generation Air Transportation System: Integrated Plan” Department of Transportation, http://www.jpdo.aero/pdf/NGATS\_v1\_1204r.pdf]

The system is already showing signs of stress and it is clear that projected demand will soon surpass the system’s capacity. The U.S. aviation system must transform itself and be more responsive to the tremendous social, economic, political, and technological changes that are evolving worldwide. We are entering a critical era in air transportation, in which we must either find better, proactive ways to work together or suffer the consequences of reacting to the forces of change. The consequence of a do- nothing approach to this public policy problem is staggering. As the Commission on the Future of the United States Aerospace Industry noted, consumers stand to lose $30B annually due to people and products not reaching their destinations within the time periods we expect today. We are nearing a time when we will have to develop a new approach to air transportation. The current approach – ground based radars tracking congested flyways and passing information from control center to control center on the ground throughout the flight of an aircraft – is becoming operationally obsolete. The density of air traffic is making the current system increasingly inefficient. Bottlenecks are showing up now, and large increases in air traffic will cause mounting delays and increased need for structuring or limiting service in many parts of the nation. Driven by the increasing pace of change, the old evolving approach is insufficient for system modernization. In terms of improving the system over the next 25 years, it is clear that business as usual will not succeed.1 Technology is giving us opportunities for an entirely new approach—one that utilizes modern communication techniques, advanced computers, precision plotting through GPS and modern computer-based decision assistance programs. This new approach to air navigation could open up the sky to much greater and more efficient utilization of airspace. It also holds great promise for improved aviation security.
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Case—Economy—Congestion Now—Ext

NextGen alleviates aviation deficiencies - sustains competitiveness

Calio 11

[Nicholas Calio, President and CEO of the Air Transport Association of America, The Hill, “Aviation infrastructure is vital to winning the future,” 2/9/11, http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/technology/143033-aviation-infrastructure-is-vital-to-winning-the-future]

In his State of the Union address, President Obama focused the nation’s attention on the economic importance of investing in infrastructure. America can win the future, and successfully compete against emerging powers such as China if we transform our economy with modern technology and infrastructure. As Congress moves forward with the reauthorization of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), lawmakers have an opportunity to pass a jobs bill that will enhance the global competitiveness of the U.S. economy. It is vital that our government better utilize aviation policy to fuel economic growth, mindful that our competitors are effectively using commercial aviation to further their national ambitions. The growth markets of the world understand how commercial aviation can transform an economy and they are investing accordingly. Just a few weeks ago, China announced plans to pour a total of 1.5 trillion Yuan, roughly $228 billion, into its aviation sector over the next five years, including the construction of 11 new commercial airports and the acquisition of 290 new planes in 2011 alone. We must meet the challenge with government investment in our nation’s air traffic control system. This is critical infrastructure that will allow us to keep pace with our competitors. We have the technology. Now it is time for America to step into the future by fully deploying a modern system that supports the national goals of global competitiveness and putting people back to work.

Gridlock costs billions

Joint Planning and Development Office, 04 [2004, “Next Generation Air Transportation System: Integrated Plan” Department of Transportation, <http://www.jpdo.aero/pdf/NGATS_v1_1204r.pdf>]

Paradoxically, aviation’s own success will erode the unique speed, predictability, and affordability benefits of air travel if the air transportation system does not expand and adapt at the same pace as the market demands. Historically, growth in aviation was possible because significant investments were made to expand the national airport system and because of our ability to incorporate productivity enhancing technologies into the system. Today, in the most densely populated areas of the U.S., we are barely keeping pace with demand. In the year 2000, millions of Americans were stranded in airports experiencing delays of more than an hour and, in rare cases, to six hours or more. Using present forecasts and maintaining aggressive plans for improvements, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) predicts that even more major airports will be congested in the 2020 time frame3 (see Figure 1). Failure to address the impact of air travel congestion on the mobility of Americans could cost consumers up to $20 billion a year by 2025.4

Aviation gridlock alienates local communities

Joint Planning and Development Office, 04 [2004, “Next Generation Air Transportation System: Integrated Plan” Department of Transportation, http://www.jpdo.aero/pdf/NGATS\_v1\_1204r.pdf]

Finally, the growth in air transportation has stressed the balance between local aviation and other interests. This could deprive communities of the opportunity for direct access to the global marketplace. Worse, many communities may even be unable to sustain satisfactory, affordable service.

NextGen sustains economic competitiveness

Calio, 11 [Nicholas, Calio is the president and CEO of the Air Transport Association of America, 2/9/11, “Aviation infrastructure is vital to winning the future,”

http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/technology/143033-aviation-infrastructure-is-vital-to-winning-the-future]

In his State of the Union address, President Obama focused the nation’s attention on the economic importance of investing in infrastructure. America can win the future, and successfully compete against emerging powers such as China if we transform our economy with modern technology and infrastructure. As Congress moves forward with the reauthorization of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), lawmakers have an opportunity to pass a jobs bill that will enhance the global competitiveness of the U.S. economy. It is vital that our government better utilize aviation policy to fuel economic growth, mindful that our competitors are effectively using commercial aviation to further their national ambitions. The growth markets of the world understand how commercial aviation can transform an economy and they are investing accordingly. Just a few weeks ago, China announced plans to pour a total of 1.5 trillion Yuan, roughly $228 billion, into its aviation sector over the next five years, including the construction of 11 new commercial airports and the acquisition of 290 new planes in 2011 alone. We must meet the challenge with government investment in our nation’s air traffic control system. This is critical infrastructure that will allow us to keep pace with our competitors. We have the technology. Now it is time for America to step into the future by fully deploying a modern system that supports the national goals of global competitiveness and putting people back to work.

Case—Economy—Bad Now

**The economy is weakening, the slowdown on job growth indicates we’re entering another recession – that’s constable july 7th.**

The economy is weak- unemployment and uncertainty

Howe 7/27

[7/27/12 US economy loses steam Peter J. Howe, New England Cable News Business Editor. <http://www.necn.com/07/27/12/US-economy-loses-steam/landing_business.html?blockID=747455&feedID=4209>]

"The U.S. economy is weakening," Eaton Vance vice president and portfolio manager Eric Stein said Friday after the Commerce Department’s GDP announcement. "We're in our third consecutive summer of a slowdown. We're not in a double dip, but it's certainly not strong growth by any stretch of the imagination. We're certainly in a soft patch for the U.S. economy … Business investment is still strong, kind of leading the recovery. Exports aren't that good. The rest of the world is slowing, particularly Europe is slowing, but also even parts of Asia are slowing" and reducing U.S. corporations’ opportunities to export goods and services abroad.

Josh Pierce, research director for Bay State Wealth Management in Boston, said the 1.5 percent growth is barely half of what the economy needs to see unemployment come down rapidly, and represents an unusually tepid level of growth reflecting what an unusual, weak recovery this has been from a unique Great Recession driven by a financial and real-estate collapse.

"Typically, going back to World War II, I think we should be looking at 3.7 to 4.2 percent growth. We're not seeing that. But then again, we're not used to a credit bubble burst and total deleveraging of the consumer" – households suddenly cutting back on spending and increasing saving to make up for collapsed housing and investment values – "So when you look at that and say, ‘At least we're growing,’ well, that's nice. But there's still a huge unemployment number. The Fed's running out of bullets. There's a lot to be worried about," said Pierce. Stein agreed that "uncertainty is holding back the U.S. economy. The biggest source of uncertainty is what's going on in Europe with their debt crisis. The second part is really here domestically, both the fiscal cliff" of threatened simultaneous steep tax increases and spending cuts on Jan. 1 if a gridlocked Congress and President Obama can’t make a deal "as well as the upcoming election."

Economy’s stalling toward another recession

The Times of India 7/27

[“US Economic Growth Slowed to 1.5%,” 7/27/12, http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/business/international-business/US-economic-growth-slowed-to-1-5/articleshow/15208436.cms] nv

The US economy grew at an annual rate of just 1.5 per cent from April through June, as Americans cut back sharply on spending. The slowdown in growth adds to worries that the economy could be stalling three years after the recession ended. The Commerce Department also said on Friday that the economy grew a little better than previously thought in the January-March quarter. It raised its estimate to a 2 per cent rate, up from 1.9 per cent. Growth at or below 2 per cent isn't enough to lower the unemployment rate, which was 8.2 per cent last month. And most economists don't expect growth to pick up much in the second half of the year. Europe's financial crisis and a looming budget crisis in the US are expected to slow business investment further. Stock futures rose slightly after the report was released. Some economists had thought the growth estimate would be even lower. "The main take away from today's report, the specifics aside, is that the US economy is barely growing,'' said Dan Greenhaus, chief economic strategist at BTIG LLC. ``Along with a reduction in the actual amount of money companies were able to make, it's no wonder the unemployment rate cannot move lower.'' The lackluster economy is raising pressure on President [Barack Obama](http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/topic/Barack-Obama) in his re-election fight with [Mitt Romney](http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/topic/Mitt-Romney), the presumptive Republican presidential nominee. But few think the Fed, the White House or Congress can or will do anything soon that might rejuvenate the economy quickly. Many lawmakers, for example, refuse to increase federal spending in light of historically large budget deficits. The 1.5 per cent growth rate in the second quarter was the weakest since the economy, as measured by the gross domestic product, expanded at a 1.3 per cent rate in the July-September quarter last year. GDP measures the country's total output of goods and services, from the purchase of a cup of coffee to the sale of fighter jets. Current-dollar GDP increased at an annual rate of $117.6 billion in the second quarter to $15.6 trillion. Growth was weaker mostly because consumer spending slowed to a growth rate of just 1.5 per cent. That's down from 2.4 per cent in the first quarter. Americans bought fewer autos, computers and other long-lasting manufactured goods. Spending on services increased. They also saved more. The savings rate increased to 4 per cent, up from 3.6 per cent in the first quarter. Consumer spending, which accounts for 70 per cent of economic activity, was offset somewhat by a slightly smaller drag from the government. Spending by governments fell at an annual rate of 1.4 per cent in the second quarter, just half of the 3 per cent rate of decline in the first quarter. The Commerce Department also revised its growth estimates for the past three years. Those revisions showed that the economy contracted 3.1 per cent in 2009, slightly less than the 3.5 per cent previously reported. Growth in 2010 was put at 2.4 per cent, down from 3 per cent, with growth in 2011 at 1.8 per cent instead of 1.7 per cent. The US economy has never been so sluggish this long into a recovery. The Great Recession officially ended in June 2009.  Until a few weeks ago, many economists had been predicting that growth would accelerate in the final six months of the year. They pointed to gains in manufacturing, home and auto sales and lower gas prices. But threats to the U.S. economy have left consumers too anxious to spend freely. Jobs are tight. Pay isn't keeping up with inflation. Retail sales fell in June for a third straight month. Manufacturing has weakened in most areas of the country.  Fear is also growing that the economy will fall off a "fiscal cliff'' at year's end. That's when tax increases and deep spending cuts will take effect unless Congress reaches a budget agreement. All that is making companies reluctant to expand and hire much.
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Case—Economy—Bad Now—Ext

Spending key to stimulate economy.

Dewan 7/27

[Shaila, Economics Reporter, The New York Times, “U.S. Growth Falls to 1.5%; a Recovery Seems Mired,” 7/27/12, http://www.nytimes.com/2012/07/28/business/economy/us-economy-expands-at-1-5-rate.html?\_r=1&pagewanted=all] nv

The United States economy has lost the momentum it appeared to be building earlier this year, as the latest government statistics showed that it expanded by a mere 1.5 percent annual rate in the second quarter. The mired recovery makes the United States more vulnerable to trouble in Europe and, at home, the potential expiration of several tax breaks and other buoyant measures at the end of the year, known as the fiscal cliff. It also illustrates the election-season challenge to President Obama, who must sell his economic record to voters as the recovery slows. Growth, as measured by the gross domestic product, lagged as consumers curbed new spending and businesses held back. Several bright spots in the first three months of the year, including auto production, computer sales and large purchases like appliances and televisions, dimmed or faded away altogether in the second quarter, and government at all levels continued to cut spending. Growth was not strong enough to drive down the unemployment rate, which has stalled above 8 percent in recent months. The lackluster figure immediately gave Mr. Obama’s opponents the opportunity to question the federal government’s response to the financial crisis, though a vast majority of economists agree that the stimulus and the bank bailouts saved jobs. House Speaker John Boehner said the G.D.P. report, released Friday by the Commerce Department, showed “the need to stop all of the looming tax hikes.” The report also spurred calls from liberals for the government to do more. The Federal Reserve, which has lowered its forecasts in recent weeks, is watching the slowdown carefully as it considers further stimulus, though several analysts said Friday that they doubted that new action from the Fed could have much effect. “Given where interest rates are, I think it should be evident that we’re in one of those spots where in order to lift growth, government needs to spend money,” said Steve Blitz, the chief economist at ITG Investment Research. The economy is following a pattern established over several years now — hopes raised by modest acceleration that later fizzles out — that underscores the notion that rebounds after financial busts take their own excruciating time. This year, some of the weakening was to be expected after a spurt of activity during an unseasonably warm winter. A mild uptick is expected in the second half of the year, driven in part by lower gas prices. But improvement strong enough to provide real traction or lower the jobless rate remains out of reach. While the economy has not entered a downward spiral in which weakness feeds on itself, wrote Jim O’Sullivan, the chief United States economist for High Frequency Economics, an analysis firm, “there does not appear to be much basis for expecting a significant pickup any time soon.” The government also provided on Friday a revised figure for first-quarter G.D.P., saying the economy then grew by a 2 percent annual rate. The previous estimate was 1.9 percent. A slowdown in household spending is still hampering economic growth. Consumers increased their savings rate, a sign of increased uncertainty about the future. Governments also continued to cut spending. Exports accelerated in the second quarter despite more recent signs of diminishing demand, but the gain was canceled out by a larger increase in imports, which count against the gross domestic product. Economists expect exports to shrink as the dollar rises against other currencies, making American goods less competitive. The housing sector, which has gone from a drag on the economy to a positive, continued to grow, posting a 9.7 percent gain — though again, that is less than half its rate of growth in the first quarter. Uncertainty cast a pall, coming from both the domestic front, with a presidential race and the fate of numerous federal policies in question, and from overseas, with companies like Ford reporting a decline in profit this week because of the slowdown in Europe, despite a healthy showing in North America. “You can’t blame all of it on Europe — we have our own problems yet,” said Joshua Shapiro, the chief United States economist at MFR Inc., a financial consulting firm. “When you have a credit bubble or asset bubble that’s popped, the recovery process from that is just really long and really painful.”

Economy unstable now.

Shapiro 7/26

[Aviv N., Senior Research Analyst and Business Development Officer for AlgosysFx, Forexpros, “Concerns Over The Weakening US Economy Elevate,” 7/26/12, http://www.forexpros.com/analysis/concerns-over-the-weakening-us-economy-elevate-130965] nv

New data from the US raised concerns about the weak economy's long-term impact on the next generation of Americans as more children and families across the United States are facing poverty and economic instability following the recession. A report released yesterday found that a rising number of children in nearly every state have families experiencing deeper poverty and economic insecurity since 2005, even as some other areas such as education and healthcare have improved. The findings showed that 2.4 Million more children slipped into poverty from 2005 to 2010, from 13.3 Million to 15.7 Million. The economic well-being of children and families has plummeted because of the recession. The findings of the report came amid an uncertain recovery in the wake of a national recession that ran from late 2007 to mid-2009 and led to significant unemployment and housing foreclosures. Further information suggest that there were a growing number of children whose parents did not have stable, full-time employment and whose families were burdened with high housing costs. Still, there were some gains in health and education. Dozens of states saw more parents with high school diplomas and fewer teen births. Children in more than 40 states gained access to health insurance, and there were fewer deaths among children and teenagers. Many states also saw steady improvement in the number of children enrolled in preschool as well as gains in reading and math proficiency. The findings come as state governors continue to wrestle with fiscal problems from the recession. Despite such trouble, policymakers should not lose sight of investing in the nation's youth. In the same way, an examination of the US economy reveals some highs and some serious problems. US growth is at a tepid 2 percent. The US housing market’s rate of descent has slowed but prices remain 30-60 percent below highs. New housing starts have stabilized, at around 50 percent below peak levels. Benefiting from a weaker dollar, manufacturing has improved. Lower oil and natural gas prices have benefitted the economy. However, employment remains weak. If discouraged workers who have left the workforce and part-time workers seeking full-time employment are included, then unemployment is above 15 percent, far higher than the headline at 8 percent. The total number of Americans now employed is around 140 Million — well-below the peak level above 146 Million. In addition, consumer spending remains patchy. Job insecurity, lack of earnings and wealth losses are causing households to reducing spending and repay debt. Record corporate profits have been achieved mainly through cost reductions and minimal revenue growth. Investment is weak due to the lack of demand. Bank lending is sluggish due to lower demand for credit and problems of financial institutions. Federal public finances remain unsustainable. Cuts in spending, mandated under the 2011 increase in the national debt ceiling, would improve deficits but adversely affect growth. State and municipal finances are under severe stress, with an increasing number of borrowers filing for bankruptcy.

Case—Economy—Jobs boost economy

NextGen boosts the economy

Calio, 11 [Nicholas, Calio is the president and CEO of the Air Transport Association of America, 2/9/11, “Aviation infrastructure is vital to winning the future,”

http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/technology/143033-aviation-infrastructure-is-vital-to-winning-the-future]

With broad consensus in the business community and organized labor that Congress should work with the president to improve the nation’s aging infrastructure, it is timely for bipartisan actions that support strategic investments to grow the economy. With deficit reduction a national priority, investing in infrastructure is not at cross purposes with cleaning up the nation’s finances. In fact, they go hand-in-hand. Making real progress on the deficit requires that we spark economic growth that drives job creation and generates additional tax revenue. It is essential that key infrastructure projects receive funding now so that industries like commercial aviation that enable businesses to grow can contribute more to the economic recovery. Providing the funding to accelerate implementation of modern air traffic infrastructure should be a top priority in the 112th Congress. The antiquated, ground-based system in place today is a major drag on productivity. As Ben Franklin famously proclaimed, time is money. Unfortunately, the nation has been losing both for years because our archaic air traffic control system has been unable to meet the demands placed upon it – let alone the demands of the future. According to a recent study commissioned by the FAA, flight delays cost the U.S. $31 billion in 2007. With a satellite-based system, airline efficiency will increase and flight delays will be minimized. Safety and customer satisfaction will improve and businesses - large and small - will reap the benefits of greater efficiency and be better positioned to create jobs. Commercial aviation already provides key connections that make the economy grow. The industry contributes $1.2 trillion to the economy, is responsible for 5.2 percent of the nation’s GDP and supports nearly 11 million jobs. A fully operational, NextGen air traffic management system will unleash the true economic power of commercial aviation and benefit every industry in this country. Conservative estimates predict that implementation of this system will lead to the creation of more than 150,000 jobs. In reality, the economic impact of this investment in modern infrastructure will be exponentially bigger. The sky is the limit for what this industry can contribute to the economy. Now it is up to our leaders in Washington to provide airlines with the infrastructure needed to compete successfully and support the U.S. in our national ambition to win in the global economy.

Next Gen is key to the aviation industry – increased capacity is vital to economic growth

Kramer 5/22

[Hillary Kramer, renound stock broker, financial contributor to forbes and several other news organizations, BA from Wellesley College, 5/22/12, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/hilarykramer/2012/05/22/building-the-runway-to-the-skies-of-tomorrow/>]

It seems that these days, the general public is a bit weary of commercial air travel – and who can blame them? We hear countless stories of TSA screeners taking their jobs perhaps too seriously, to say nothing of the general unpleasantness and inconvenience of arriving 90 minutes early to your flight, removing your shoes and getting full-body scanned. Despite these admitted irritations, I think it’s important to take a step back and realize just how complex and technologically sophisticated an achievement it is – even a miracle, you might say – that we, the traveling public, make it safely from departure gate to arrival gate day-in and day-out. It’s really quite impressive, especially considering that today’s air traffic network is based on systems developed more than 60 years ago. This is both good news (that the network is resilient) and bad (the network is old). Demand for air travel – and the resulting pressure this demand places on the existing aviation network – is imminently on the verge of exceeding our system’s limits. Consider that in 1995, our air-traffic management system accommodated 580 million passengers per year on 30,000 flights per day. Just 15 years later, in 2010, those numbers jumped to 712 million passengers per year on 43,000 flights per day. The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) estimates that, if left unaddressed, increased air congestion could cost the American economy $22 billion annually in lost market activity by 2022. The reason for this is simple: Aviation is now the premier enabler of global commerce. $562.1 billion in goods were transported in 2008 alone; $249.2 billion was spent on direct expenditures by air travelers in 2009, the same year in which aviation made up 5.2 percent of total U.S. GDP. This is a staggering reality. If technology cannot keep up, the entire industry will face massive economic and logistical difficulties that will affect millions of travelers and businesses annually. The entire fabric of global connectivity is at risk. Thankfully, though, innovation and technology are advancing at a rate faster than any previous generation thought possible. We now live in a world whose aviation technology needs are light-years ahead of those in which our current systems were first implemented. The landscape has changed, and our aviation technology must change with it if we are to address the aviation challenges of tomorrow – not only for the airlines and the air travel market, but for the traveling consumer as well. The technology is there, in the form of what the FAA calls the Next Generation Air Transportation System, or NextGen. NextGen is unique in that it represents an incremental but innovative and integrated system that will vastly improve efficiencies for both the traveling public and the aviation industry. It moves air-traffic management systems away from ground-based radar, instead relying on more advanced satellite-based technology to accommodate continued growth and increased safety. By switching to GPS-based systems, airlines can get more planes in the air; these planes can fly, safely, in closer proximity to each other; and the airlines can run more routes, getting more people to more places more quickly. According to the FAA, “This evolution is vital to meeting future demand, and to avoiding gridlock in the sky and at our nation’s airports.” If fully implemented, FAA analysts indicate that NextGen is expected to save $123 billion in costs by 2030. And, as a bonus, NextGen is expected to significantly reduce aviation’s impact on the environment by allowing for more direct routes. In fact, according to the International Air Transport Association, cutting flight times by just one minute per flight on a global basis – something that NextGen technology would easily make a reality – would save 4.8 tons of carbon dioxide emissions every year. The private sector has a role to play here as well, particularly companies like Boeing, Booz Allen Hamilton, Exelis and Raytheon. Ultimately, NextGen’s success will depend on the leadership and contribution of these and a handful of other companies that are playing a central role in its development and the overall evolution of air-traffic management. But while technology is the inanimate core of NextGen, the benefits of these new systems and technologies will never be realized without air traffic controllers and other aviation industry professionals who undergo efficient and successful training, which is arguably the most critical element to NextGen. (After all, the new technology is rather useless if no one knows how to properly operate it.) At first, training does seem to be a huge challenge as we look forward to the implementation of this next generation of global air traffic technology. But, it actually won’t be so ominous and will ultimately be a very beneficial process integrally woven into NextGen. In fact, Raytheon (RTN), in particular, comes to mind for its role in providing training. Active in air-traffic management for over 60 years, Raytheon is a major player in providing both systems and training for all dimensions of air-traffic control. Currently, Raytheon trains allU.S.air-traffic controllers, in addition to providing 60 percent of all air-traffic control training worldwide. Raytheon has delivered more than 350 air-traffic management systems to more than 60 countries, and companies like Raytheon will be critical partners for the FAA as the agency continues to implement (and require training for) NextGen technologies. Of course, while all of this sounds great in theory, NextGen has had its bumps in the road along the way. Cost has been one of the more contentious issues, with the FAA and the airlines currently embroiled in a tug-of-war when it comes to picking up the $29 – 42 billion check. Despite challenges in its development and execution, it is vital that NextGen be implemented as rapidly as possible in order to ensure the ability ofU.S.aviation systems to meet traveler and cargo demand, achieve efficiencies and minimize the impact of aviation on the environment. Simply put, NextGen will succeed if it can equip the talented individuals who manage and oversee America’s airspace to meet the growing demands of tomorrow’s aviation challenges – all while ensuring you and I make it safely, happily and more efficiently to our arrival gate.

Case—Economy—Accidents

Even marginal safety improvement from NextGen would save billions of dollars.

Salam 12

(Sakib bin Salam, Policy Intern at Eno Center for Transportation, “NextGen: Aligning Costs, Benefits, and Political Leadership,” April 2012.)

With more precise location information on all aircraft, con­trollers can have a much better sense of their location with respect to the location of other moving and non-moving aircraft in their vicinity. NextGen provides precision verti­cally guided approaches with no equipment expenditure on the ground. The direct result of the improved information is less of a risk of collisions on the ground or in the air, especially in times of low visibility.

While commercial aviation in the United States has an unparalleled safety record, general aviation still faces sub­stantial flight incidents and casualties annually. An analysis of the National Transportation Safety Board’s (NTSB) data for general aviation accidents shows over 1,000 cases in 2010, including 245 casualties.25 A common probable cause for accident according to the NTSB’s investigation reports is pilot error due to lack of situational awareness, particularly during times of poor visibility.

In quantifying the cost of fatalities, the USDOT’s recom­mended value per casualty is $5.8 million, or a range of $3.2-$8.4 million due to uncertainty.26 Based on this estimate, the cost of general aviation accidents in terms of lives lost is about $1.421 billion or between $784 million-$2.058 billion annually.27

The database indicates damage to the aircraft as “substan­tial” or “destroyed”. In 2010 there were 38 cases where the aircraft was completely destroyed, and 981 cases of substantial damage. Using a roughly estimated price of a used Cessna 180 aircraft of $100,000, the cost of destroyed aircraft is approximately $3.8 million. The cost of damaged aircraft is about $24.5 million, assuming the per-aircraft cost to be a quarter of damaged aircraft.

Based on these estimates, the total cost of accidents to the general aviation community in 2010 was about $1.449 bil­lion.

Even with on-board ADS-B, the prospect of greater situ­ational feedback and data could be undermined by human error of judgment. However, a reasonably moderate esti­mate can be made where greater situational awareness does contribute to preventing some accidents. Table 5 shows savings to the general aviation community under various levels of NextGen’s impact on safety. Even if NextGen plays a small role in improving safety and reduc­ing incidents in general aviation, the potential benefits are substantial.28

Case—Economy—Growth Boosts Global Recovery

**U.S economic growth is key to global recovery**

 Washington Times 10-[“Obama: Strong U.S. economy key to global recovery” By Erica Werner-Associated Press< <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/nov/10/obama-strong-us-economy-key-global-recovery/>>]

SEOUL (AP) — President Obama said a strong, job-creating economy in the United States would be the country’s most important contribution to a global recovery as he pleaded with world leaders to work together despite sharp differences. Arriving in South Korea on Wednesday for the G-20 summit, Mr. Obama is expected to find himself on the defensive because of plans by the Federal Reserve to buy $600 billion in long-term government bonds to try to drive down interest rates, spur lending and boost the U.S. economy. Some other nations complain that the move will give American goods an unfair advantage. In a letter sent Tuesday to leaders of the Group of 20 major economic powers, Mr. Obama defended the steps his administration and Congress have taken to help the economy. “The United States will do its part to restore strong growth, reduce economic imbalances and calm markets,” he wrote. “A strong recovery that creates jobs, income and spending is the most important contribution the United States can make to the global recovery.” Mr. Obama outlined the work he had done to repair the nation’s financial system and enact reforms after the worst recession in decades. He implored the G-20 leaders to seize the opportunity to ensure a strong and durable recovery. The summit gets under way on Thursday. “When all nations do their part — emerging no less than advanced, surplus no less than deficit — we all benefit from higher growth,” the president said in the letter. The divisions between the economic powers was evident when China’s leading credit rating agency lowered its view of the United States, a response to the Federal Reserve’s decision to buy more Treasury bonds. Major exporting countries such as China and Germany are complaining that the Federal Reserve’s action drives down the dollar’s value and gives U.S. goods an edge in world markets.

Case—Spending Good—General

#### Austerity kills the economy

Sahadi (Senior Writer for CNNMoney. Specializing in taxes and deficit spending) 7/16/12 (Jeanne, “IMF: Deal with fiscal cliff and debt ceiling soon” LexisNexis)

Hit the brakes on the fiscal cliff and hit the gas on raising the debt ceiling. That was the message to Congress from the International Monetary Fund on Monday. The IMF and others have often advised that the United States come up with a serious plan to reduce its debt over time. But the so-called fiscal cliff - a series of expiring tax cuts and the onset of a record amount of spending cuts - would be anything but gradual when it comes to deficit reduction. The fiscal cliff includes the expiration of the Bush tax cuts, the onset of $1 trillion in blunt spending cuts, and a reduction in Medicare doctors' pay. If all the provisions go into effect, they would take more than $500 billion out of the economy in 2013 alone. Such an abrupt shift risks pushing the economy into recession, according to many economists. The mix of tax increases and spending cuts would slash the deficit in half - to 3.8% of gross domestic product, down from the 7.6% projected for this year. The IMF has recommended a slower course of deficit reduction, so that it drops by just 1 percentage point next year. "A more modest retrenchment in 2013 ... would be a better option," the agency said. The good news is that no one in Congress actually wants all the fiscal cliff measures to take effect. The bad news is that lawmakers cannot agree on more gradual debt-reduction measures to replace them. And the consensus is they won't seriously try to do so until after the November elections. That is around the same time the country's debt load will near its legal limit of $16.394 trillion, requiring another increase in the debt ceiling to pay all the bills the government has incurred. As last summer's debt ceiling showdown so vividly demonstrated, the vote to increase the country's borrowing limit can become a firestorm with very negative consequences for the economy and the United States' reputation. So it's little surprise that the IMF urged lawmakers to do the right thing this time and raise the ceiling without any drama. "Early action on the federal debt ceiling ... would mitigate risks of financial market disruptions and a loss in consumer and business confidence," the agency said.

#### Spending is key to reclaim borrowing roles from the private sector – no confidence loss

Paul Krugman and Richard Layard, Nobel Prize Winner for Economics, Professor of Economics and International Affairs at Princeton, and director of the Centre for Economic Performance at the London School of Economics, 6-28-12, “A Manifesto for Economic Sense,” <http://www.manifestoforeconomicsense.org/>

Their first argument is that government deficits will raise interest rates and thus prevent recovery. By contrast, they argue, austerity will increase confidence and thus encourage recovery. But there is no evidence at all in favour of this argument. First, despite exceptionally high deficits, interest rates today are unprecedentedly low in all major countries where there is a normally functioning central bank. This is true even in Japan where the government debt now exceeds 200% of annual GDP; and past downgrades by the rating agencies here have had no effect on Japanese interest rates. Interest rates are only high in some Euro countries, because the ECB is not allowed to act as lender of last resort to the government. Elsewhere the central bank can always, if needed, fund the deficit, leaving the bond market unaffected. Moreover past experience includes no relevant case where budget cuts have actually generated increased economic activity. The IMF has studied 173 cases of budget cuts in individual countries and found that the consistent result is economic contraction. In the handful of cases in which fiscal consolidation was followed by growth, the main channels were a currency depreciation against a strong world market, not a current possibility. The lesson of the IMF’s study is clear - budget cuts retard recovery. And that is what is happening now - the countries with the biggest budget cuts have experienced the biggest falls in output. For the truth is, as we can now see, that budget cuts do not inspire business confidence. Companies will only invest when they can foresee enough customers with enough income to spend. Austerity discourages investment. So there is massive evidence against the confidence argument; all the alleged evidence in favor of the doctrine has evaporated on closer examination. The causes. Many policy makers insist that the crisis was caused by irresponsible public borrowing. With very few exceptions - other than Greece - this is false. Instead, the conditions for crisis were created by excessive private sector borrowing and lending, including by over-leveraged banks. The collapse of this bubble led to massive falls in output and thus in tax revenue. So the large government deficits we see today are a consequence of the crisis, not its cause. The nature of the crisis. When real estate bubbles on both sides of the Atlantic burst, many parts of the private sector slashed spending in an attempt to pay down past debts. This was a rational response on the part of individuals, but - just like the similar response of debtors in the 1930s - it has proved collectively self-defeating, because one person’s spending is another person’s income. The result of the spending collapse has been an economic depression that has worsened the public debt. The appropriate response. At a time when the private sector is engaged in a collective effort to spend less, public policy should act as a stabilizing force, attempting to sustain spending. At the very least we should not be making things worse by big cuts in government spending or big increases in tax rates on ordinary people. Unfortunately, that’s exactly what many governments are now doing. The big mistake. After responding well in the first, acute phase of the economic crisis, conventional policy wisdom took a wrong turn - focusing on government deficits, which are mainly the result of a crisis-induced plunge in revenue, and arguing that the public sector should attempt to reduce its debts in tandem with the private sector. As a result, instead of playing a stabilizing role, fiscal policy has ended up reinforcing and exacerbating the dampening effects of private-sector spending cuts.

Case—Spending Good—Stimulus True

#### We control empirics – WWII proved Keynes right

Brad Delong, professor of Economics and chair of the Political Economy major at the University of California, Berkeley. He served as Deputy Assistant Secretary of the United States Department of the Treasury in the Clinton Administration , research associate of the National Bureau of Economic Research, o-editor of The Economists' Voice, 2-09 <http://delong.typepad.com/sdj/2009/02/a-guide-for-the-perplexed-justin-fox-on-fiscal-policy.html>

Justin Fox is needlessly worried. He writes: The uncertainty of stimulus :: The Curious Capitalist - TIME.com: From a Congressional Budget Office estimate released today on the impact of some amendment or other to the Senate stimulus bill: The macroeconomic impacts of any economic stimulus program are very uncertain. Economic theories differ in their predictions about the effectiveness of stimulus. Furthermore, large fiscal stimulus is rarely attempted, so it is difficult to distinguish among alternative estimates of how large the macroeconomic effects would be. For those reasons, some economists remain skeptical that there would be any significant effects, while others expect very large ones. It's sort of like that mutual fund boilerplate, "Past performance is no guarantee of future results." Except that we're not even sure of what the past performance was. (And I say this as somebody who thinks the stimulus legislation is on balance a good idea.) Well, why should we be certain of what past performance was? There haven't been a great many uses of large-scale fiscal policy to try to cure depression. And in those cases in which it has been tried, a lot else has been going on. But when fiscal boost was tried on a large enough scale, it certainly did the job. And it is reasonable to infer (with all the caveats provided by the CBO) that what is true in the very large will be true in the merely large as well. Eugene Fama says that it is theoretically impossible for fiscal stimulus to boost output: World War II proves him wrong. Robert Barro says that the multiplier is zero: World War II proves him wrong. Benn Steil says that Jacques Rueff in 1947 conclusively proved that fiscal policy could not boost employment: World War II proves him wrong. The extent to which the Great Depression and World War II changed how economists thought--and how those who know their history still think--cannot be overstated. And even those economists who don't know their history should be forced to come up with a reason why the lessons of the Great Depression do not apply to today. As I am going to say in class a couple of weeks from now: The end in the Great Depression of laissez faire--the idea that the government should keep its hands off of the economy--as a doctrine for guiding economic policy did not mean the end of the market economy as a social resource allocation mechanism. "Keynesianism" and the doctrine of the "mixed economy" that it supported emerged in the nick of time, soon became the ruling ideologies in the industrial core of the world economy, and provided North America and western Europe with a Keynesian escape route from what had seemed the insoluble crises of the interwar period. The Keynesian escape route opened up key ground in the middle between fascist-style regimentation and socialist-style national planning. Keynes argued that the market economy and capitalist order could be salvaged, and salvaged by relatively minor reforms. An activist welfare-state government with a commitment to full employment had the tools to eliminate Great Depressions, and could put economies back onto the road to Utopia. If only governments would reduce interest rates to get private agents or would themselves spend money freely (without raising taxes) in times when total demand was low, and raise interest rates to reduce private spending and themselves raise taxes (without raising spending) in times when total demand was high, then fluctuations in employment and production could be greatly reduced, and Great Depressions avoided. Belief in this escape route was strongly reinforced by facts. Those countries that had tried it by accident during the Depression--had infiated early, printed money, ensured low interest rates, and run large budget deficits--managed to survive the Depression much more easily than others. World War II provided final proof, were any necessary--"vindication by Mars," as John Kenneth Galbraith calls it. That component of unemployment, called "structural" or "permanent" during the 1930s, that was seemingly-immune to both the self-adjusting forces of the market and the armament of the New Deal vanished entirely in the 1940s as the federal budget deficit approached and then exceeded the levels that had long been recommended by John Maynard Keynes. And the United States fought World War II without reducing civilian consumption: all of U.S. war production came from new capacity or from capacity that stood idle at the end of the 1930s. Demand expansion--deliberate attempts by governments to put the unemployed back to work by deficit spending and loose-money low interest rate policies--was successful in the 1930s and 1940s. It put the unemployed back to work. It did not contain within itself the seeds of a renewed Great Depression. It did not explode into hyperinflation. The coming of "stablization policy" enlarged the policy steps that could be undertaken without forcing a definitive break with the market-capitalist order, and without forcing a choice between Hitler's way and Stalin's. In later years--in the second and third post-World War II generation--tasks of macroeconomic management would prove harder, and the truth of the doctrines of Keynes's disciples if not of the doctrines of Keynes himself would become less clear.

Case—Spending Good—Jobs

#### Spending creates jobs – outweighs benefits of austerity – Spain proves

Paul Krugman, Nobel Prize Winner for Economics, Professor of Economics and International Affairs at Princeton, 7-11-12, <http://krugman.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/07/11/pointless-pain-in-spain/>

It’s no fun being Prime Minister of a debtor nation without its own currency. Unlike the US or the UK, Spain has no easy options. That said, the new austerity measures just announced make no sense at all. According to news reports, Rajoy has announced [65 billion euros of tax increases and spending cuts](http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-07-11/rajoy-announces-65-billion-euros-in-budget-cuts-to-fight-crisis.html); this will clearly deepen Spain’s depression. So what purpose will this serve? Think of Spain as facing a three-level problem. The topmost level is the problem of the banks; set that aside for now. Below that is the problem of sovereign debt. What makes the debt problem so serious, however, is the underlying problem of competitiveness: Spain needs to increase exports to make up for the jobs lost when its housing bubble burst. And it faces years of a highly depressed economy until costs have fallen enough relative to the rest of Europe to achieve the needed gain in competitiveness. So, what do the new austerity measures contribute to the solution of these problems? Well, Spain’s deficit will be smaller. Not 63 billion euros smaller, since the further depression of Spain’s economy will reduce revenues; say it’s 40 or 45 billion euros less debt, which is around 4 percent of Spanish GDP. Does anyone think this will make a big difference to the long-run fiscal outlook, or restore investor confidence? What about competitiveness? Let’s be frank and brutal: the European strategy is basically for debtor nations to achieve relative deflation via high unemployment. Think of it in terms of a Phillips curve: I’ve drawn this curve very flat at high rates of unemployment – which is what all the evidence suggests. If nothing else, this crisis has given us overwhelming evidence that [downward nominal wage rigidity](http://krugman.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/06/24/revenge-of-the-optimum-currency-area/) is real and a major factor. Now think about what Spain is doing: basically, it’s moving from A to B – driving its unemployment rate even higher. This will possibly lead to a slight acceleration of the improvement in Spain’s competitiveness. Maybe. But it won’t be significant. So, Rajoy is imposing harsh further austerity that will raise unemployment while making no significant dent in either the fiscal problem or the competitiveness problem. And this makes sense why?

Case—Spending Good—Infrastructure Specific

#### Infrastructure spending is a sound investment – stimulus works and cuts will only worsen problems

Henry Blodget, CEO and editor of *Business Insider*, BA from Yale, 4-24-12, <http://www.businessinsider.com/its-official-keynes-was-right-2012-4>

But I will also add this in defense of Keynesianism ... The Austerians love to point at the 1930s as "proof" that Keynes was wrong. Look at the huge "New Deal," they say. Look at all those expensive public works projects. Look at all the spending the government did to try to get us out of the Great Depression, and it never really worked. What got us out of the Depression, the Austerians smugly observe, was World War 2. But what was World War 2 if not an absolutely gigantic Keynesian stimulus? The Federal deficit in World War 2 was massive—much bigger than any time during the Great Depression. And we built up a huge Federal debt load. And ... we set the stage for two decades of amazing prosperity, in which we worked off those debts. Our current debt and deficit situation scares the bejeezus out of me.  We absolutely have to get our long-term budget problems under control, and doing so will involve both cutting spending and raising taxes. If we don't do that, we really will collapse, as Niall Ferguson et al have long been arguing.
 But getting the budget under control by radically chopping spending or increasing taxes this minute, as many Austerians want to do, won't help. In fact, it will likely make the problems vastly worse, because it will put that many more people out of work and reduce tax revenue that much further (just take a look at Europe). Meanwhile, given that we've already racked up $15 trillion of debt, I certainly wouldn't be opposed to our spending another couple of trillion upgrading our piss-poor infrastructure. Incurring debt to build things that help all Americans, from unemployed folks to business leaders to children, is a trade-off I'm willing to make. Especially if the jobs created by this "stimulus" spending help alleviate our massive unemployment and inequality problems.

Case—Spending Good—AT: Confidence

#### Turn – cuts worsen things, killing confidence – multiple studies prove spending is better

Joseph Stiglitz, Nobel Prize winner in Economics, November 2010, “Comment: To choose austerity is to bet it all on the confidence fairy: The mystical belief is that a smaller deficit will lead to an investment boom. What Britain really needs now is another stimulus,” <http://search.proquest.com/docview/759371294>)

Advocates of austerity believe that mystically, as the deficits come down, confidence in the economy will be restored and investment will boom. For 75 years there has been a contest between this theory and Keynesian theory, which argued that spending more now, especially on public investments (or tax cuts designed to encourage private investment) was more likely to restore growth, even though it increased the deficit. The two prescriptions could not have been more different. Thanks to the IMF, multiple experiments have been conducted - for instance, in east Asia in 1997-98 and a little later in Argentina - and almost all come to the same conclusion: the Keynesian prescription works. Austerity converts downturns into recessions, recessions into depressions. The confidence fairy that the austerity advocates claim will appear never does, partly perhaps because the downturns mean that the deficit reductions are always smaller than was hoped. Consumers and investors, knowing this and seeing the deteriorating competitive position, the depreciation of human capital and infrastructure, the country's worsening balance sheet, increasing social tensions, and recognising the inevitability of future tax increases to make up for losses as the economy stagnates, may even cut back on their consumption and investment, worsening the downward spiral. No business with a potential for making investments yielding high returns would pass up the opportunity to make these investments if it could get access to capital at very low interest rates. But this is what austerity means for the UK.

#### No risk that austerity improves confidence – spending is key

Paul Krugman, Nobel Prize Winner for Economics, Professor of Economics and International Affairs at Princeton, 7-1-10, “Myths of Austerity,” <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/07/02/opinion/02krugman.html?_r=1&ref=paulkrugman>

Which brings me to the subject of today’s column. For the last few months, I and others have watched, with amazement and horror, the emergence of a consensus in policy circles in favor of immediate fiscal austerity. That is, somehow it has become conventional wisdom that now is the time to slash spending, despite the fact that the world’s major economies remain deeply depressed. This conventional wisdom isn’t based on either evidence or careful analysis. Instead, it rests on what we might charitably call sheer speculation, and less charitably call figments of the policy elite’s imagination — specifically, on belief in what I’ve come to think of as the invisible bond vigilante and the confidence fairy. Bond vigilantes are investors who pull the plug on governments they perceive as unable or unwilling to pay their debts. Now there’s no question that countries can suffer crises of confidence (see Greece, debt of). But what the advocates of austerity claim is that (a) the bond vigilantes are about to attack America, and (b) spending anything more on stimulus will set them off. What reason do we have to believe that any of this is true? Yes, America has long-run budget problems, but what we do on stimulus over the next couple of years has almost no bearing on our ability to deal with these long-run problems. As Douglas Elmendorf, the director of the Congressional Budget Office, recently put it, “There is no intrinsic contradiction between providing additional fiscal stimulus today, while the unemployment rate is high and many factories and offices are underused, and imposing fiscal restraint several years from now, when output and employment will probably be close to their potential.” Nonetheless, every few months we’re told that the bond vigilantes have arrived, and we must impose austerity now now now to appease them. Three months ago, a slight uptick in long-term interest rates was greeted with near hysteria: “Debt Fears Send Rates Up,” was the headline at The Wall Street Journal, although there was no actual evidence of such fears, and Alan Greenspan pronounced the rise a “canary in the mine.” Since then, long-term rates have plunged again. Far from fleeing U.S. government debt, investors evidently see it as their safest bet in a stumbling economy. Yet the advocates of austerity still assure us that bond vigilantes will attack any day now if we don’t slash spending immediately. But don’t worry: spending cuts may hurt, but the confidence fairy will take away the pain. “The idea that austerity measures could trigger stagnation is incorrect,” declared Jean-Claude Trichet, the president of the European Central Bank, in a recent interview. Why? Because “confidence-inspiring policies will foster and not hamper economic recovery.” What’s the evidence for the belief that fiscal contraction is actually expansionary, because it improves confidence? (By the way, this is precisely the doctrine expounded by Herbert Hoover in 1932.) Well, there have been historical cases of spending cuts and tax increases followed by economic growth. But as far as I can tell, every one of those examples proves, on closer examination, to be a case in which the negative effects of austerity were offset by other factors, factors not likely to be relevant today. For example, Ireland’s era of austerity-with-growth in the 1980s depended on a drastic move from trade deficit to trade surplus, which isn’t a strategy everyone can pursue at the same time. And current examples of austerity are anything but encouraging. Ireland has been a good soldier in this crisis, grimly implementing savage spending cuts. Its reward has been a Depression-level slump — and financial markets continue to treat it as a serious default risk. Other good soldiers, like Latvia and Estonia, have done even worse — and all three nations have, believe it or not, had worse slumps in output and employment than Iceland, which was forced by the sheer scale of its financial crisis to adopt less orthodox policies. So the next time you hear serious-sounding people explaining the need for fiscal austerity, try to parse their argument. Almost surely, you’ll discover that what sounds like hardheaded realism actually rests on a foundation of fantasy, on the belief that invisible vigilantes will punish us if we’re bad and the confidence fairy will reward us if we’re good. And real-world policy — policy that will blight the lives of millions of working families — is being built on that foundation.

#### Investor confidence is resilient

Tymoigne 10 Eric Tymoigne, Ph.D. is Assistant Professor of Economics at Lewis and Clark College and Research Associate at The Levy Economics Institute, 7/30/10, “The CBO’s Misplaced Fear of a Looming Fiscal Crisis,” Wall Street Pit, http://wallstreetpit.com/37891-the-cbos-misplaced-fear-of-a-looming-fiscal-crisis

A government with a sovereign currency (i.e. one that creates its own currency by fiat, only issues securities denominated in its own currency and does not promise to convert its currency into a foreign currency under any condition) does not face any liquidity or solvency constraints. All spending and debt servicing is done by crediting the accounts of the bond holders (be they foreign or domestic) and a monetarily-sovereign government can do that at will by simply pushing a computer button to mark up the size of the bond holder’s account (see Bernanke attesting to this here). In the US, financial market participants (forget about the hopelessly misguided international “credit ratings”) recognize this implicitly by not rating Treasuries and related government-entities bonds like Fannie and Freddie. They know that the US government will always pay because it faces no operational constraint when it comes to making payments denominated in a sovereign currency. It can, quite literally, afford to buy anything for sale in its own unit of account. This, of course, as many of us have already stated, does not mean that the government should spend without restraint. It only means that it is incorrect to state that government will “run of out money” or “burden our grandchildren” with debt (which, after all, allows us to earn interest on a very safe security), arguments that are commonly used by those who wish to reduce government services. These arguments are not wholly without merit. That is, there may well be things that the government is currently doing that the private economy could or should be doing. But that is not the case being made by the CBO, the pundits or the politicians. They are focused on questions of “affordability” and “sustainability,” which have no place in the debate over the proper size and role for government (a debate we would prefer to have). So let us get to that debate by recognizing that there is no operational constraint – ever – for a monetarily sovereign government. Any financial commitments, be they for Social Security, Medicare, the war effort, etc., that come due today and into the infinite future can be made on time and in full. Of course, this means that there is no need for a lock box, a trust fund or any of other accounting gimmick, to help the government make payments in the future. We can simply recognize that every government payment is made through the general budget. Once this is understood, issues like Social Security, Medicare and other important problems can be analyzed properly: it is not a financial problem; it is a productivity/growth problem. Such an understanding would lead to very different policies than the one currently proposed by the CBO (see Randy’s post here).

AT: Confidence

#### Deficit increase is the only way to stimulate investment

Malcolm Sawyer, Professor Emeritus of Economics at Leeds University Business School, May 2012, “Fiscal austerity: the cure that makes the patient worse,” <http://classonline.org.uk/docs/2012.05.20_Malcolm_Sawyer_-_the_cure_that_makes_the_patient_worse.pdf>

The present challenge is how to stimulate investment (and of the ‘right sort’) – the return of the ‘confidence fairy’ cannot be relied upon, nor can the false optimism of the OBR/Treasury macroeconometric forecasting. Low interest rates and quantitative easing have had little, if any, effect on investment. The direct way to stimulate investment is by the expansion of public investment – taken with the evidence that public investment can itself stimulate additional private investment⁷. Let us though be clear – the stimulation of investment, whether public or private, is likely to require effectively an increase in the budget deficit. The funding of the Green Investment Bank is a clear example of this. The increase can be masked by institutional and accounting practices which place the borrowing ‘off balance sheet’ – through, for example, creation of a State Investment Bank which borrows from the financial markets (along the lines of the European Investment Bank). But borrowing from a State backed institution is still needed. Insofar as the stimulation of investment is viewed as a boost to demand while the economy is recovering from recession and not a permanent increase in borrowing and in the budget deficit, it should not be included in the calculation of the structural budget deficit.

Investors will still come to the US first –financial crisis in Europe makes US a safe zone for investments

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

We are a safe haven for now” for investors because of Europe’s debt crisis, Ryan said in an interview. Rates will rise, he predicted. “We just don’t know when, and I don’t want to tempt fate.” El-Erian of Newport Beach, California-based Pimco, which oversees the world’s biggest bond fund, didn’t respond to a request for comment. Terry Belton, global head of fixed-income and foreign- exchange research at JPMorgan Chase & Co. in New York, said on a July 26, 2011, conference call that a downgrade could boost Treasury yields by as much as 70 basis points in the intermediate term and increase the government’s borrowing costs by $100 billion a year. A basis point is 0.01 percentage point. Instead, the U.S. is on track to pay less interest this year. U.S. Treasury securities paid $454 billion of interest last year, [according](http://www.treasurydirect.gov/govt/reports/ir/ir_expense.htm) to the [Congressional Budget Office](http://topics.bloomberg.com/congressional-budget-office/). That’s projected to decline to $442 billion this year and won’t climb above the 2011 cost level until 2015, according to CBO forecasts. Credit Quality Weakening U.S. credit quality, such that the nation more resembles a AA rated borrower, is still likely to drive up 10- year yields by about 60 basis points over time, JPMorgan’s Belton said in a recent interview. “Yield changes during the last year had nothing to do with the downgrade, but it had to do with everything else pushing yields lower,” Belton said. “On the top of that list you have a massive flight to quality out of Europe, and the U.S. is a safe haven.” Investors outside the U.S. owned $5.16 trillion of U.S. government debt as of April 30, compared with $4.7 trillion at the end of July 2011 before the credit-rating cut. “The one thing the Treasury market has above any other government bond market is liquidity,” [Stuart Thomson](http://topics.bloomberg.com/stuart-thomson/), a money manager in Glasgow at Ignis Asset Management, which oversees the equivalent of $109 billion, said in a June 22 interview. “That liquidity premium is not going to disappear no matter how many downgrades Moody’s or S&P give to it.” Bidders offered $3.16 for each dollar of the $1.075 trillion of notes and bonds [auctioned](http://www.bloomberg.com/quote/USN10YBC%3AIND)by the Treasury Department this year as of July 2, as yields reached all-time lows, above the previous high of $3.04 in all of 2011, according to data compiled by Bloomberg. The so-called bid-to-cover ratio was 2.26 from 1998 to 2001 when the nation ran budget surpluses.

Case—Spending Good—AT: Unsustainable

#### Stimulus is self-financing

Dennis Leech, Faculty, Department of Economics, University of Warwick, April 2012, “Fiscal Stimulus Improves Solvency in a Depressed Economy,” <http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/fac/soc/economics/staff/academic/leech/multiplier.pdf>

The Keynesian argument for a fiscal stimulus to a depressed economy either by an injection of government spending or a tax cut has been dismissed too readily by some on the grounds that it increases borrowing. We are told that the policy would simply make a bad debt problem worse: that the extra output induced by the stimulus will not yield sufficient additional tax revenue to pay for the extra government spending or to finance the tax cut because the multiplier effect described by Keynes in the *General Theory* is too weak.

However, this view is too pessimistic for two reasons. First, in general, what Is impor­tant is not the absolute level of debt but its level relative to gross domestic product: it is the debt/GDP ratio that is the key indicator of solvency. This means that in deciding on the efficacy or otherwise of a stimulus package it Is necessary to consider the magnitude of both components of this ratio and determine their net effect. When this is done, a different picture emerges. Secondly, in any case, there is growing evidence that the multiplier effect in a depressed economy might be more substantial than we sometimes allow. There are grounds for believing that the fiscal multipliers built into existing econometric models are underestimates for present conditions. There is even strong evidence to suggest that, with output well below capacity and interest rates near the zero lower bound, certain types of stimulus might be strong enough to be self-financing.

Case—Spending Good—AT: Downgrade

#### Downgrades have no effect

Mike Dorning, John Detrixhe and Ian Katz, Bloomberg Press, 07/16/’12, [Downgrade Anniversary Shows Investors Gained Buying U.S., <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-07-16/downgrade-anniversary-shows-investors-gained-buying-u-s-.html>] VN

More Entrenched Because the consequences that had been forecast for a downgrade haven’t occurred, lawmakers may become more entrenched in their positions in the next standoff over fiscal policy, approaching at the end of the year. The threat of a downgrade has lost some of its power, said Steve Bell, a former Republican staff director for the Senate Budget Committee. “You cried wolf, and no wolf appeared,” said Bell, who’s now a senior director at the Bipartisan Policy Center in Washington. “It has persuaded a fair number of members of Congress that the effect of a downgrade is overstated and it will not lead to some serious economic or financial problem.”

#### Empirics prove – no impact to a downgrade

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

When [Standard & Poor’s](http://topics.bloomberg.com/standard-%26-poor%27s/) downgraded the U.S. government’s [credit rating](http://topics.bloomberg.com/credit-rating/) in August, predictions of serious fallout soon followed. Republican presidential candidate Mitt Romney described it as a “meltdown” reminiscent of the economic crises of[Jimmy Carter](http://topics.bloomberg.com/jimmy-carter/)’s presidency. He warned of higher long-term[interest rates](http://topics.bloomberg.com/interest-rates/) and damage to foreign investors’ confidence in the U.S. U.S. House Budget Committee Chairman [Paul Ryan](http://topics.bloomberg.com/paul-ryan/) said the government’s loss of its AAA rating would raise the cost of mortgages and car loans. Mohamed El-Erian, chief executive officer of Pacific Investment Management Co., said over time the standing of the dollar and U.S. financial markets would erode and credit costs rise “for virtually all American borrowers.” They were wrong. Almost a year later, [mortgage rates](http://topics.bloomberg.com/mortgage-rates/)have dropped to record lows, the government’s borrowing costs have eased, the dollar and the benchmark S&P stock index are up, and global investors’ enthusiasm for Treasury debt has strengthened. “The [U.S. Treasury](http://topics.bloomberg.com/u.s.-treasury/) is still the widest, deepest and most actively traded in the world,” said Jeffrey Caughron, a partner at Baker Group LP in Oklahoma City, which advises community banks on investments of more than $40 billion. “That becomes all the more important when you have signs of weakening global economic growth and continued problems in Europe.” Even in a slow recovery, the U.S. has unparalleled assets in the global market, including the size and resilience of its economy and the dollar’s standing as the world’s reserve currency. Low Treasury yields show that most investors think the U.S. government will meet its obligations, no matter how dysfunctional the political climate becomes in Washington.

#### Cuts cause downgrade – falling exports – and credit ratings are unreliable anyway

Malcolm Sawyer, Professor Emeritus of Economics at Leeds University Business School, May 2012, “Fiscal austerity: the cure that makes the patient worse,” <http://classonline.org.uk/docs/2012.05.20_Malcolm_Sawyer_-_the_cure_that_makes_the_patient_worse.pdf>

The ‘fear of the credit rating agencies’ argument is a convenient scare tactic and needs to be critically examined. It may first be noted that the credit rating of a government should be based on the ability of that government to service its debt. It is well-known that a government can always service debt provided that it is denominated in its own currency. At the limit the UK government can ‘print the money’ in order to service the debt: this would not take form of literally ‘printing money’ but rather the Central Bank being a willing purchaser of government debt in exchange for money. Second, the credibility of a programme designed to reduce a structural budget deficit cannot only be judged by the perceived commitment of the government to make public expenditure cuts and raise taxes. An achieved reduction of the budget deficit requires, as a matter of an accounting identity, some combination of a rise in the balance between private investment and savings and a rise in net exports (exports minus imports). Fiscal austerity threatens to bring that about through a decline in output and income which depresses savings and imports. The government’s hope (the return of the ‘confidence fairy’) is for a boom in investment and exports, which finds support in the forecasts of the Office for Budget Responsibility. But (as argued in Fontana and Sawyer, 2011, 2012) those forecasts are close to incredible. “The Office for Budget Responsibility's forecast of a return to growth next year, driven by a surge in investment and exports, has looked absurd for months. The idea that business investment will jump 40% by 2015/16, the biggest since 1945, is risible” (Hutton, 2012). Third the reputation and judgement of the credit rating agencies had been severely undermined by their roles in the build-up to the financial crisis. An oft-quoted example has been the degree to which triple A ratings were given to mortgage backed securities and credit default swaps. This would not deny that in the event of the credit ratings agencies downgrading government debt the government concerned could well be faced with higher interest charges and difficulties in borrowing, as funds are moved from that government’s debt to others. But what is questioned is the basis on which the ratings are made, and what actions by a government would lead to a downgrade.

Case—Spending Good—AT: Crowdout

#### Spending expands demand – excess savings mean it doesn’t crowd out privates

Paul Krugman, Nobel Prize Winner for Economics, Professor of Economics and International Affairs at Princeton, 5-2-09, <http://krugman.blogs.nytimes.com/2009/05/02/liquidity-preference-loanable-funds-and-niall-ferguson-wonkish/>

In any case, I thought it might be useful to re-explain why our current predicament can be thought of as a global excess of desired savings — which means that fiscal deficits won’t drive up interest rates unless they also expand the economy. Here’s what I imagine Niall Ferguson was thinking: he was thinking of the interest rate as determined by the supply and demand for savings. This is the “loanable funds” model of the interest rate, which is in every textbook, mine included. It looks like this: where S is savings, I investment spending, and r the interest rate. What Keynes [pointed out](http://krugman.blogs.nytimes.com/2009/02/23/liquidity-preference-versus-loanable-funds-televised-wonkish-with-video/?scp=1&sq=keynes%20diagram&st=cse) was that this picture is incomplete if you allow for the possibility that the economy is not at full employment. Why? Because saving and investment depend on the level of GDP. Suppose GDP rises; some of this increase in income will be saved, pushing the savings schedule to the right. There may also be a rise in investment demand, but ordinarily we’d expect the savings rise to be larger, so that the interest rate falls: So supply and demand for funds doesn’t tell you what the interest rate is — not by itself. It tells you what the interest rate would be conditional on the level of GDP; or to put it another way, it defines a relationship between the interest rate and GDP, like this: This is the IS curve, taught in Econ 101. Now, we usually explain how this curve is derived in a different way: we say that given the interest rate, you can determine investment demand, and then through the multiplier process this determines GDP. What you’re supposed to understand, however, is that the derivation I’ve just given is just a different way of arriving at the same result. It’s just different presentations of the same model. So what determines the level of GDP, and hence also ties down the interest rate? The answer is that you need to add “liquidity preference”, the supply and demand for money. In the modern world, we often take a shortcut and just assume that the central bank adjusts the money supply so as to achieve a target interest rate, in effect choosing a point on the IS curve. Which brings us to the current state of affairs. Right now the interest rate that the Fed can choose is essentially zero, but that’s not enough to achieve full employment. As shown above, the interest rate the Fed would like to have is negative. That’s not just what I say, by the way: the FT reports that the [Fed’s own economists](http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/23b62bfc-338b-11de-8f1b-00144feabdc0.html) estimate the desired Fed funds rate at -5 percent. What does this situation look like in terms of loanable funds? Draw the supply and demand for funds that would obtain if we were at full employment. They look like this: In effect, we have an incipient excess supply of savings even at a zero interest rate. And that’s our problem. So what does government borrowing do? It gives some of those excess savings a place to go — and in the process expands overall demand, and hence GDP. It does NOT crowd out private spending, at least not until the excess supply of savings has been sopped up, which is the same thing as saying not until the economy has escaped from the liquidity trap. Now, there are real problems with large-scale government borrowing — mainly, the effect on the government debt burden. I don’t want to minimize those problems; some countries, such as Ireland, are being forced into fiscal contraction even in the face of severe recession. But the fact remains that our current problem is, in effect, a problem of excess worldwide savings, looking for someplace to go.

#### Their author concedes that infrastructure spending eventually boosts the private sector

Daniel Mitchell, Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute, 2-1-10, <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/spending-our-way-stagnation>

Interestingly, a large body of academic work attempts to measure the growth-optimizing level of government. This research is based on the notion there is not much prosperity in a state of anarchy. Governments solve this problem by imposing the rule of law (courts, police protection, etc). Those governmental functions cost money, but they yield big benefits. Moreover, government spending on "public goods" such as basic infrastructure also can facilitate the functioning of a market economy.

Case—Spending Good—AT: Fiscal Cliff

No impact to fiscal cliff

Nin-Hai Tseng, Staff Writer for CNN Money, 06/12/’12, [The fiscal cliff may look more like a fiscal slope, <http://finance.fortune.cnn.com/2012/06/12/fiscal-cliff-explainer/>] VN

Some think so. Chad Stone, chief economist at the non-partisan Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, says the fears are misplaced. In a paper released last week, he wrote that the economy won't immediately fall over a cliff and plunge into another Great Recession come January 1. Rather than rush negotiations and end up with potentially very bad policy, policymakers still have some (although limited) time to come up with a solid plan and therefore avoid another downturn. To be sure, Stone doesn't doubt the U.S. will slip into recession if lawmakers drag their feet for too long. The slated policy changes include an end to the temporary tax cuts enacted during the George W. Bush administration, as well as an end to the temporary Obama administration payroll tax reductions. If the slated changes take effect, the economy could contract by 1.3% during the first half of 2013 and grow by 2.3% during the second half, according to the Congressional Budget Office. That's scary stuff. However, it will take some time before the economy feels the weight of those changes. Stone offers a few examples, starting with the tax cuts: It's true that households might feel a pinch from an increase in taxes withheld from their weekly or monthly checks, "but taxpayers newly falling within the reach of the [Alternative Minimum Tax] in 2012 will not actually pay those higher taxes until they file their returns in subsequent months," he writes. So while the implications of a fiscal cliff are very real, it's more like a "fiscal slope," he adds. Stone's bigger point is that good policymaking takes time. If lawmakers go past the fiscal cliff by a few weeks or a month, the economy would be okay.

Fiscal cliff won’t make the economy any worse

Heidi N. Moore, Marketplace Economy Staff, 06/07/’12, [Is the U.S. headed off a fiscal cliff?, <http://www.marketplace.org/topics/economy/us-headed-fiscal-cliff>] VN

Ryssdal: So pick your geographic feature -- is it really a cliff, or a slope? I mean, what's it going to be? Moore: Yeah, you can call it a canyon, a gully, a ditch -- I mean, the question is: Are we going to bungee jump off this thing or what, right? The key problem, as you mentioned, is the spending cuts and the tax cuts that start at the beginning of 2013. So Congress has until basically the beginning of the year to deal with that. And the problem is, there's problems with calling it a cliff. We know it's happening in January, but look around: We already have problems, we have high unemployment, we have a weak economy. So it's not like we're falling from a really great height. And the economy doesn't run on our timetable; it's not as if like the New Year's ball is going to drop in Times Square -- Ryssdal: And boom! Moore: Right -- 'Recession! It's here!' That's not going to happen, there's going to be a lag. So I would say picture it more as a ski slope, it'll be gradually downward. Ryssdal: A bunny slope, if you will? Moore: A bunny slope, even. Except we're going to hit nothing but empty air if we don't get it right, which is more like a black diamond slope. Ryssdal: All right, well help me out then. Why was it that we've known about this cliff for a while, you look at the markets -- first of all, all day yesterday and then early today, up hundreds of points -- what's the disconnect between what's actually going to come and what Wall Street and that part of the economy thinks is happening? Moore: Sure, absolutely. Well what Wall Street wants to see is that lawmakers are paying attention. And from that montage we just heard, they definitely are -- they're obsessing about it, they're having secret meetings about it, that's really good. And the other thing that helps is that governments all over the world are thinking about a recession, and so we're not the only ones worried -- there's China, Australia, Brazil -- they all cut their interest rates. Europe has low interest rates. And people in the markets like to see that. So I talked to Gary Thayer, he's the chief macrostrategist for Wells Fargo Advisers. He said the fact that Congress is having all these secret meetings is a good sign.

Case—Terrorism—Al Qaeda Strong

**Al Qaeda is growing stronger**

Jones, June [Seth G., April/June, 2012, “Think Again: Al Qaeda,” Foreign Policy, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/04/23/think\_again\_al\_qaeda]

These declarations of victory, however, underestimate al Qaeda's continuing capacity for destruction. Far from being dead and buried, the terrorist organization is now riding a resurgent tide as its affiliates engage in an increasingly violent campaign of attacks across the Middle East and North Africa. And for all the admiration inspired by brave protesters in the streets from Damascus to Sanaa, the growing instability triggered by the Arab Spring has provided al Qaeda with fertile ground to expand its influence across the region. Al Qaeda's bloody fingerprints are increasingly evident in the Middle East. In Iraq, where the United States has withdrawn its military forces, al Qaeda operatives staged a brazen wave of bombings in January, killing at least 132 Shiite pilgrims and wounding hundreds more. The following week in Yemen, fighters from al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula seized the town of Radda, while expanding al Qaeda's control in several southern provinces. "Al Qaeda has raised its flag over the citadel," a resident told Reuters. Beyond these anecdotes, several indicators suggest that al Qaeda is growing stronger. First, the size of al Qaeda's global network has dramatically expanded since the 9/11 attacks. Al Qaeda in Iraq, al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula, al Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb, and Somalia's al-Shabab have formally joined al Qaeda, and their leaders have all sworn bayat -- an oath of loyalty -- to bin Laden's successor, Ayman al-Zawahiri. These al Qaeda affiliates are increasingly capable of holding territory. In Yemen, for example, al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula has exploited a government leadership crisis and multiple insurgencies to cement control in several provinces along the Gulf of Aden. Al Qaeda's affiliates in Somalia and Iraq also appear to be maintaining a foothold where there are weak governments, with al-Shabab in Kismayo and southern parts of Somalia, and al Qaeda in Iraq in Baghdad, Diyala, and Salah ad Din provinces, among others. The number of attacks by al Qaeda and its affiliates is also on the rise, even since bin Laden's death. Al Qaeda in Iraq, for instance, has conducted more than 200 attacks and killed more than a thousand Iraqis since the bin Laden raid, a jump from the previous year. And despite the group's violent legacy, popular support for al Qaeda remains fairly high in countries such as Nigeria and Egypt, though it has steadily declined in others. If this is what the brink of defeat looks like, I'd hate to see success. Wishful thinking. In recent years, al Qaeda leaders have consciously developed a strategy to expand their presence in North Africa, the Middle East, and South Asia. Rather than weakening the organization, this mergers-and-acquisitions strategy has been fairly successful in allowing al Qaeda to expand its global presence. Today, al Qaeda has evolved from a fairly hierarchical organization at its 1988 founding to a more decentralized one composed of four main tiers. First, there's al Qaeda's core leadership in Pakistan. Zawahiri took over as emir after bin Laden's death, and Abu Yahya al-Libi, the head of al Qaeda's religious committee, became his deputy. They are flanked by a new cast of younger operatives, such as Hassan Gul, Hamza al-Ghamdi, Abd al-Rahman al-Maghrebi, and Abu Zayd al-Kuwaiti al-Husaynan -- figures charged with plotting al Qaeda operations, managing its media image, and developing its religious dogma.
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Case—Terrorism—Al Qaeda Strong—Ext

**Al Qaeda is globally strong**

Habeck, 4/17 [Foreign Policy, Mary, 2012, “Evaluating the war with al Qaeda, part IV: How well are we doing?” http://shadow.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/04/17/evaluating\_the\_war\_with\_al\_qaeda\_part\_iv\_how\_well\_are\_we\_doing]

Al Qaeda's leadership, on the other hand, considers itself to be much more than just a core of terrorists, but rather the "high command" of a global organization. In their view, the affiliates (or branches), as well as many fighters in Afghanistan-Pakistan, are integral members of al Qaeda. They have publicly described expansive objectives that include overthrowing the rulers of every Muslim-majority country (whether part of an earlier Islamic state or not), imposing their version of sharia, and then setting up "amirates," or Islamic states in these countries. Al Qaeda believes that they have achieved many of these goals already and are pressing forward to seize more territory and set up new shadow governments. So how do we reconcile these very different versions of the war and determine where we are at in this conflict? I believe that the most important question we can ask ourselves is this: Is al Qaeda better off now than it was ten years ago? If we just look at attacks on the U.S., its citizens, and even its allies, we will agree with the current majority view of al Qaeda and answer "no." Unlike before 9-11, when al Qaeda and terrorists trained by the group were able to carry out devastating attacks against the U.S. and its interests in 1993, 1995, 1998, and 2000, the period since 9-11 has been marked by one CT triumph after another. The planned follow-up attacks (the so-called "second wave") were foiled or failed to materialize and other serious plots have been stopped on a regular basis. The only large-scale attacks that succeeded were abroad (Bali (2002), Spain (2004), London (2005) -- no other major attempts since 2005 have made it past the CT nets of the U.S. and our allies. We will, however, draw quite a different conclusion if we look at how al Qaeda is faring in the rest of the world. On September 11, al Qaeda controlled perhaps a half-dozen camps in one safe-haven (Afghanistan) and had a few tentative alliances with other jihadist groups that had mostly local concerns. Today al Qaeda has multiple safe-havens (in northern Pakistan, Somalia, Yemen, the Sahel); controls branches in many countries that share al Qaeda's global aspirations; holds territory through shadow governments that force local Muslims to follow al Qaeda's version of sharia; and is waging open war on numerous battlefields (Afghanistan, Somalia, Yemen, Mali, etc.). Most tellingly, it is involved -- sometimes weakly, at other times in strength -- in every Muslim-majority country in the world. Based on these facts, any net assessment of al Qaeda would conclude that, despite its failure to carry out a mass-casualty attack on the U.S. since 9-11, the group is in far better condition on a global scale than at any time in its history. And if, as al Qaeda itself has always argued, attacking the U.S. was just one means toward the greater ends of overthrowing Muslim rulers, imposing their version of sharia, and controlling territory, then they have made real progress toward achieving their strategic goals.

**Terrorists are trying to attack Aviation System**

CBS News, 7/2

[“Norwegian at center of new al Qaeda plot fears,” CBS This Morning, 7/2/12, http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-505263\_162-57464755/norwegian-at-center-of-new-qaeda-plot-fears/]

There are reports of concern over another terror plot involving Al Qaeda targeting a U.S. airliner. Sources say that the bomber that Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP) has recruited is a Norwegian convert to Islam, who is believed to be in his thirties, with no criminal record. The Times of London reports that the airliner attack is believed to be timed to the upcoming Olympics, though a U.K. intelligence official told the paper that the plot would be pursued regardless of the London Games: "The only thing that connects this to the Olympics is the fact that they are about to happen," the official said. An earlier AQAP plot to blow up a plane was foiled two months ago when a man working with British intelligence infiltrated the group and volunteered to be a suicide bomber - then delivered the bomb to intelligence officials. CBS News senior correspondent John Miller, a former Deputy Director of National Intelligence, said that despite foiled bomb plots targeting airliners, al Qaeda has not lost its fascination with commercial aviation - and that AQAP (al Qaeda's branch based in Yemen) has been specifically assigned to find a way to blow up a U.S. plane. "They were the architects of the first underwear bomb, they were the architects of the ingenious printer bomb which was interdicted before it could go off," Miller said. "And I think what we're seeing once again is they've tried to put a bomb on a person and get them on a plane. Whether it has anything to do with the Olympics or the Fourth of July - one of the chosen target holidays by bin Laden - is something we don't yet know. "Another thing that AQAP and Yemen developed was a surgically implanted bomb," Miller added. "Now, we've seen the design for that, but we haven't seen it used in a commercial airline threat yet." On "CBS This Morning" Miller said using a Norwegian convert matches al Qaeda's efforts to find operatives who don't fit the profile of terrorists for whom Western intelligence is searching, who are radicalized via the Internet. Miller said intelligence agencies must now find an individual who fits the profile of an al Qaeda convert: "Someone 18 to 35, someone who is from Norway, someone who has traveled to places that are jump-off spots to go to Yemen. Now, you've got maybe tens of thousands of people, or thousands. But you want to crunch that down to who has connection somewhere else in the database, and focus on those people." Miller said there are two ways to investigate the pool of possible suspects: "One, the traditional way, which is you have intelligence officers overseas who run intelligence agents in the field and you say, 'Now bang against your sources and see if we can come up with a real name on this guy and where he is.' "And the less traditional and perhaps the more interesting way is the data crunching piece where you take what you do know about him and then what you know about the geography, and then you use supercomputers to crunch through those records and say 'How do we narrow this pool down and then how do we look for further connections?'

Case—Terrorists love aviation attacks

Terrorists are obsessed with aviation attacks

Jenkins 2012 [Brian Michael, July “New Challenges to U.S. Counterterrorism Efforts” Testimony presented before the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee on July 11, 2012

http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/testimonies/2012/RAND\_CT377.pdf]

Terrorists remain obsessed with attacking commercial aviation. With improved passenger screening, locked and armored cockpit doors, armed air marshals, armed pilots, and, most importantly, airline passengers no longer willing to remain passive bystanders but more likely to assault would-be hijackers, terrorist hijackings may no longer be viable, but sabotage of aircraft with concealed explosives remains a favored terrorist tactic. Since 9/11, terrorists have made eight attempts to smuggle bombs on board commercial aircraft. Four of the attempts involved planes flying to the United States (the shoe bomber in 2001, the underwear bomber in 2009, and the two bombs aboard cargo aircraft in 2010). There also were 10 several thwarted plots, including the 2006 Heathrow plot, the recovery by an undercover agent of an improved underwear bomb in 2012, and the recent discovery of another plot in the United Kingdom to sabotage a U.S. airliner. Aviation security remains a matter of national security.6 While terrorists apparently consider airliners to be their gold-medal target, public surface transportation offers easier access and concentrations of people in confined environments, enhancing the effects of explosives and unconventional weapons. Surface transportation has become a terrorist killing field. Between 9/11 and the end of 2011, there were 75 terrorist attacks on airplanes and airports worldwide, resulting in 157 deaths.

Case—Terrorism—Sparks securitization

Terrorism is a global threat and it causes international responses

CFR, 7/9 [Council on Foreign Relations, “The Global Regime for Terrorism” 2012 <http://www.cfr.org/asia/global-regime-terrorism/p25729>]

September 11, 2001, shocked the international system, changing global perspectives on both the threat of terrorism and the tools required to prevent it. Although multilateral instruments against terrorism have existed since the 1960s, the unprecedented reach and potential of terrorist networks such as al-Qaeda and its affiliates constitute a new danger that challenges standing tools and institutions. Despite the death of al-Qaeda leader Osama bin Laden in May 2011, the world is still—a decade after September 11—looking for an effective way to respond to the global terrorist threat. In recent years, terrorist networks have evolved, moving away from a dependency on state sponsorship; many of the most dangerous groups and individuals now operate as nonstate actors. Taking advantage of porous borders and interconnected international systems—finance, communications, and transit—terrorist groups can reach every corner of the globe. While some remain focused on local or national political dynamics, others seek to affect global change. At the forefront of this trend is al-Qaeda. From its base in the borderlands between Afghanistan and Pakistan, the al-Qaeda network has spread widely, establishing branches or affiliates elsewhere, including in North Africa, Yemen, and Southeast Asia. Driven by an extreme salafi ideology—characterized by opposition to Western influence and the goal of creating a global Islamic caliphate—al-Qaeda operatives have killed thousands—from Madrid to Bali to Baghdad. What is more, the group's alluring ideology extends its reach, prompting some individuals outside its direct command to take violent action. The threat from al-Qaeda has proven global, multifaceted, and difficult to track and contain. It continues to pose the most prominent terrorist threat. Other groups, however, have also emerged, and operate, with their own distinct goals, outside traditional networks and hotspots. Europe and the United States are not immune from terrorism within their borders. This global diffusion of the threat requires a comprehensive response that provides solutions on national, regional, and international levels—and addresses not only the methods but also the factors that can contribute to the spread of terrorism. Since September 11, generating such a comprehensive response has proven difficult.

Case—Terrorism—Terminal impact

Terrorism results in great power war

Ayson 10**,** Professor of Strategic Studies and Director of the Centre for Strategic Studies: New Zealand at the Victoria University of Wellington, 2010 (Robert,“After a Terrorist Nuclear Attack: Envisaging Catalytic Effects,” *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, Volume 33, Issue 7, July, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via InformaWorld)

But these two nuclear worlds—a non-state actor nuclear attack and a catastrophic interstate nuclear exchange—are not necessarily separable. It is just possible that some sort of terrorist attack, and especially an act of nuclear terrorism, could precipitate a chain of events leading to a **massive exchange** of nuclear weapons between two or more of the states that possess them. In this context, today’s and tomorrow’s terrorist groups might assume the place allotted during the early Cold War years to new state possessors of small nuclear arsenals who were seen as raising the risks of a **catalytic nuclear war** **between the superpowers** started by third parties. These risks were considered in the late 1950s and early 1960s as concerns grew about nuclear proliferation, the so-called n+1 problem. It may require a considerable amount of imagination to depict an especially plausible situation where an act of nuclear terrorism could lead to such a massive inter-state nuclear war. For example, in the event of a terrorist nuclear attack on the United States, it might well be wondered just how Russia and/or China could plausibly be brought into the picture, not least because they seem unlikely to be fingered as the most obvious state sponsors or encouragers of terrorist groups. They would seem far too responsible to be involved in supporting that sort of terrorist behavior that could just as easily threaten them as well. Some possibilities, however remote, do suggest themselves. For example, how might the United States react if it was thought or discovered that the fissile material used in the act of nuclear terrorism had come from **Russia**n stocks,40 and if for some reason Moscow denied any responsibility for nuclear laxity? The correct attribution of that nuclear material to a particular country might not be a case of science fiction given the observation by Michael May et al. that while the debris resulting from a nuclear explosion would be “spread over a wide area in tiny fragments, its radioactivity makes it detectable, identifiable and collectable, and a wealth of information can be obtained from its analysis: the efficiency of the explosion, the materials used and, most important … some indication of where the nuclear material came from.”41 Alternatively, if the act of nuclear terrorism came as a complete surprise, and American officials refused to believe that a terrorist group was fully responsible (or responsible at all) **suspicion would shift immediately to state possessors.** Ruling out Western ally countries like the United Kingdom and France, and probably Israel and India as well, authorities in Washington would be left with a very short list consisting of North Korea, perhaps Iran if its program continues, and possibly Pakistan. But at what stage would Russia and China be definitely ruled out in this high stakes game of nuclear Cluedo? In particular, if the act of nuclear terrorism occurred against a backdrop of existing tension in Washington’s relations with Russia and/or China, and at a time when threats had already been traded between these major powers, would officials and political leaders not be tempted to assume the worst? Of course, the chances of this occurring would only seem to increase if the United States was already involved in some sort of limited armed conflict with Russia and/or China, or if they were confronting each other from a distance in a proxy war, as unlikely as these developments may seem at the present time. The reverse might well apply too: should a nuclear terrorist attack occur in Russia or China during a period of heightened tension or even limited conflict with the United States, could Moscow and Beijing resist the pressures that might rise domestically to consider the United States as a possible perpetrator or encourager of the attack? Washington’s early response to a terrorist nuclear attack on its own soil might also raise the possibility of an unwanted (and nuclear aided) confrontation with Russia and/or China. For example, in the noise and **confusion during the immediate aftermath of the terrorist nuclear attack,** the U.S. president might be expected to place the country’s armed forces, including its nuclear arsenal, **on a higher stage of alert.** In such a tense environment, when careful planning runs up against the friction of reality, it is just possible that Moscow and/or China might mistakenly read this as a sign of U.S. intentions to use force (and possibly nuclear force) against them. In that situation, the temptations to preempt such actions might grow, although it must be admitted that any preemption would probably still meet with a devastating response.

**Terrorism crushes the economy and leads to retaliation and global war**

Diamond 8 [USA Today, 10/9, John Diamond is a Washington fellow of the Saga Foundation. He is also a former national security reporter for USA TODAY and author of The CIA and the Culture of Failure. “A financial apocalypse isn't nearly as scary as a nuclear one”] LexisNexis

Nuclear terrorism, the most serious existential threat to our homeland, has fallen off our priority list. The startling crisis on Wall Street, and the threat it poses to Main Street, has relegated national security to an afterthought -- when it should be anything but. Four years ago, during the presidential campaign, President Bush and Sen. John Kerry, D-Mass., agreed that the possibility that a terrorist group could obtain fissile material, fashion a crude nuclear weapon and set it off in an American city was our greatest threat. This year, the topic barely got a mention in the presidential debates. Go to the websites of Barack Obama and John McCain and click on the "Issues" buttons. In neither case does the drop-down list include a separate category called "terrorism." Once you click through enough layers, you discover that they both agree on the importance of securing nuclear weapons material. Both have endorsed the concept of "a world without nuclear weapons." And they both support gradual but significant reductions in the U.S. and Russian arsenals. The absence of a sharp disagreement between the candidates on responding to the nuclear terror threat might explain why it has all but disappeared from view as the fall campaign approaches. Yet perhaps our leaders and their constituents have not fully grasped the consequences of such an attack beyond the grim image of a mushroom cloud over an American city. The aftershocks As the Saga Foundation -- a non-profit organization focused on the threat of terrorism involving weapons of mass destruction -- argued in a recent white paper, the vast damage at and around a nuclear ground zero would be dwarfed in scope by the national and global economic aftershocks. These aftershocks would stem not only from the explosion itself but also from a predictable set of decisions a president would almost certainly have to make in grappling with the possibility of a follow-on attack. Assuming, as the experts believe likely, that such a weapon would have to be smuggled into the country, the president could be expected to close the nation's borders, halt all freight commerce and direct a search of virtually any moving conveyance that could transport a nuclear weapon. Most manufacturing would then cease. In a nation that lives on just-in-time inventory, these developments could empty the nation's shelves in days. The effects of post-attack decision-making go far beyond this example. If U.S. intelligence determined that one or more countries had somehow aided and abetted the attack, we would face the prospect of full-scale war. Even short of that, the nation would demand, and the president would almost certainly order, a level of retaliation at the suspected locus of the attacking group that would dwarf the post-9/11 military response. The possibility of follow-on attacks could transform our notions of civil liberties and freedom forever. And as former 9/11 Commission co-chairman Lee Hamilton has pointed out, a nuclear terrorist attack would prompt a collapse in public faith in the government's ability to protect the American people. Think your 401(k) hurts now? The presidential nominees, and the American people, should reconsider the tendency to view these two issues -- economic crisis and the threat of catastrophic terrorism -- as separate problems. A nuclear attack on a U.S. city would not only devastate the target and kill possibly hundreds of thousands, it would also create instantaneous national and global economic ripple effects with incalculable consequences. To put it in personal terms, if you think things are tough in the nation's financial sector now, imagine what your 401(k) -- or your paycheck -- might look like six months after a nuclear detonation in Lower Manhattan or downtown Washington. Saga's study merely began what must become a much larger-scale effort to understand in the fullest detail possible the consequences of an act of nuclear terrorism, not only the attack itself but also the decisions that would almost certainly follow. The idea is not to depress people but to motivate them. While some of the consequences are obvious, others are not, and it is the less understood aftershocks that could damage our world as well as transform it -- and not for the better. John Diamond is a Washington fellow of the Saga Foundation. He is also a former national security reporter for USA TODAY and author of The CIA and the Culture of Failure.

Case—Terrorism—National Attacks—Prevention

Integration is essential to national defense

Joint Planning and Development Office, 04 [2004, “Next Generation Air Transportation System: Integrated Plan” Department of Transportation, http://www.jpdo.aero/pdf/NGATS\_v1\_1204r.pdf]

The future air transportation system must be able to facilitate the nation’s ability to respond rapidly to emerging threats while maintaining commercial and civilian access to our airspace. Integrating the information and communication systems of defense agencies is essential to ensuring that our nation is prepared to combat threats. Integrated capabilities will support national defense by improving our ability to share information among agencies and organizations responsible for protecting our country. Sharing information and obtaining a common picture of our skies will enable a proactive approach to protection. It also will facilitate rapid responses to a variety of threats. For example, improved information regarding aircraft that may be entering restricted airspace will likely reduce the need for combat air patrols. The future air transportation system also will improve support for military missions. Commercial carriers will be able to provide more capable and economical transportation services and access to global airspace. Additionally, global harmonization of standards, procedures, and operations will reduce the investment necessary to ensure U.S. military access to international airspace. The availability of improved tracking and surveillance technologies will allow continued commercial and civilian access to our national airspace while mobilizing defense activities. The future system will feature the ability to define flexible airspace, quickly changing boundaries required by military and civilian operations. This will enhance the ability to support military missions and ensure continuous quality service to other airspace users.

NextGen prevents aviation attacks

Joint Planning and Development Office, 2007 [February 28, “Concept of Operations

for the Next Generation Air Transportation System” http://www.jpdo.gov/library/nextgenconopsv12.pdf]

The major objective of Secure Airspace is to prevent or counter external attacks on aircraft and 3531 other airborne vehicles anywhere in the NAS or using an aircraft as a weapon to attack assets and 3532 people on the ground. In order to reduce the security risk within the air domain, NextGen Secure 3533 Airspace systems and procedures detect and prevent or mitigate (1) anomalies in aircraft 3534 operation that indicate unauthorized use or attempted unauthorized use, (2) aircraft not providing 3535 the appropriate cooperative data concerning identity and intentions, (3) external attacks on 3536 aircraft, and (4) aircraft that can pose a threat from operating in the NAS. These risk 3537 management requirements include defining (almost always dynamically) the boundaries of SUA 3538 and temporary flight restrictions (TFR), the cooperative division of responsibilities between the 3539 DSP, SSP, and ANSP in the event of security events in flight or by airborne threat aircraft, and 3540 the security personnel on flights and modifications/equipage to the aircraft. [R-118], [R-119], [R- 3541 120], [R-121], [R-122], [P-57], [P-58], [P-59] In addition, Secure Airspace implements airspace 3542 access and flight procedures based on a verification process that dynamically adjusts for aircraft 3543 performance capabilities. [P-60] The model combines credentialing data with performance data 3544 as part of developing the risk profile of the aircraft. [R-123], [P-61] One objective is to permit 3545 increased NAS access by low-performance aircraft through most restricted zones since the 3546 reaction time to intercept is correspondingly greater than with high-performance aircraft. Refer 3547 to Chapter 2 for additional information. A depiction of secure airpace is provided in Figure 6-1.
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Case—Terrorism—National Attacks—Prevention—Ext

NextGen protects the environment and boosts heg

Joint Planning and Development Office, 04 [2004, “Next Generation Air Transportation System: Integrated Plan” Department of Transportation, http://www.jpdo.aero/pdf/NGATS\_v1\_1204r.pdf]

As aviation grows, we must reduce aircraft noise and emissions as well as contaminants from airports. Aviation simply must become a better neighbor. Improved environmental protection will be a vital element to ensure U.S. air transportation viability and global leadership. Certain regions of the world already have adopted policies that limit aviation growth to protect the environment. Noise and emissions at the Nation’s largest airports would limit capacity if they are not aggressively addressed. his environmental compatibility will be achieved through a combination of improvements in aircraft performance and operational procedures, land use around airports, policies and incentives to accelerate technology introduction into the fleet, and aircraft de-icing procedures. The Next Generation Air Transportation System (NGATS) will apply advances in design, engineering, and emerging technologies to ensure that growth in the number of aircraft and airports does not exceed approved environmental limits. Further gains will be realized from new policies and approaches in regulation and mitigation. Long-term, reinvigorated research and development and refined technology implementation strategies will help to keep pace with changing environmental requirements. Policy and financial incentives will be used to accelerate the introduction of environmental technology improvements in aircraft, including propulsion technologies, materials development, and airframe designs. Intelligent flight planning, coupled with improved flight management capabilities, will enable more fuel-efficient profiles throughout the flight envelope. Noise and local emission reduction efforts will be coordinated among multiple aviation operations in large metropolitan areas. By 2025, the impact of aviation on community noise and local air quality will be reduced in absolute terms, even with anticipated growth in air traffic. Uncertainty in the emerging issues of climate change and health effects of emissions will be reduced to a level that enables appropriate actions to be undertaken to address these effects. Airports will be valued neighbors keeping the public well informed about aviation and environment issues. Airlines and airframe/ engine manufacturers will be recognized as global leaders in jointly addressing mobility and environmental needs.

NextGen enhances security

Joint Planning and Development Office, 2007 [February 28, “Concept of Operations

for the Next Generation Air Transportation System” http://www.jpdo.gov/library/nextgenconopsv12.pdf]

Security services are provided by a risk-informed security system that depends on multiple 83 technologies, policies, and procedures adaptively scaled and arranged to defeat a given threat. 84 New technologies and procedures aid in passenger screening and checkpoint responsibilities. 85 Baggage screening improvements include integrated chemical, biological, radiological, and 86 nuclear explosives (CBRNE) detection and sensor fusion systems ranging in size for increased 87 portability and remote screening.

Case—Solvency—3-5 Years

A stream of funding for NextGen guarantees implementation in 3-5 years

Wilson, Contributing writer, Aerospace America, 10

J.R.Wilson, Contributing writer, Aerospace America, 5-10, [“A Slow Transformation,” AEROSPACE AMERICA/MAY 2010 31, http://www.aerospaceamerica.org/Documents/May%202010%20Aerospace%20America%20PDF%20Files/30\_NextGen\_MAY2010.pdf] E. Liu

“The aviation industry—from the makers of planes to the people and companies who fly them, from foreign air navigation service providers to local airports—all agree that, with adequate resources, we, government and industry can work together to bring NextGen to implementation in 3-5 years instead of the 10-15 years that is currently pegged,” Aerospace Industries Association president and former FAA administrator Marion Blakey told a symposium on ADS-B (Automatic Dependent Surveillance-Broadcast) last fall. “So, what is holding us back? Funding. Not an inconsequential barrier when you consider the economy, the state of the airline industry and multiple priorities weighing on the administration and Congress.”

Case—Ready Now – Tests

Next Gen is ready for deployment now and will solve – testing and status quo applications prove

Mims ’11

 [Christopher Mims, contributor to Good, Technology Review and The Huffington Post, and is a former editor at Scientific American; “Next Gen will change air travel, Why the delay?” http://www.txchnologist.com/2011/nextgen-will-change-air-travel-why-the-delay]

Standards finalized The intransigence of air carriers aside, the most important technical standards for NextGen have been finalized. Much of the equipment has been put through its paces, and in some parts of the world, including the U.S., some of its most important components are already in service. By the end of 2012, the U.S. will be fully covered with the radio receivers that will replace conventional radar, according to R. John Hansman, director of the International Center for Air Transportation at MIT. NextGen is satellite enabled, which means that airplanes in the system can use GPS to determine their location. But this doesn’t mean the system is dependent on GPS, says Hansman, who points out that airplanes have long had other sources of location information, including inertial navigation, which uses dead reckoning to determine location based on last known position, as well as transponder-based radio navigation systems. The FAA will also continue to maintain some radar installations, which will also be a last line of defense against “uncooperative targets, in other words, terrorists,” says Hansman. Some carriers are already enjoying some of the benefits of the core communication system of NextGen, known as Automatic Dependent Surveillance-Broadcast, or ADS-B. By 2015, most of the countries in Europe and Asia will require that all planes in their airspace be equipped with ADS-B “out,” which broadcasts the location of a plane. The same technology will be mandated in U.S. airspace by 2020. UPS has been experimenting with ADS-B since 1996, according to Mike Mangeot, a company spokesman. Its entire fleet is equipped with both ADS-B in and out, which means its planes not only broadcast their location but can see the location of every other plane with the equipment. UPS has a special incentive to pioneer this technology — at its packed world-wide air hub in Louisville, delays of even a few minutes can be problematic. ADS-B also allows UPS to engage in “Continuous Descent Approaches,” in which “an aircraft coasts into an airport with its engines at idle thrust, rather than stepping down in a traditional landing. This reduces noise and nitrous oxide emissions and reduces fuel consumption,” says Mangeot. But who will pay? The fact that NextGen will reduce costs for the FAA, by eliminating the need for many expensive radar installations and the overtaxed air traffic controllers who run them, has led some in industry to conclude that the agency should foot most of the bill. The FAA has already spent $4.4 billion of the $7 billion it currently has allotted to realize NextGen. To incentivize airlines to cover the cost of retrofitting their own planes with ADS-B and, in some cases, new navigational systems, which Hansman says can run to hundreds of thousands of dollars a plane for a large commercial aircraft, the agency is considering giving carriers who install the equipment before the 2020 deadline privileged access to airports. If that doesn’t work, there’s always the argument that, as fuel costs rise, the routes that can be plotted with precise satellite navigation will save enough fuel to justify the cost of retrofits. Southwest Airlines has already made this kind of commitment, and is saving $16 million a year in fuel as a result. It’s also been proposed that the FAA subsidize airlines’ costs for upgrading, but that seems unlikely in the current fiscal climate in Washington. Many of the benefits of NextGen, such as safety and improved awareness for America’s many small airplanes, are public goods that are not likely to be justified on the grounds of cost alone, anyway. That’s just one of the reasons it has taken this long to realize a system that was first proposed in the 1980s. Another is that a misconception remains that NextGen is a monolithic enterprise that will be realized all at once, and can’t be rolled out in pieces. “NextGen is completely based on an incremental rollout; it’s designed to be scalable” says Laura Brown, deputy assistant administrator for public affairs at the FAA. One of the dimensions of the technology that will continue to scale is a feature of NextGen that will be present only in the U.S.: A high-bandwidth data channel, known as UAT, which will allow ground controllers to send almost any kind of digital communication to planes. Literally, an Internet in the sky.

Case—Solvency—Boosts the environment

NextGen protects the environment

Joint Planning and Development Office, 2007 [February 28, “Concept of Operations

for the Next Generation Air Transportation System” http://www.jpdo.gov/library/nextgenconopsv12.pdf]

Environmental interests are proactively addressed through the development and implementation 89 of an integrated Environmental Management System (EMS). Technologies are incorporated 90 before and during operations to enable optimized route selection, landing, and take-off 91 procedures based on a range of data feeds including noise, air emission, fuel burn, cost, and route 92 efficiency. At airports, a flexible, systematic approach is developed to identify and manage 93 environmental resources that are critical to sustainable growth. Environmental considerations 94 continue to be incorporated into aircraft design to proactively address issues including noise 95 reduction and aircraft engine emissions.

NextGen would reduce carbon dioxide emissions.

Salam 12

(Sakib bin Salam, Policy Intern at Eno Center for Transportation, “NextGen: Aligning Costs, Benefits, and Political Leadership,” April 2012.)

Another criticism is that the operators cause most of the de­lays in some airports through flight scheduling for business reasons as opposed to due to airport capacity limitations. As a result it is argued that NextGen could do little to alleviate delays.

In part to counter these concerns, the FAA released its NextGen Implementation Plan in March 2011 where it esti­mated benefits from NextGen in terms of reduced conges­tion and increased fuel efficiency based on both simulations and in some case actual data: In Atlanta, arrivals making use of Performance Based Navi­gation (PBN) procedures have saved hundreds of thousands of gallons of fuel and thousands of tons of carbon dioxide and air pollutants. Similar fuel savings and reductions in emissions have resulted from the use of precise, continuous descents into Los Angeles and customized descents into San Francisco. Preliminary results from a surface management initiative in Boston point to a fuel savings of 5,100 gallons and a reduction in carbon dioxide emissions of 50 tons dur­ing periods of heavy congestion. Shared surface surveillance data coupled with aircraft metering techniques are creating taxi-out time savings of up to 7,000 hours a year at New York’s John F. Kennedy airport and 5,000 hours a year at Memphis, Tenn.6

Case—Solvency—A2 Peak Oil

Tech solves peak oil- there is plenty remaining

Helm 8/18/11

Dieter Helm is an economist specialising in utilities, infrastructure, regulation and the environment, and concentrating on the energy, water, communications and transport sectors primarily in Britain and Europe. He is a professor at the university of Oxford and a fellow of New College, Oxford

The peak oil brigade is leading us into bad policymaking on energy

One can't assume energy prices are going ever upwards. The real problem is there may be too much fossil fuel, not too little

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2011/oct/18/energy-price-volatility-policy-fossil-fuels>

The last time policymakers were this sure was the last time oil prices peaked – back in 1979. Oil peaked at $39 a barrel (around $150 in today's prices). It was assumed then that oil prices would go ever up, and the incoming Conservative government launched a plan to build one nuclear reactor per annum for 10 years. Instead, prices collapsed in the mid 1980s, and didn't return to the 1979 prices for more than a quarter of a century (even with two Gulf wars).

As then, we are led to believe that the world's fossil fuel resources are finite and known, and that the peak of production has either been already met or will come soon. Gas, it is assumed, will follow oil. Put simply, we are going to run out of fossil fuels, and they will therefore get (much) more expensive. For the peak oil advocates, the convenient truth is that de-carbonisation via renewables and nuclear is not only good for the climate, but sound economics too. Almost all of this is nonsense – and some of it is dangerous nonsense. There is enough oil and gas (and coal too) to fry the planet several times over. The problem is there may be too much fossil fuel, not too little, and that fossil fuel prices might be too low, not too high.

The Earth's crust is riddled with fossil fuels. The issue is not whether there is a shortage of the stuff, but the costs of getting it out. Until recently, the sheer abundance of low-cost conventional oil in places like the Middle East has limited the incentives to find more, and in particular to go after unconventional sources. But technical change has been driven by necessity – and the revolution in shale gas (and now shale oil, too) has already been transformational in the US, one of the world's biggest energy markets.

Case—Solvency—Cost Estimate

Government agencies agree NextGen costs 14-20 billion

bin Salam, Fellow, Eno Center for Transportation, 12

Sakib bin Salam, Fellow, Eno Center for Transportation, 4-12, [“NextGen Aligning Costs, Benefits and Political Leadership,” Eno Center for Transportation Policy, https://www.enotrans.org/store/research-papers/nextgen-aligning-costs-benefits-and-political-leadership] E. Liu

According to the FAA, the total infrastructure cost of NextGen through 2025 is approximately $15 billion-$20 billion. However, the FAA has not published its cost breakdowns for individual infrastructure projects. To the best of our knowledge, the only published source for the project costs is the recent GAO report that tracks the status of NextGen projects and associated costs. Based on that report, Table 7 shows 30 major NextGen programs with FAA approved budget and schedule,29 with an estimated total cost of about $14.243 billion.

Case—Solvency—Funding Spurs Industry Adoption

#### Plan creates the confidence that the industry needs to implement NextGen which results in an economic stimulus and a greening of airports

**Elwell, 2008** (Dan, vice president of Civil Aviation Aerospace Industries Association, “Investing in Infrastructure: The Road to Recovery”, Oct. 29, http://www.aia-aerospace.org/aianews/speeches/2008/testimony\_house-transportation-infrastructure-comm\_102908.pdf) Megan

In today’s economic environment, that kind of investment may strike some as expensive, but pails in comparison to the recently passed $700 billion Economic Stabilization Act. As you know, **NextGen is absolutely necessary if commercial aviation is to achieve sustainable growth. By even the most modest estimates**, the direct and indirect economic benefits of commercial **aviation accounts for about five percent of U.S. GDP**. The civil aerospace industry **employs more than ten million people. To sustain this vital industry and allow it to grow in an environmentally sound way, NextGen** air traffic management **infrastructure must be built;** private aircraft owners must purchase new equipment; and airlines must replace older, fuel-guzzling aircraft with new, quieter, fuel-efficient, NextGen-ready models. To remove the risk inherent in large expenditures, **the industry needs the economic confidence that NextGen has the fiscal commitment of the U.S. Government.** This can be achieved in several ways: 31. **Economic stimulus package funding increases for the Airport Improvement Program should include flexible eligibility for NextGen investments** both on and off airside property. **Funds** to build taxiways and runways **will create jobs** in local districts and provide more room for aircraft, but **without new NextGen approaches**, new ground tracking systems, and ADS-B devices, **growth** at our airports **will be restricted**. Integrating security for passengers and baggage into the travel experience must be a priority so that the passenger is not as inconvenienced as they are today, while achieving the same security objectives. 2. One year extension of existing legislation granting accelerated depreciation for the purchase of new, environmentally friendly aircraft and the addition of new language to provide the same benefit for the purchase of commercial aircraft. 3. **Any initiatives by congress to reduce risk** and incentivize initial purchase decisions for new aircraft and aircraft equipment w**ill help keep jobs, create new employment opportunities and improve fuel efficiency. Improved fuel efficiency translates to a smaller environmental footprint through reduced CO2 emissions**. All future growth in the civil aviation sector must be environmentally sustainable. Purchasers of environmentally friendly aircraft and NextGen avionics equipment could receive environmental tax credits – much like the tax credits given by some states to motorists who purchase hybrid automobiles. The State of Alaska has instituted a low- interest loan program for the purchase of certain NextGen-related aircraft avionics purchases. Similar initiatives at the federal level could incentivize a faster transition to NextGen. AIA and its members do not support handouts or bailouts. **The only economic stimulus civil aviation needs in today’s economic crisis is growth made possible by the efficiencies of NextGen, and confidence in the industry that the commitment to implement NextGen is real** and on a predictable schedule.

####  Uncertainty of federal funding is preventing implementation of NextGen

Bogdan, 2012– Staff Writer for the Press of Atlantic City(Jennifer, “Uncertainty about benefits, funds hurting Next Generation Air Transportation System, think tank study says”, Press of Atlantic City, April 15, 2012, http://www.pressofatlanticcity.com/communities/eht/uncertainty-about-benefits-funds-hurting-next-generation-air-transportation-system/article\_606a1c4a-86a1-11e1-9a37-001a4bcf887a.html) //GKoo

Airline carriers are reluctant to take on the costs associated with upgrading planes to accommodate the Next Generation Air Transportation System because there is no clear funding stream for the project and there is disagreement about its benefits, according to a study by a Washington, D.C., think tank. The study by the Eno Center for Transportation, a nonpartisan group that leads professional development in the transportation industry, found four key barriers to implementing the federal program known as NextGen: n Uncertainty about the program’s benefits; n Uncertainty about the Federal Aviation Administration’s ability to deliver the program; n Lack of a clear source of funds for NextGen; n And operators’ reluctance to invest in NextGen equipment. NextGen refers to a series of initiatives that will modernize the air traffic control system, transforming it from a radar-based system to a more-efficient satellite-based program. The cost of the upgrades is projected at about $40 billion — with half shouldered by the federal government and half by the airlines — and they are not expected to be complete before 2025. Much is riding on the federal program for South Jersey. NextGen concepts must be tested at the FAA’s William J. Hughes Technical Center in Egg Harbor Township, which employs 1,500 FAA workers and 1,500 contractors. Plans have existed since 2005 to develop a NextGen Aviation Research and Technology Park on the tech center’s grounds in the hope that major aviation companies would take up residence there. Progress on the park, however, has been slowed by gaffes made by the South Jersey Economic Development District, which leases the park’s land from the FAA. Slow progress also is attributed to problems with federal funding for the initiative. The FAA has released only $442 million of $7 billion in NextGen funding, and when the rest will come is unknown. “Operators are unlikely to invest until, at a minimum, the (FAA) is ready to deliver the promised benefits. This leads to a stalemate: Operators are uncertain whether investing in NextGen is worthwhile. When the infrastructure is not yet fully in place and without equipage, the infrastructure by itself is ineffective,” the report reads. Joshua Schank, president and CEO of the Eno Center, said he couldn’t speak specifically about the prospects of the Egg Harbor Township park. However, he said, given his firm’s research, he would move cautiously if involved in the project. “To be frank, basing any development of any kind on federal money is pretty risky,” Schank said. “Things like transportation are often the first things to be cut in a federal budget because people take them for granted. If you say, ‘We’re going to cut funding for NextGen,’ what constituency is going to step up and fight that? The aviation industry? Maybe. But probably no one.”

Investment in a beneficial NextGen program causes acceptance and adoptation

bin Salam, Fellow, Eno Center for Transportation, 12

Sakib bin Salam, Fellow, Eno Center for Transportation, 4-12, [“NextGen Aligning Costs, Benefits and Political Leadership,” Eno Center for Transportation Policy, https://www.enotrans.org/store/research-papers/nextgen-aligning-costs-benefits-and-political-leadership] E. Liu

Third, the airlines and general aviation users have been hesitant to bear equipage costs due to low profitability, economic turmoil, and a lack of clear incentives to justify investing in NextGen. Operators are unlikely to invest until, at a minimum, the FAA is ready to deliver the promised benefits. This leads to a stalemate: operators are uncertain whether investing in NextGen is worthwhile, when the infrastructure is not yet fully in place, and without equipage the infrastructure by itself is ineffective. The FAA has mandated equipage of Automated Dependent Surveillance-Broadcast Out (ADS-B) that allows the equipped aircraft to send transmission to other equipped aircraft ADS-B ground stations for all operators by 2020. However, there is uncertainty over when other NextGen on-board equipment will be required, particularly ADS-B In which allows the equipped aircraft to receive transmission from other ADS-B ground stations and other aircraft. Fourth, NextGen faces funding issues that pose some very difficult policy decisions. Work on the ground infrastructure aspect of NextGen is currently funded by the Facilities and Equipment account of the AATF and some progress, albeit slow, has been made on this project. However, recent reports by the Congressional Budget Office and the Government Accountability Office show that current AATF revenues are inadequate to fund NextGen.2 Despite recent resolution over the long overdue FAA reauthorization bill, little progress has been regarding securing a full-fledged modernization funding plan. The current bill authorizes a flat amount of $2.731 billion over four years for NextGen and funding is still subject to annual appropriation. A project that is already endangered by uncertainties regarding its worth would benefit from a stable and adequate funding source.

Airlines will adopt NextGen – Profits and benefits

bin Salam, Fellow, Eno Center for Transportation, 12

Sakib bin Salam, Fellow, Eno Center for Transportation, 4-12, [“NextGen Aligning Costs, Benefits and Political Leadership,” Eno Center for Transportation Policy, https://www.enotrans.org/store/research-papers/nextgen-aligning-costs-benefits-and-political-leadership] E. Liu

Low profitability due to increasing fuel costs and post-9/11 recessionary demand-side shocks is another reason why commercial carriers have been reluctant to pay for NextGen equipage. Some carriers have lobbied in vain for federal stimulus funding for NextGen equipage during this period.35 Operators would have an incentive to invest in NextGen if they can be sure it will generate profits by reducing operating costs. As discussed earlier, NextGen could significantly reduce operating costs by reducing delay and fuel consumption. Whether this would increase airline profits depends to some extent on the intensity of competition between operators.36 However, assuming that the underlying assumptions and analyses are correct and annual airline benefits exceed the total equipage cost, there is a sensible business case for the industry as a whole to invest in NextGen, meaning there is a reason for operators to pay for their own equipage. From a policy side, a strong set of incentives needs to be provided to facilitate this equipage. The FAA has already begun to provide some aid to airlines for equipage, but it has not been enough to counter the continuing risk across the larger industry.37

Case—Solvency—A2 No Airplane Equipage

All recent airplanes already have NextGen technology

Wilson, Contributing writer, Aerospace America, 10

J.R.Wilson, Contributing writer, Aerospace America, 5-10, [“A Slow Transformation,” AEROSPACE AMERICA/MAY 2010 31, http://www.aerospaceamerica.org/Documents/May%202010%20Aerospace%20America%20PDF%20Files/30\_NextGen\_MAY2010.pdf] E. Liu

When NextGen was inaugurated, air travel was at a peak, with growth expected to continue at a significant pace. Boeing and Airbus had new jetliners under development to help airlines increase and modernize their fleets. That influx of new aircraft was expected to help speed NextGen implementation by incorporating required airborne capabilities with the initial purchase rather than as retrofits. Anticipating such developments, some airlines had begun including GPS and other advanced system capabilities in aircraft they purchased as early as the mid-1990s. According to the Air Transport Association (ATA), some aircraft already are being retired with equipment the airline was never able to use. “The industry has spent hundreds of millions of dollars on NextGen already. All the aircraft developed in the last several years had NextGen technology built into them. At one point, that was probably optional equipment; today it is standard, so it is hard to calculate that cost,” says ATA vice president for operations and safety Basil Barimo, the association’s NextGen technology lead. “And airlines are investing in upgrades to existing aircraft, such as new displays, flight management systems and GPS capability. I don’t have a specific number, but it is probably north of $1 billion when you add in new deliveries and retrofits.”

\*\*\*Topicality

Topicality—Communications

**We meet:**

NextGen improves on airplane transportation infrastructure through the FAA

bin Salam, Fellow, Eno Center for Transportation, 12

Sakib bin Salam, Fellow, Eno Center for Transportation, 4-12, [“NextGen Aligning Costs, Benefits and Political Leadership,” Eno Center for Transportation Policy, https://www.enotrans.org/store/research-papers/nextgen-aligning-costs-benefits-and-political-leadership] E. Liu

On the technology side, NextGen is composed of two main components: aircraft based equipment that records and transmits the exact location of the aircraft using Global Positioning System (GPS), and ground based infrastructure that can receive and analyze the GPS data. Infrastructural improvements also entail devising more direct and fuel-efficient routes, and upgrading the computer and backup system used at 20 Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) air traffic control centers nationwide. The infrastructure implementation is currently in the hands of the FAA and funded by the Airport and Airway Trust Fund (AATF), while aircraft equipage is expected to be paid for by the operators.

**And, the aff doesn’t improve satellite technology, it just uses it**.

**Counterinterp:**

Transportation infrastructure refers to one of 9 subsectors – airports and air traffic control systems

**American Jobs Act, 11**

(112 H. Doc. 53, legislation submitted to the House by Obama, 9/13, lexis)

(9) Infrastructure project.-- (A) In general.--The term ``eligible infrastructure project'' means any non-Federal transportation, water, or energy infrastructure project, or an aggregation of such infrastructure projects, as provided in this Act. (B) Transportation infrastructure project.--The term ``transportation infrastructure project'' means the construction, alteration, or repair, including the facilitation of intermodal transit, of the following subsectors: (i) Highway or road. (ii) Bridge. (iii) Mass transit. (iv) Inland waterways. (v) Commercial ports. (vi) Airports. (vii) Air traffic control systems. (viii) Passenger rail, including high-speed rail. (ix) Freight rail systems. (C) Water infrastructure project.--The term ``water infrastructure project'' means the construction, consolidation, alteration, or repair of the following subsectors: (i) Waterwaste treatment facility. (ii) Storm water management system. (iii) Dam. (iv) Solid waste disposal facility. (v) Drinking water treatment facility. (vi) Levee. (vii) Open space management system. (D) Energy infrastructure project.--The term ``energy infrastructure project'' means the construction, alteration, or repair of the following subsectors: (i) Pollution reduced energy generation. (ii) Transmission and distribution. (iii) Storage. (iv) Energy efficiency enhancements for buildings, including public and commercial buildings.

**Reasons to prefer:**

1. **Ground: NO affs would be allowed. Communication is involved in building and implementing every infrastructure project.**
2. **Limits: using communication systems for our transporation infrastructure does not explode the topic.**

We’re reasonable—the negative can always find an interpretation to exclude us and competing interpretation detracts from substantive debate.

Potential abuse isn’t a voter.

Topicality—Transportation Infrastructure

Transportation infrastructure is air traffic control systems

3/14, DOT [2012, Department of Transportation, “National Transportation Week turns 50” Fast Lane, The Official Blog of the U.S. Secretary of Transportation, <http://fastlane.dot.gov/2012/05/50th-anniversary-of-national-transportation-week.html#.UB0wQmg-cvE>]

By talking about our number one priority. During the next few days, we'll highlight our commitment to ensuring the safety of America’s transportation systems, a commitment we pursue all 52 weeks of the year. We'll also be talking about the tremendous value of our investments in America's transportation infrastructure. Because highway lanes, transit networks, air traffic control systems, and port facilities don't build themselves. The safety and reliability of our nation’s infrastructure are critical for our economy and for many aspects of our daily lives. Through competitive grants, formula programs, and educational efforts, DOT never stops working to keep America moving forward.

Nextgen improves air traffic control systems and ground-based systems

“Overview of NextGen “NextGen” is an umbrella term for the ongoing, wide-ranging transformation of the National Airspace System (NAS). At its most basic level, NextGen represents an evolution from a ground-based system of air traffic control to a satellite-based system of air traffic management. This evolution is vital to meeting future demand, and to avoiding gridlock in the sky and at airports. The new system will open the nation’s skies to continued growth and increased safety while reducing aviation’s environmental impact. These goals are being achieved through the development of aviation-specific applications for existing, widely used technologies, such as the Global Positioning System (GPS) and technological innovation in areas such as weather forecasting, data networking and digital communications. Coupled with state-of-the-art technology will be new airport infrastructure and new procedures, including the shift of certain decision-making responsibility from the ground to the cockpit. When fully implemented, NextGen will allow more aircraft to safely fly closer together on more direct routes, which reduces delays and provides benefits for the environment through reductions in carbon emissions, fuel consumption and noise. The program will also create more than twelve million jobs and over $1 billion in new economic activity.”

NextGen is transportation infrastructure

7/13, [2012, Town of Islip, a county in New York State,

“NYS and LI lawmakers urge FAA to choose Long Island MacArthur Airport (LIMA) as new home for new air traffic control facility

“http://www.townofislip-ny.gov/news/press-releases/37-town-council/1897-nys-and-li-lawmakers-urge-faa-to-choose-long-island-macarthur-airport-lima-as-new-home-for-new-air-traffic-control-facility]

the development of the NextGen air traffic facility will bring 1,000 construction jobs to Long Islanders who desperately need them,” said NYS Senator Owen Johnson. "Long Island MacArthur Airport is one of the gems of the 3rd Senate District and a significant asset to our local economy," said NYS State Senator Lee M. Zeldin. "It is undoubtedly the ideal home for the FAA's new NextGen facility and placing it here will save critical, high-tech jobs and create hundreds more on Long Island. I strongly urge the FAA to make the right choice and house their new facility at Long Island MacArthur Airport."

NextGen boosts air transportation infrastructure

Braden 2/6 [Laura, 2012, “BAF Applauds Federal Aviation Bill; Implementation of NextGen” Building America’s Future,

<http://action.bafuture.org/news/press-release/baf-applauds-federal-aviation-bill-implementation-nextgen>]

“WASHINGTON, DC – Today the Congress passed a multi-year bill to fund federal aviation programs and modernize the nation’s air traffic control system. The legislation is now on its way to President Obama who is expected to sign it into law. In response, Building America’s Future President Marcia Hale issued the following: “We applaud the passage of this long-overdue aviation bill. The U.S. has the world’s worst air traffic congestion – a quarter of our flights arrive more than 15 minutes late, and the national average for all delayed flights is twice that of Europe’s average. Furthermore, the World Economic Forum ranks U.S. air transportation infrastructure 31st in the world, behind countries like Panama, Chile and Malaysia. This bill will finally bring our nation’s air traffic control system into the 21st Century by moving forward with the implementation of NextGen. NextGen will open America’s skies to continued growth and increased safety while reducing aviation’s environmental impact.“ Building America’s Future Educational Fund recently released a new report – “Falling Apart and Falling Behind” – using 2010 data to compare the transportation infrastructure investments in the U.S. with those being made by our economic competitors: • U.S. infrastructure has fallen from first place in the World Economic Forum’s 2005 economic competitiveness ranking to number 15 today. • China now boasts six of the world’s top ten ports – and none of the top ten are located in the U.S. • U.S. air traffic control is managed by the same ground-based system developed in the 1950’s. • The U.S. is one of the only leading nations without a national plan for public-private partnerships for infrastructure projects or a National Infrastructure Bank to finance large-scale projects and leverage private capital.

\*\*\*CPs

States CP

**Doesn’t solve —**

According to Congress, the Supreme Court, and laws, the federal government has “exclusive sovereignty of airspace in the United States. – that’s the court of appeals 98 evidence. Many benefits from NextGen such as efficiency, and reducing delays comes from it’s ability to have planes make and follow the most direct routes – instead of following predetermined and inefficient routes in the sky.

50 state fiat bad……………

The federal government is critical to NextGen’s success

Goldsmith et. **Al** (The Daniel Paul Professor of the Practice of Government and the Director of the Innovations in American Government Program at Harvard's Kennedy School of Government. Stephen is also the Chair of the Corporation for National and Community Service) 2010

(Stephen, Fred Messina is a Herndon-based Vice President with Booz Allen Hamilton in the Transportation business. With a focus on aviation infrastructure, Mr. Messina is responsible for driving the creation and application of critical service offerings for clients in the Department of Transportation and the Federal Aviation Administration, Zachary Tumin is the Special Assistant to the Director and Faculty Chair, Science, Technology, and Public Policy Program at the Harvard Kennedy School, “Assuring the Transition to the Next Generation Air Transportation System: A New Strategy for Networked Governance,” <http://www.oig.dot.gov/sites/dot/files/WEB%20FILE_NextGen%20Testimony.pdf>, March 2010)

Many of NextGen’s challenges at the national level seem monolithic, risky to embrace, and filled with uncertainty. By contrast, they present themselves at the local level in unique constellations and seem to offer many more levers for change locally. By expanding the problem to the local level—and empowering local networks to solve them—the prospects for change seem higher*,* both by avoiding “predictable surprises” and by crafting locally relevant solutions. The task of our current network of partisans, represented by those at the roundtable, might be to design its own network to support the controlled proliferation of a network of networks *each solving the NextGen challenge at the local level.* At the local level, networks would assure that the right parties come to the table, making it possible for the right incentives to align, the right economic drivers and investment cases to be made, and the right local interests to converge. Airspace is of course a national asset, and some solutions will require response at the national scale, with top-down accountability. Design and planning for NextGen-wide enterprise architecture, development of certain policies and procedures, and funding and procurement, for example, all require a strong central role. “We have to ask for top-down. That’s the political mandate from the President or from the Administration,” one participant said, and it is critical to the success of NextGen. “There must be someone on the FAA side who has the accountability for everything that has to happen within that organization, be held accountable, and make the commitments.” But the great challenges of implementation might be best addressed by grassroots-level local networks if such networks were given a broad bottom-up charge consistent with a national strategy, resourced by FAA with some authority and support, and tasked to develop the local solution that works.

Federal government key to aviation security

FAS, 2007 [March 26th, The Federation of American Scientists (FAS) is a nonpartisan, 501(c)(3) organization intent on using science and scientific analysis to attempt make the world more secure.“The National Strategy for Aviation Security” http://www.fas.org/irp/offdocs/nspd/nspd-47.pdf]

In this ambiguous security environment, responding to these unpredictable threats requires teamwork to prevent attacks, protect people and infrastructure, minimize damage, and expedite recovery. The response necessitates the integration and alignment of all aviation security programs and initiatives into a far-reaching and unified national effort involving Federal, State, local, and tribal governments, as well as private sector organizations. Since September 11, 2001, Federal departments and agencies have risen uncompromisingly to the challenge of ensuring aviation security. The challenges that remain ahead for the Nation, the adversaries it confronts, and the environment in which it operates compel the United States to strengthen its ties with international partners and to seek new relationships with others. Therefore, international cooperation is critical to ensuring that lawful private and public activities in the Air Domain are protected from attack and hostile or unlawful exploitation. Such collaboration is fundamental to worldwide economic stability and growth, and it is vital to the interests of the United States. It is only through such an integrated approach among all aviation partners, governmental and non-governmental, public, and private, that the United States can improve the security of the Air Domain.

Conditionality is a VI—destroys 2AC strategy and time allocation—and, uniquely disadvantages the 1AR vs the block—dispo forces the neg to think about possible straight turns

**Perm do both**

-------

STOP

-------

**Federal government key to security**

FAS, 2007 [March 26th, The Federation of American Scientists (FAS) is a nonpartisan, 501(c)(3) organization intent on using science and scientific analysis to attempt make the world more secure.“The National Strategy for Aviation Security” http://www.fas.org/irp/offdocs/nspd/nspd-47.pdf]

Aviation security is best achieved by integrating public and private aviation security global activities into a coordinated effort to detect, deter, prevent, and defeat threats to the Air Domain, reduce vulnerabilities, and minimize the consequences of, and expedite the recovery from, attacks that might occur. The Strategy aligns Federal government aviation security programs and initiatives into a comprehensive and cohesive national effort involving appropriate Federal, State, local, and tribal governments and the private sector to provide active layered aviation security for, and support defense in-depth of, the United States.

NextGen needs government involvement

Scovel, 2009 [March 18th, Statement of The Honorable Calvin L. Scovel III Inspector General. Before the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee on Aviation United States House of Representatives, U.S. Department of Transportation “Federal Aviation Administration: Actions Needed To Achieve Mid- Term NextGen Goals”

http://www.oig.dot.gov/sites/dot/files/pdfdocs/WEB\_FILE\_NextGen\_Statement.pdf]

We appreciate the opportunity to discuss the Federal Aviation Administration’s (FAA) development of the Next Generation Air Transportation System (NextGen) and what the Agency can achieve toward this effort in the near and mid term. The National Airspace System is an integral part of the Nation’s economy and handles almost 50,000 flights per day and more than 700 million passengers per year. Developing NextGen is a high-risk effort involving billion-dollar investments from both the Government (new ground systems) and airspace users (new avionics). The challenges with NextGen are multi-dimensional and involve research and development, complex software development and integration for both existing and new systems, workforce changes, and policy questions about how to spur aircraft equipage.

Federal government key to aviation’s collaboration

Joint Planning and Development Office, 04 [2004, “Next Generation Air Transportation System: Integrated Plan” Department of Transportation, http://www.jpdo.aero/pdf/NGATS\_v1\_1204r.pdf]

While achieving the vision for air transportation will be done via collaboration among federal, state, and local governments and private industry, the essential purpose of the vision will be to establish a stable and transparent framework that encourages private sector innovation. All of these efforts will be coordinated through eight major strategies that broadly address the goals and objectives for the Next Generation Air Transportation System (NGATS). Supporting these strategies will be a combination of research, development, and implementation activities. These activities will involve a review of policy and financial mechanisms as well. The eight major strategies, along with their key research areas, are presented in this next section.

Privatization CP

Perm - do the plan and use a public-private partnership to fully fund the Next Generation Air Transportation System.

* this perm tests functionally competition because our plan doesn’t exclude this specific implementation.

Perm do the cp – if the government gives any incentive to the private sector its investment.

#### Airport privatization kills safety – Feds solve best

Keith 1

[Alexander, Issues and Controversies, “Air-Travel Delays” http://www.2facts.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/icof\_story.aspx?PIN=i0601700&term=privatization]

Other experts oppose reallocating air-traffic control to a separate organization, however. The U.S. is the safest nation for air travel in the world, due to the efforts of the FAA, they contend. They argue that air-traffic control and safety are inextricably intertwined, and that any reforms that weaken the FAA could threaten aviation safety. "Safety is a governmental responsibility," says Transportation Secretary Norman Mineta. Moreover, critics of a privatized system argue that experts still do not have a complete understanding of the full consequences of systems such as Nav Canada. For example, recently some small regional airlines within Canada have complained that the system gives preference to Air Canada, the country's predominant airline. "The jury is out on privatization," says Kevin Psutka, president of the Canadian Owners and Pilots Association. Critics of privatization also question whether a system modeled after Nav Canada would even work in the U.S. They contend that the airline industry in the U.S. is much bigger and more complicated than in other nations, making U.S. air-traffic control a far greater challenge. "We have a lot we can learn from looking at private structures that are set up in place in Europe and Canada," says FAA Chairman Jane Garvey. "But our system is much more complex."

#### Privatization destroys jobs, creating many social costs

Joseph Stiglitz, winner of 2001 Nobel Prize in Economics, 2002 “Globalization and its Discontents” p. 58 <http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=075MS-ZBsswC&oi=fnd&pg=PR9&dq=Globalization+and+Its+Discontent.&ots=tprWMvl139&sig=wZHYhso47gc1kwwj3J_O1GxVuC8#v=onepage&q=privatization&f=false>

Privatization has also come not just at the expense of consumers but at the expense of workers as well. The impact of employment has perhaps been both the major argument for and against privatization, with advocates arguing that only through privatization can unproductive workers be shed, and critics arguing that jobs cuts occur with no sensitivity to the social costs. There is, in fact, considerable truth in both positions. Privatization often turns state enterprise from losses to profits by trimming the payroll. Economists, however, are supposed to focus on overall efficiency. There are social costs associated with unemployment, which private firms simply do not take into account. Given minimal job protections, employers can dismiss workers, with little or no costs, including, at best, minimal severance pay. Privatization has been so widely criticized because, unlike so-called Greenfield investments–investments in new firms as opposed to private investors taking over existing firms–privatization often destroys jobs rather than creating new ones. In industrialized countries, the pain of layoffs is acknowledged and somewhat ameliorated by the safety net of unemployment insurance. In less developed countries, the unemployed workers typically do not become a public charge, since there are seldom unemployment insurance schemes. There can be a large social cost nonetheless–manifested, in its worst forms, by urban violence, increased crime, and social and political unrest. But even in the absence of these problems, there are huge costs of unemployment. They include widespread anxiety even among workers who have managed to keep their jobs, a broader sense of alienation, additional financial burdens on family members who manage to remain employed, and the withdrawal of children from school to help support the family. These kinds of social costs endure long past the immediate loss of a job. They are often especially apparent in the case when a firm is sold to foreigners. Domestic firms may at least be attuned to the social context and be reluctant to fire workers if they know there are no alternative jobs available. Foreign owners, on the other hand, may feel greater obligation to their shareholders to maximize stock market value by reducing costs, and less of an obligation to what they will refer to as an “overbloated labor force.” It is important to restructure state enterprises, and privatization is often an effective way to do so. But moving people from low-productivity jobs in state enterprises to unemployment does not increase a country’s income, and it certainly does not increase the welfare of the workers.

[LINKS TO PTX]

Privatization is controversial and mucks up modernization debates

bin Salam, Fellow, Eno Center for Transportation, 12

Sakib bin Salam, Fellow, Eno Center for Transportation, 4-12, [“NextGen Aligning Costs, Benefits and Political Leadership,” Eno Center for Transportation Policy, https://www.enotrans.org/store/research-papers/nextgen-aligning-costs-benefits-and-political-leadership] E. Liu

Making a case for or against privatization is not the focus of this paper, as it deserves more thorough analysis. In any case, due to its controversial nature, privatization talks in Congress would likely cause more friction than fluency towards modernization efforts.

[LINKS TO SPENDING]

Poor management means government has to bailout privates – That makes federal spending inevitable

Sclar, Director of graduate programs in Urban Planning at Columbia, 03

Elliott Sclar, Director of graduate programs in Urban Planning at Columbia, his book on privatization won two prestigious academic awards, the Louis Brownlow Award for the Best Book of 2002 from the National Academy of Public Administration and the 2001 Charles Levine Prize from the International Political Science, 03, [“Pitfalls of Air Traffic Control Privatization,” National Air Traffic Controllers Association, http://www.inthepublicinterest.org/sites/default/files/PitfallsofATCPrivatization.pdf] E. Liu

The third blanket claim common to most privatization proposals is that the funding stream associated with a private ATC provider would keep costs to users down, and isolate the government from the risk of escalating provision costs. Review of the Canadian and British cases both demonstrate cost escalations and increased user fees. In Canada user fees have increased several times since NAV CANADA’s inception, and particularly since the traffic downturn of the past year. The system is structured in such a way that even when the control fee charged to airlines decreases, passengers end up paying more. By 2002, the average fee per-traveler increased from $12 to $22.11The user fee system in Canada has definitely hit travelers as ticket prices have increased dramatically. The situation in the United Kingdom is even more problematic. The British privatized their ATC services by selling a 46% stake to a consortium of seven airlines, and an additional 5% to employees. The government retained 49% plus an extra “golden share.” Over the past year the government has had to bail out the new National Air Traffic Services (NATS) twice, to the tune of $131 million – about two thirds of the original sale price. The private sector holds 46% percent of the equity in NATS, but as the recent government bailouts have demonstrated, the private sector is assuming none of the risk. Air traffic control is a vital public service, one in which a shutdown or catastrophic failure would cripple the nation. Regardless of technical or legal responsibility, the government will always be in a position of having to ensure continuing service. As has been made clear by the British case, market-based privatization of the air traffic control system means that the government surrenders its vital assets, but continues to assume the costs and final responsibility for ensuring continuing service. This situation could not possibly be described as “stabilized.”

**Perm** – the United States federal government should establish a public-private partnership to fully fund the Next Generation Air Transportation System.

* this perm is testing the textual competition of the CP because basically the counterplan is our plan,
* the federal aviation industry contracts work all the time to private companies. Airplanes are made from corporations like Boeing and Airbus – the government doesn’t make them.

#### Can’t solve our national security advantage – NextGen focuses on improving communication and agency integration to coordinate responses against threats. A Public Private Partnership would increase discord.

Can’t solve - Only the federal government has the authority to enact the plan.

Court of Appeals 98

(137 F.3d 81, National Helicopter Corp. of America, Plaintiff-Appellee-Cross-Appellant, v. the CITY OF NEW YORK; The Council of the City of New York; The City Planning Commission of the City of New York; The New York City Economic Development Corporation, Defendants-Appellants-Cross-Appellees. Dockets 97-7082, 97-7142, United States Court of Appeals, Second Circuit, argued Sept. 8, 1997, decided Feb. 17, 1998, http://bulk.resource.org/courts.gov/c/F3/137/137.F3d.81.97-7142.97-7082.html)

The City claims the invasive nature of helicopter noise justifies the condition restricting sightseeing routes to the East River and the Hudson River. This argument, as the trial court recognized, evidences a misunderstanding of federal aviation law. Congress, the Supreme Court, and we have consistently stated that the law controlling flight paths through navigable airspace is completely preempted. See, e.g., Concorde I, 558 F.2d at 83 ("[L]egitimate concern for safe and efficient air transportation requires that exclusive control of airspace management be concentrated at the national level."); City of Burbank, 411 U.S. at 626-27, 93 S.Ct. at 1856-57 (recognizing the federal government's possession of exclusive national sovereignty in U.S. airspace); 49 U.S.C. § 40103(a)(1) (stating that the federal government has "exclusive sovereignty of airspace of the United States"). The proprietor exception, allowing reasonable regulations to fix noise levels at and around an airport at an acceptable amount, gives no authority to local officials to assign or restrict routes. As a result, the City unlawfully intruded into a preempted area when it curtailed routes for the flights of certain Heliport aircraft. This condition was properly enjoined.

#### Airport privatization kills safety

Keith 1

[Alexander, Issues and Controversies, “Air-Travel Delays” http://www.2facts.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/icof\_story.aspx?PIN=i0601700&term=privatization]

Other experts oppose reallocating air-traffic control to a separate organization, however. The U.S. is the safest nation for air travel in the world, due to the efforts of the FAA, they contend. They argue that air-traffic control and safety are inextricably intertwined, and that any reforms that weaken the FAA could threaten aviation safety. "Safety is a governmental responsibility," says Transportation Secretary Norman Mineta. Moreover, critics of a privatized system argue that experts still do not have a complete understanding of the full consequences of systems such as Nav Canada. For example, recently some small regional airlines within Canada have complained that the system gives preference to Air Canada, the country's predominant airline. "The jury is out on privatization," says Kevin Psutka, president of the Canadian Owners and Pilots Association. Critics of privatization also question whether a system modeled after Nav Canada would even work in the U.S. They contend that the airline industry in the U.S. is much bigger and more complicated than in other nations, making U.S. air-traffic control a far greater challenge. "We have a lot we can learn from looking at private structures that are set up in place in Europe and Canada," says FAA Chairman Jane Garvey. "But our system is much more complex."

Conditionality is a VI—destroys 2AC strategy and time allocation—and, uniquely disadvantages the 1AR vs the block—dispo forces the neg to think about possible straight turns

Public private partnerships depend on revenue streams — federal funding is needed for NextGen

FHA, No Date [U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, “Public Private Partnerships”

<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/ipd/fact_sheets/p3.htm>]

“Potential P3 Constraints

Barriers to P3s include technical challenges, such as determining the appropriate level of return on investment for the private sector, ensuring fair rates for users, lack of professional capacity to evaluate a P3 approach early in the project development process in order to negotiate a viable agreement and to work with the concessionaire over the life of the project, public resistance, and in over half of the States, the absence of enabling P3 legislation. It is important to note that although P3s can offer access to capital, P3s do not provide States with new revenue; in fact, P3s need a revenue stream to work. Finally, P3s may not be the most cost-effective or appropriate procurement model for projects if the public sector can deliver better value without it. Most countries with P3 programs require analysis of a "public sector comparator," which shows the added value, if any, of delivering the project through a P3 procurement model.

#### **Federal control better–accountability**

Facts on File News Services 07 [Issues and Controversies “Infrastructure Upkeep.” http://www.2facts.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/icof\_story.aspx?PIN=i1200460&term=privatization,]

Supporters of increased federal spending on infrastructure, on the other hand, say that restoring infrastructure is a pressing task that the federal government is uniquely qualified to undertake. There is no good reason to oppose increasing the gasoline tax by a few cents, they say, or to oppose spending on infrastructure what is currently being spent on the ongoing war in Iraq. And supporters argue that rather than being more accountable than the government, private owners of infrastructure are actually less easy to hold accountable if something goes wrong. Proponents of increasing federal spending contend that critics are driven by ideology. Opposition to taxes and federal power has fostered a climate where government neglect of infrastructure upkeep is widely accepted, they charge. That undermines the point of infrastructure, they say, which is to make society work better.

Public dislikes PPPs

Brown, 2009 [Janice Weingart, March“Public-Private Partnerships for Highway Infrastructure: Capitalizing on International Experience” <http://international.fhwa.dot.gov/pubs/pl09010/pl09010.pdf>]

Public Acceptance of PPPs As PPP programs have evolved in the host countries, so too has public acceptance of PPPs, although some issues remain. In many respects, public perspectives of PPPs have improved over time as the nations have tightened policies and improved practices. This is not to say that resistance has dissipated entirely, but that the public has come to expect better government decisionmaking on and oversight of PPPs. Public concern over private sector profiteering was quite pronounced in some of the host nations at the onset of PPP programs. Public apprehension over the potential for unreasonable private sector profits was a real issue. With time, adjustments in policy and practice have reduced this apprehension. The more recent adoption of value-for- money principles for PPP projects and the public sector’s contractual regulation of private revenues or profits as well as sharing in the financial upside have helped minimize this concern. More specific practices are described in subsequent chapters.

1AR—Perm Extensions

NextGen involves a public private partnership

FAA, 2007 [October 10, “Fact Sheet – Next Generation Air Transportation System 2006 Progress Report” Federal Aviation Administration

The FAA is completely transforming air traffic control from a ground-based system of radars to a satellite-based system through the Next Generation (NextGen) Air Transportation System Integrated National Plan. NextGen is critically important because the current system will not be able to handle traffic that is expected to increase to one billion passengers by 2015 and double current levels by 2025. Planning and implementing NextGen is being carried out by a unique public/private partnership called the Joint Planning and Development Office (JPDO). The JPDO is made up of representatives from the Departments of Transportation, Defense, Homeland Security, Commerce, the FAA, NASA and the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy. It is also supported, through the JPDO, by a wide range of aviation experts from across the private sector.

NextGen already involves both public and private entities

GAO, 2011 [June 30, U.S. Government and Accountability Office, “Mechanisms for Collaboration and Technology Transfer Could Be Enhanced to More Fully Leverage Partner Agency and Industry Resources” <http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-11-604>]

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is developing and implementing a broad transformation of the national airspace system known as the Next Generation Air Transportation System (NextGen). NextGen is a complex undertaking that requires new technologies and supporting infrastructure and involves the activities of several agencies as well as private industry. This report provides information on the effectiveness of (1) FAA's and the federal partner agencies' mechanisms for collaborating and leveraging resources to develop and implement NextGen, and (2) FAA's mechanisms for working with and transferring technology to or from private industry. To do this, we assessed FAA and partner agency mechanisms against applicable agreements, the agencies' own guidance for these activities, as well as applicable key practices that GAO has reported can enhance federal collaborative efforts. Some mechanisms for FAA and partner agency collaboration are effective, though others fail to ensure research and technology from the partner agencies and industry are fully used by FAA. Some mechanisms used by FAA and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) for coordinating research and transferring technology are consistent with several key practices in interagency coordination. For instance, FAA and NASA use research transition teams to coordinate research and transfer technologies from NASA to FAA. The design of these teams is consistent with several key practices GAO has identified in previous work that can enhance interagency coordination, such as identifying common outcomes, establishing a joint strategy to achieve that outcome, and defining each agency's role and responsibilities. This allows the agencies to overcome differences in mission, culture, and ways of doing business. However mechanisms for collaborating with other partner agencies do not always ensure that FAA effectively leverages agency resources. For example, the mechanisms used by FAA, DOD, and DHS have not yet resulted in a full determination of what research, technology, or expertise FAA can leverage to benefit NextGen. Further, collaboration between FAA, DOD, and DHS may be limited by differing priorities. Finally, FAA and the Joint Planning and Development Office--an interagency organization created to plan and coordinate research for NextGen--have not fully coordinated the partner agencies' research efforts, though they are working to address research gaps. A lack of coordination could result in a duplication of research or an inefficient use of resources. Numerous mechanisms are available to FAA to collaborate with industry to identify and transfer technology to advance NextGen, but some lack flexibility and outcomes can be unclear. Within its Acquisition Management System (AMS), FAA may use several mechanisms at various stages to conduct outreach, collaborate with private-sector firms, or transfer technology. In particular, FAA may use several types of research and development agreements between itself and the private sector as mechanisms to facilitate technology transfer. However, stakeholders said that the system can lack flexibility, in some circumstances, to consider alternative technologies or new ideas once the process is underway. GAO has made recommendations in the past to improve FAA's AMS system. FAA has begun to implement these recommendations. FAA is beginning to use a new, possibly more flexible, contracting vehicle--Systems Engineering 2020--to acquire the research, development, and systems engineering support to integrate NextGen concepts. FAA also reviews unsolicited proposals as a mechanism for private industry to offer unique ideas or approaches outside of the competitive procurement process. However, FAA's unsolicited proposal process is not a significant source of new technology for FAA. Other mechanisms such as outreach events with private industry and NextGen test facilities might enhance knowledge and result in technology transfer, but outcomes, such as specific benefits, from some of these mechanisms can be unclear. GAO recommends that FAA and the Departments of Defense (DOD) and Homeland Security (DHS) work together to develop mechanisms that will enhance collaboration and technology transfer between the agencies. GAO and others have outstanding recommendations related to interaction with industry that FAA has begun to address and GAO makes no further recommendations in this report. DOD and DHS concurred with the recommendation, while FAA did not comment on whether or not it agreed.

Privatization—AT: Competition Good

Competition doesn’t apply here and isn’t better – No rebiding and public services match

Sclar, Director of graduate programs in Urban Planning at Columbia, 03

Elliott Sclar, Director of graduate programs in Urban Planning at Columbia, his book on privatization won two prestigious academic awards, the Louis Brownlow Award for the Best Book of 2002 from the National Academy of Public Administration and the 2001 Charles Levine Prize from the International Political Science, 03, [“Pitfalls of Air Traffic Control Privatization,” National Air Traffic Controllers Association, http://www.inthepublicinterest.org/sites/default/files/PitfallsofATCPrivatization.pdf] E. Liu

In general, privatization is a blunt instrument of organizational change. In many ways it is at variance with much of the general consensus in the management literature that effective organizational change is a process of continual improvement focused upon the actual work of service delivery. To make a case for privatization it is necessary to demonstrate that the problem is so extreme that incremental improvement is unworkable. Privatization proponents assert that to be the case, but they never identify the specific basis within the FAA for this conclusion. Typically, privatizations are aimed at improving efficiency by introducing competitive behavior to a marketplace. It is clear to all parties, however, that there is no potential for competition in the air traffic control market. Air traffic control is too infrastructure dependent, and far too vital to our national interest to set up multiple competitive systems. Services cannot be rebid at any level of frequency if we hope to maintain continuity in a knowledge-dependent industry. Privatization advocates would agree with this assessment of the inherent impossibility of inserting competition into the air traffic control market. However, they turn to general notions found in privatization theory that assert that, because private organizations can provide economic rewards to employees who further the profit or surplus generating potential of the organization, it will become more efficient in fulfilling its mission. The privatization literature also suggests that public agencies are entrenched and intractable to change. However there is also management literature that demonstrates that public agencies are as amenable to improvement as private ones as long as the problem is properly specified. Implicit in the theoretical formulation of privatization is an assumption that efficiency will improve because customers can take their business elsewhere. The threat of the loss of business is supposed to ensure that the private provider will create a better product for the organization’s customers. But what if the private agency is to be the sole supplier? Economic incentives can quickly become a double-edged sword cutting against the interests of the consuming public. The generation of revenue and economic rewards will not necessarily redound to better management of the ATC system. It is also important to note that the ability to generate revenue surpluses and improved organizational efficiency are not the same. Especially when a private monopoly with less public accountability is proposed.

No ATC competition – It’s a natural monopoly because of the cost of infrastructure and lack of providers

Sclar, Director of graduate programs in Urban Planning at Columbia, 03

Elliott Sclar, Director of graduate programs in Urban Planning at Columbia, his book on privatization won two prestigious academic awards, the Louis Brownlow Award for the Best Book of 2002 from the National Academy of Public Administration and the 2001 Charles Levine Prize from the International Political Science, 03, [“Pitfalls of Air Traffic Control Privatization,” National Air Traffic Controllers Association, http://www.inthepublicinterest.org/sites/default/files/PitfallsofATCPrivatization.pdf] E. Liu

ATC is not and will never be a service subject to the discipline of the competitive market place. It fails the "yellow pages" test. There are no available private sector providers with listed phone numbers ready, willing, and able to sell a national ATC system on a moment's notice. Furthermore, the government could not create a competitive market for ATC services even if it wanted to. ATC does not lend itself to competitive market configurations. It would be inefficient to duplicate the costly advanced technology that modern ATC demands among many providers who would then compete to sell it to government. ATC is what economists characterize as a "natural monopoly." Situations of natural monopoly are situations in which, because of the large scale of operation and the high fixed costs in infrastructure, it is less expensive to have a single regulated provider.

Privatization—AT: Efficiency

Efficiency crushes labor costs – That causes strikes and worse efficiency issues

Sclar, Director of graduate programs in Urban Planning at Columbia, 03

Elliott Sclar, Director of graduate programs in Urban Planning at Columbia, his book on privatization won two prestigious academic awards, the Louis Brownlow Award for the Best Book of 2002 from the National Academy of Public Administration and the 2001 Charles Levine Prize from the International Political Science, 03, [“Pitfalls of Air Traffic Control Privatization,” National Air Traffic Controllers Association, http://www.inthepublicinterest.org/sites/default/files/PitfallsofATCPrivatization.pdf] E. Liu

Privatization advocates often presume a private “efficiency” advantage. Several ATC privatization efforts have been successful at reducing total costs. However, the “at what price?” question is rarely asked. Evidence from Canada and Australia suggests that the price is safety and employee satisfaction, both of which bring new costs. In Canada, NAV CANADA has been successful at keeping costs low by negotiating with Controllers to keep flexible schedules. As a result, fewer Controllers need to be hired and labor costs are kept low. The second result of this cost containment strategy has been an operational irregularity rate of two per 100,000 aircraft movements – over twice that of the American rate for a system 7% of our size.6Controllers in Canada are stretched to the point of being unable to perform their jobs.7Cost saving work rules have so infuriated controllers in Australia that a series of strikes have crippled air traffic movement for hours at a time at a high cost to Australians as a whole.8In both of these cases, cost savings strategies have translated to new, more serious problems with safety and efficiency.

Their methodology makes illogical comparisons and ignores quality losses

Sclar, Director of graduate programs in Urban Planning at Columbia, 03

Elliott Sclar, Director of graduate programs in Urban Planning at Columbia, his book on privatization won two prestigious academic awards, the Louis Brownlow Award for the Best Book of 2002 from the National Academy of Public Administration and the 2001 Charles Levine Prize from the International Political Science, 03, [“Pitfalls of Air Traffic Control Privatization,” National Air Traffic Controllers Association, http://www.inthepublicinterest.org/sites/default/files/PitfallsofATCPrivatization.pdf] E. Liu

One of the strongest arguments for privatization is found in the belief that it will save money. It is suggested that privatization will cut the bureaucratic waste out of the operation. This is done by a methodology that can be referred to as "psuedo benchmarking." Benchmarking is a time honored management tool for comparing the performance of an organization with an outstanding peer as a way to assess its performance in terms of effectiveness and efficiency. However it is, at best, only a first approximation as no two organizations are ever identical. Differences matter and must be taken into account. The Reason Foundation, in its attempt to argue for the cost savings of privatization, cite the cut in the size of the Canadian ATC system when it was converted to a private operation with the creation of NAV CANADA. There are clearly problems with such a comparison between a system the size of the U.S. system and the Canadian system, which is only a fraction of the size. But, more importantly, as the NRC study shows, the cut in staffing at NAV CANADA may represent a decrease in quality. Quality in this case translates into passenger safety and national security.

PPP counterplan

#### PPP is key to NextGen success.

Peters 12 (Mary Peters, 2012, Administrator of FHWA, USDOT, NextGen Fund, “This Public Private Partnership is the only way to bridge the gap between the FAA’s NextGen system and the airline industry.” <http://www.nextgenfund.com/fund.html>)

Finding efficiencies and cost-effective ways to meet public needs has never been more important. A proven Public Private Partnership (PPP) structure is the only viable way forward. This is not about privatization. It is about using the strengths, knowledge and resources of all parties to benefit our economy. There are hundreds of examples of PPPs working efficiently in the U.S. and around the world. The NextGen Fund, supported by ITT Corporation and leading aerospace companies and leading financial institutions from Wall Street, will invest $1.5 billion in private-sector capital to overcome the investment barriers that have prevented U.S. airlines from investing in NextGen technologies. The NextGen Fund will enable the retrofit of up to 70 percent of the U.S. commercial air transport fleet — and some general aviation aircraft — with NextGen systems. The airlines' hesitation is understandable, as they need to start making these investments years before the FAA systems are ready to deliver real economic benefits. There are several features of the NextGen Fund that are of key importance to addressing the airlines' concerns. Airlines will be able to upgrade their aircraft without large capital outlays or adding debt to their balance sheets. Payments can be deferred until the FAA delivers specific NextGen services. Using the NextGen Fund, airline commitments can be used to accomplish "Predominant Equipage" where they are most needed in our Nation's skies. We've talked a lot about the commitment and benefit to private companies and industries. There is also a large commitment from the public sector. Congress continues to support and fund NextGen as a national priority. The FAA is already investing in NextGen infrastructure development, and plans to invest billions of dollars to develop and install NextGen systems in our Nation's aging air traffic control system. The first of these NextGen technologies uses advanced satellite position data to track aircraft with more precision. The FAA is on schedule to have this system installed and operating in 2013. As the FAA's first major procurement for an air traffic control system structured as a PPP, its success is a harbinger for future NextGen technology programs. According to the U.S. Department of Transportation,1 PPPs represent a wide variety of project financing and delivery approaches, which offer the potential to expedite projects and cost effectively operate and maintain the resulting infrastructure and services. By leveraging scarce public funds and tapping private sector capital, PPPs can help agencies "do more with less." The common element of a PPP is that public sponsors of transportation projects, in this case the FAA, engage the private sector to a greater degree in the performance of certain functions previously handled by the public sector. This can range from contract maintenance to innovative life-cycle finance, technology and infrastructure development, operations, and preservation. Not too long ago, a senior Department of Transportation official stated, "In a time of funding shortages at all levels of government, it is particularly important that we look to opportunities for the private sector to participate in funding transportation infrastructure improvements."
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#### Lack of cooperation in both houses leaves Congress with no solution to the economy

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

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

**The economy is weakening, the slowdown on job growth indicates we’re entering another recession – that’s constable july 7th.**

The economy is weak- unemployment and uncertainty

Howe 7/27

[7/27/12 US economy loses steam Peter J. Howe, New England Cable News Business Editor. <http://www.necn.com/07/27/12/US-economy-loses-steam/landing_business.html?blockID=747455&feedID=4209>]

"The U.S. economy is weakening," Eaton Vance vice president and portfolio manager Eric Stein said Friday after the Commerce Department’s GDP announcement. "We're in our third consecutive summer of a slowdown. We're not in a double dip, but it's certainly not strong growth by any stretch of the imagination. We're certainly in a soft patch for the U.S. economy … Business investment is still strong, kind of leading the recovery. Exports aren't that good. The rest of the world is slowing, particularly Europe is slowing, but also even parts of Asia are slowing" and reducing U.S. corporations’ opportunities to export goods and services abroad.

Josh Pierce, research director for Bay State Wealth Management in Boston, said the 1.5 percent growth is barely half of what the economy needs to see unemployment come down rapidly, and represents an unusually tepid level of growth reflecting what an unusual, weak recovery this has been from a unique Great Recession driven by a financial and real-estate collapse.

"Typically, going back to World War II, I think we should be looking at 3.7 to 4.2 percent growth. We're not seeing that. But then again, we're not used to a credit bubble burst and total deleveraging of the consumer" – households suddenly cutting back on spending and increasing saving to make up for collapsed housing and investment values – "So when you look at that and say, ‘At least we're growing,’ well, that's nice. But there's still a huge unemployment number. The Fed's running out of bullets. There's a lot to be worried about," said Pierce. Stein agreed that "uncertainty is holding back the U.S. economy. The biggest source of uncertainty is what's going on in Europe with their debt crisis. The second part is really here domestically, both the fiscal cliff" of threatened simultaneous steep tax increases and spending cuts on Jan. 1 if a gridlocked Congress and President Obama can’t make a deal "as well as the upcoming election."

#### Downgrade coming – can’t address debt

The Hill 12 (Geneva Sands, the Hill, “Sen. Coburn: 'No doubt' US credit rating will be downgraded again,” 5/23/12, <http://thehill.com/video/senate/229105-coburn-no-doubt-us-credit-will-be-downgraded-again->)hhs-ps

The United States suffered the [first downgrade](http://thehill.com/blogs/on-the-money/801-economy/175735-sap-downgrades-us-credit-rating%22%20%5Ct%20%22_self) to its credit rating in history when Standard & Poor's reduced the nation's rating from AAA to AA+ last August. "We should see another downgrade, because we have not done the structural things that will fix our country," he added. The battle over last summer's debt crisis was reignited when House Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) vowed earlier this month that the House would only raise the federal government’s $16.4 trillion debt ceiling if Democrats agree to further spending cuts and entitlement reforms. When asked if he agreed with Boehner's decision to push forward the tumultuous debt-ceiling debate, Coburn said, "I think that's exactly what our founders had in mind." He argued that the credit rating wasn't downgraded because of deadlock in Congress, but rather because the biggest cost drivers of U.S. debt were not addressed. Coburn, who was a member of President Obama's fiscal commission, called for changes to Medicare and Social Security, saying in order to stem the mounting U.S. debt, earnings limitations and age requirements will have to be reformed. "Those are all things people don't want to hear, but it's going to happen, because if we don't do it, the people who are loaning us the money are going to make us do it," he said. The GOP senator predicted that if nothing is done to reduce the federal debt, in two to five years the United States will face the same economic problems as Greece.

**No impact to downgrades** —The EU is collapsing, and China’s growth is declining as because its housing bubble is popping. Global investors have no where safer in the world to put their money than the U.S. treasury. Thus, interest rates will continue to be extremely low.

Turn – we boost the economy …

Spending is consistently increasing now under Obama – Their figures are a numbers game

AFP, 12

AFP, 5-27-12, [“FACT CHECK: Obama off on thrifty spending claim,” Andrew Taylor, http://lubbockonline.com/election/election-general/2012-05-27/fact-check-obama-thrifty-spending-claim#.T-kW2JLm7fs] E. Liu

A fairer calculation would give Obama much of the responsibility for an almost 10 percent budget boost in 2009, then a 13 percent increase over 2010-2013, or average annual growth of spending of just more than 3 percent over that period. So, how does the administration arrive at its claim? First, there’s the Troubled Assets Relief Program, the official name for the Wall Street bailout. First, companies got a net $151 billion from TARP in 2009, making 2010 spending look smaller. Then, because banks and Wall Street firms repaid a net $110 billion in TARP funds in 2010, Obama is claiming credit for cutting spending by that much. The combination of TARP lending in one year and much of that money being paid back in the next makes Obama’s spending record for 2010 look $261 billion thriftier than it really was. Only by that measure does Obama “cut” spending by 1.8 percent in 2010 as the analysis claims. The federal takeover of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac also makes Obama’s record on spending look better than it was. The government spent $96 billion on the Fannie-Freddie takeovers in 2009 but only $40 billion on them in 2010. By the administration’s reckoning, the $56 billion difference was a spending cut by Obama. Taken together, TARP and the takeover of Fannie and Freddie combine to give Obama an undeserved $317 billion swing in the 2010 figures and the resulting 1.8 percent cut from 2009. A fairer reading is an almost 8 percent increase. Those two bailouts account for $72 billion more in cuts in 2011. Obama supported the bailouts. There’s also the question of how to treat the 2009 fiscal year, which actually began Oct. 1, 2008, almost four months before Obama took office. Typically, the remaining eight months get counted as part of the prior president’s spending since the incoming president usually doesn’t change it much until the following October. The MarketWatch analysis assigned 2009 to former President George W. Bush, though it gave Obama responsibility that year for a $140 million chunk of the 2009 stimulus bill. But Obama’s role in 2009 spending was much bigger than that. For starters, he signed nine spending bills funding every Cabinet agency except Defense, Veterans Affairs and Homeland Security. While the numbers don’t jibe exactly, Obama bears the chief responsibility for an 11 percent, $59 billion increase in non-defense spending in 2009. Then there’s a 9 percent, $109 billion increase in combined defense and non-defense appropriated outlays in 2010, a year for which Obama is wholly responsible. As other critics have noted, including former Congressional Budget Office Director Douglas Holtz-Eakin, the MarketWatch analysis also incorporates CBO’s annual baseline as its estimate for fiscal years 2012 and 2013. That gives Obama credit for three events unlikely to occur: —$65 billion in 2013 from automatic, across-the-board spending cuts slated to take effect next January. —Cuts in Medicare payments to physicians. —The expiration of refundable tax cuts that are “scored” as spending in federal ledgers. Lawmakers are unlikely to allow the automatic cuts to take full effect, but it’s at best a guessing game as to what will really happen in 2013. A better measure is Obama’s request for 2013. “You can only make him look good by ignoring the early years and adopting the hope and not the reality of the years in his budget,” said Holtz-Eakin, a GOP economist and president of the American Action Forum, a free market think tank. So how does Obama measure up? If one assumes that TARP and the takeover of Fannie and Freddie by the government as one-time budgetary anomalies and remove them from calculations — an approach taken by Holtz-Eakin — you get the following picture: —A 9.7 percent increase in 2009, much of which is attributable to Obama. —A 7.8 percent increase in 2010, followed by slower spending growth over 2011-13. Much of the slower growth reflects the influence of Republicans retaking control of the House and their budget and debt deal last summer with Obama. All told, government spending now appears to be growing at an annual rate of roughly 3 percent over the 2010-2013 period, rather than the 0.4 percent claimed by Obama and the MarketWatch analysis.

Short-term spending doesn’t affect debt outlook – Larger cycles and trends control fiscal adjustments

Auerbach, Robert D. Burch Professor of Economics and Law at the University of California, Berkeley, 11

Alan J Auerbach, Robert D. Burch Professor of Economics and Law at the University of California, Berkeley, 7-11, [“Long-Term Fiscal Sustainability in Major Economies,” www.bis.org/publ/work361.pdf] E. Liu

These short-term trajectories clearly are attention-getting. For some countries, such as Greece, there is little need to look beyond them to know that a large and immediate fiscal 2 adjustment is needed. But debt-GDP ratios alone typically do not tell us how long countries have before they must make fiscal adjustments or how large these adjustments need to be. Some countries, for example Italy and Japan, have maintained high debt-GDP ratios for some time. Also, for countries not necessarily facing any short-run crisis, these projections may provide an inadequate picture of underlying fiscal imbalances. This is because the factors contributing to short-term debt accumulation differ substantially from those that will affect debt accumulation over the longer term, after the next few years, factors that have little to do with the business cycle and the rate of economic recovery, and much more to do with demographic change and the associated changes in government spending and tax collections.

7. Political uncertainty collapses confidence and demand – Causes recession

Reuters 12

Reuters, 6-25-12, [“In Washington, uncertainty the only sure thing,” Andy Sullivan, http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/06/25/us-washington-summit-preview-idUSBRE85L17520120625] E. Liu

(Reuters) - The tepid U.S. recovery is stalling for the third summer in a row, and Washington yet again is hurtling toward a showdown over taxes and spending that could push the economy back into recession. Sound familiar? To weary voters and investors, dysfunction in Washington is no longer news. The ongoing uncertainty on everything from taxes to transportation has undercut the economy as battle lines harden ahead of what is sure to be the most expensive presidential election in history. The Reuters Washington Summit next week, from June 25 to 27, will shed light on how the coming months could play out. In interviews at the Reuters office in Washington, key lawmakers, campaign officials, political operators and budget analysts will offer insight into their strategies for navigating the coming turbulence. The November 6 matchup between Democratic President Barack Obama and his Republican challenger, Mitt Romney, could determine whether the United States chooses new stimulus programs or further spending cuts in the years ahead. The elections could determine which party controls Congress as well. But the elections are not the only question mark. Thousands of construction workers could be laid off if Congress does not resolve a highway funding bill by the end of the month. Student loan rates are also due to double on July 1 if Congress does not act, potentially draining more money out of the economy. More threatening is the "fiscal cliff" - automatic spending cuts and tax hikes that could drag the economy back into recession in January if Democrats and Republicans do not strike a deal on taxes and debt reduction. And the ugly debate over whether to raise the federal debt ceiling, which hammered consumer confidence last summer and prompted a first-ever downgrade of the U.S. government's debt rating, is likely to return early next year. "This uncertainty leads firms to cut back or defer hiring and investment decisions. It also drives consumers to put off buying new goods. As a result, uncertainty stalls both the corporate and consumer sector drivers of a recovery," wrote Steven J. Davis of the University of Chicago and Nick Bloom and Scott Baker of Stanford University. The trio's "policy uncertainty" index is creeping back up toward levels last seen after the August 2011 debt ceiling showdown.

8. US debt is more stable and trustworthy

Nelson, Analyst in International Trade and Finance 12

Rebecca M. Nelson, Analyst in International Trade and Finance, 2-29-12, [“Sovereign Debt in Advanced Economies: Overview and Issues for Congress,” Congressional Research Service, www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R41838.pdf] E. Liu

Some analysts,52 as well as some Members of Congress, have expressed concern that the United States is headed towards a debt crisis similar to those experienced by some Eurozone countries, including Greece, Ireland, and Portugal. They are concerned about loss of investor confidence and the loss of the United States’ ability to borrow at reasonable interest rates. Like these Eurozone countries, it is argued, the United States has been reliant on foreign investors to fund a large budget deficit, resulting in rising debt levels and increasing vulnerability to a sudden reversal in investor confidence. S&P’s downgrade of long-term U.S. debt in August 2011 reinforced concerns about the U.S. commitment and ability to repay its debt. Other economists argue that the U.S. debt position is much stronger than that of the Eurozone economies in crisis.53 Unlike Greece, Portugal, and Ireland, the United States has a floating exchange rate and its currency is an international reserve currency, which can alleviate many of the pressures associated with rising debt levels.54 Additionally, they argue that the stronger levels of economic growth and the lower borrowing costs of the United States put U.S. debt levels on a more sustainable path over time. Even with the S&P downgrade, the U.S. credit rating is still higher than the crisis countries. The United States also has a strong historical record of debt repayment that helps bolster its reputation in capital markets. Greece, by contrast, has been in a state of default about 50% of the time since independence in the 1830s.55 Bond market data indicate that investors do not view the United States in a similar light to Greece, Ireland, or Portugal. Figure 6 compares the spreads on Greek, Irish, Portuguese, U.S., and UK 10-year bonds (over 10-year German bonds) since 2008. Higher bond spreads indicate higher levels of risk. U.S. bond spreads have remained substantially lower than Greek, Irish, and Portuguese bond spreads throughout the Eurozone crisis. U.S. bond spreads have been much closer in value to UK bond spreads, even during the financial crisis that originated in the U.S. housing market.

Federalism – No Link

The federal government has a constitutional obligation to invest in infrastructure including airports

ACG, Associated General Contractors of America, represents more than 33,000 firms including 7,500 of America's leading general contractors, 11

ACG, Associated General Contractors of America, represents more than 33,000 firms including 7,500 of America's leading general contractors, 5-20-11, [“Why and How the Federal Government Should Continue to Fund Vital Infrastructure in the New Age of Public Austerity,” http://www.mmsend50.com/link.cfm?r=33208529&sid=13749970&m=1370386&u=agca&s=http://www.agc.org/galleries/news/Case-for-Infrastructure-Reform.pdf] E. Liu

One area where this question is likely to arise is federal investments in infrastructure, including highways, transit systems, airports, dams, levees, federal buildings and drinking & wastewater systems. Some are likely to wonder why federal taxpayers should help subsidize financing for drinking water in Louisville, pay into a pool of funds that will add new highway capacity in Richmond, or use general treasury funds to prevent flooding and speed barge traffic by improving locks along the Ohio River. The answer is that it is clearly in the national interest to invest in infrastructure. For example, there is a clear, constitutionally defined federal role for supporting interstate commerce by investing in transportation infrastructure. Likewise, there is a strong argument to be made that the federal government has a vital role to play in maintaining our national economic security by investing in the infrastructure that is vital to commerce. Indeed, the Constitution is quite clear that it is the responsibility of the federal government to facilitate interstate commerce. Today, the vast majority of that interstate commerce travels on America’s vast, interconnected network of highways, airports and waterways. That means that if Congress and the Administration want to fulfill their Constitutional obligation to facilitate interstate commerce, they must continue to make the investments needed to maintain sufficient quality and capacity along our interstate highway network, our waterways and ensure the safety of air travelers. It also is important to note that the federal programs for investing in highway and transit projects has traditionally been self-funded. Since the 1950s, highway users have, through a mixture of gas taxes and other use-related fees, provided all of the funds that go into the Highway Trust Fund. Until only recently all federal surface transportation investments had come from this self-funded Trust Fund. In other words, structured correctly, the federal surface transportation program does not have to cost anyone that doesn’t use the highway system a single penny. As important, there is a strong argument to be made for the fact that the proper role of the federal government is to create and set conditions favorable to private sector job creation. For example, in an economy where the difference between success and failure is often measured by a company’s ability to deliver goods quickly and efficiently, maintaining transportation infrastructure is as important to the success of the private sector as are stable and low tax rates, minimal red tape and regulations and consistent and stable rule of law.

Dedev

**Our plan sustains peace** by boosting the nation’s economy. NextGen does this by creating jobs and improving the productivity of businesses.

- Prosperity reinforces peace, while bad economic times tend to spawn conflicts – that’s Royal 10 and Mead 9.

Growth solves global conflict

Marquardt, 5

(Michael J. Marquardt, Professor of Human Resource Development and International Affairs at George Washington University, “Globalization: The Pathway to Prosperity, Freedom and Peace,” Human Resource Development International, March 2005, Volume 8, Number 1, pg. 127-129, http://org8220renner.alliant.wikispaces.net/file/view/Marquardt.pdf)

Perhaps the greatest value of globalization is its potential for creating a world of peace. Economic growth has been identiﬁed as one of the strongest forces that turn people away from conﬂict and wars among groups, tribes, and nations. Global companies strongly discourage governments from warring against countries in which they have investments. Focusing on economic growth encourages cooperation and living in relative peace (Marquardt, 2001, 2002)

Transition fails – people will revert back to the growth mentality

Kornai 2k

Janos. Professor of economics at Harvard. Winter 2000. Journal of Economic Perspectives. Volume 14, Number 1. Online.

Self-evidently, a mixed system is in place during the transition from capitalism to socialism, and in the transition from socialism to capitalism. But apart from the countries undergoing the great transformations, several other countries operated in mixed systems for a long time as well. India offers a prime example, with much more state-ownership and bureaucratic control than most other capitalist countries, and a ruling party with an ideology exhibiting some socialist features for two or three decades. However, the party did not include in its program the elimination of private property nor the market, nor did it seek the retention of power at all costs. Combinations similar in many respects can be found in certain periods of the histoty of other developing countries. It is too early to reach a final judgement, but the study of these episodes so far suggests that the mixed cases tend to return eventually to the path of capitalist development.

Collapse causes massive transition wars

Panzner 8 (Michael J. Panzner, faculty at the New York Institute of Finance, 25-year veteran of the global stock, bond, and currency markets who has worked in New York and London for HSBC, Soros Funds, ABN Amro, Dresdner Bank, and JPMorgan Chase, 2008, “Financial Armageddon: Protect Your Future from Economic Collapse”, Revised and Updated Edition, p. 136-138)

Many will wonder whether the United States might renege on some of its fi nancial obligations or even declare an outright default on its once AAA securities. Likely adding to a widespread sense of panic will be the exodus from an array of global fi at currencies into gold, silver, property, and other tangible assets, which can hold their value in a world of government fi nances run amok. Needless to say, systemic fi nancial pressures and domino-like bank failures will make preservation of capital the utmost concern. Rising angst will also wreak havoc with links among markets, fi nancial systems, economies, and countries. Many people could fi nd themselves subject to stricter government controls or even fi nd avenues closed off as a result of attempts to stem contagion effects. The widespread urge to withdraw will feed rising xenophobia, already infl amed by illegal immigration, unfair trade practices, and leaking borders. Playing to populist sentiment, politicians around the country will respond enthusiastically to calls for restrictions on foreigners. This will further feed a brain drain, as scientists, students, and other temporary visa holders are left with little choice but to uproot and go elsewhere, further sapping America’s economic resiliency. Continuing calls for curbs on the fl ow of fi nance and trade will inspire the United States and other nations to spew forth protectionist legislation like the notorious Smoot-Hawley bill. Introduced at the start of the Great Depression, it triggered a series of tit-for-tat economic responses, which many commentators believe helped turn a serious economic downturn into a prolonged and devastating global disaster. But if history is any guide, those lessons will have been long forgotten during the next collapse. Eventually, fed by a mood of desperation and growing public anger, restrictions on trade, fi nance, investment, and immigration will almost certainly intensify. Authorities and ordinary citizens will likely scrutinize the cross-border movement of Americans and outsiders alike, and lawmakers may even call for a general crackdown on nonessential travel. Meanwhile, many nations will make transporting or sending funds to other countries exceedingly diffi cult. As desperate offi cials try to limit the fallout from decades of ill-conceived, corrupt, and reckless policies, they will introduce controls on foreign exchange. Foreign individuals and companies seeking to acquire certain American infrastructure assets, or trying to buy property and other assets on the cheap thanks to a rapidly depreciating dollar, will be stymied by limits on investment by noncitizens. Those efforts will cause spasms to ripple across economies and markets, disrupting global payment, settlement, and clearing mechanisms. All of this will, of course, continue to undermine business confi - dence and consumer spending. In a world of lockouts and lockdowns, any link that transmits systemic fi nancial pressures across markets through arbitrage or portfolio-based risk management, or that allows diseases to be easily spread from one country to the next by tourists and wildlife, or that otherwise facilitates unwelcome exchanges of any kind will be viewed with suspicion and dealt with accordingly. The rise in isolationism and protectionism will bring about ever more heated arguments and dangerous confrontations over shared sources of oil, gas, and other key commodities as well as factors of production that must, out of necessity, be acquired from less-than-friendly nations. Whether involving raw materials used in strategic industries or basic necessities such as food, water, and energy, efforts to secure adequate supplies will take increasing precedence in a world where demand seems constantly out of kilter with supply. Disputes over the misuse, overuse, and pollution of the environment and natural resources will become more commonplace. Around the world, such tensions will give rise to fullscale military encounters, often with minimal provocation. In some instances, economic conditions will serve as a convenient pretext for confl icts that stem from cultural and religious differences. Alternatively, nations may look to divert attention away from domestic problems by channeling frustration and populist sentiment toward other countries and cultures. Enabled by cheap technology and the waning threat of American retribution, terrorist groups will likely boost the frequency and scale of their horrifying attacks, bringing the threat of random violence to a whole new level. Turbulent conditions will encourage aggressive saber rattling and interdictions by rogue nations running amok. Age-old clashes will also take on a new, more heated sense of urgency. China will likely assume an increasingly belligerent posture toward Taiwan, while Iran may embark on overt colonization of its neighbors in the Mideast. Israel, for its part, may look to draw a dwindling list of allies from around the world into a growing number of confl icts. Some observers, like John Mearsheimer, a political scientist at the University of Chicago, have even speculated that an “intense confrontation” between the United States and China is “inevitable” at some point. More than a few disputes will turn out to be almost wholly ideological. Growing cultural and religious differences will be transformed from wars of words to battles soaked in blood. Long-simmering resentments could also degenerate quickly, spurring the basest of human instincts and triggering genocidal acts. Terrorists employing biological or nuclear weapons will vie with conventional forces using jets, cruise missiles, and bunker-busting bombs to cause widespread destruction. Many will interpret stepped-up confl icts between Muslims and Western societies as the beginnings of a new world war.

Dedev—A2 Resource scarcity

Tech innovation and resource substitution solves scarcity – green revolution and oil crisis prove

Eastin et al 10 ( Josh Eastin Department of Political Science, 101 Gowen Hall, Box 353530, University of Washington, Seattle. Reiner Grundmann Sociology and Public Policy, Aston University, School of Languages and Social Sciences, Aseem Prakash Department of Political Science, 39 Gowen Hall, Box 353530, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195-3530, USA, The two limits debates: ‘‘Limits to Growth’’ and climate change http://www2.lse.ac.uk/researchAndExpertise/units/mackinder/pdf/Futures\_LtG-CC\_2010.pdf

Arguably, the Limits to Growth report insufﬁciently recognized or factored in the human capacity for technological innovation. Technological innovation and market forces can, at least partially, mitigate resource scarcity by facilitating resource substitution. This argument was made by a host of scholars shortly following the publication of LtG, notably Julian Simon [21] and Herman Kahn [22] (see also [23]). The food crisis in some parts of the world was averted by the ‘‘green revolution’’ that entailed the introduction of new technology (high yielding varieties of seeds coupled with the systematic application of pesticides, fertilizers and irrigation), and policy changes (e.g. altering terms of trade between rural and urban areas). If the current food crisis persists, it would be interesting to see if it leads to investment in the development of ‘‘second wave’’ of green revolution technologies (or the third wave if genetically engineered crops are to be labeled as the second wave). The oil crises of 1973 and 1979 illustrated that exogenous shocks on primary resource availability can spur the development of new resources and technologies. Although these ‘‘solutions’’ deferred issues of resource depletion into the (then) future (and our present), the broader lesson is that under certain conditions, human ingenuity and adaptability, often mediated through governmental intervention, can alter patterns of consumption and production, at least at the margins. In this capacity, the social, political, and economic dimensions of human response need to be anticipated, and if possible, accounted for in making predictions about resource scarcity. However, despite the importance of anticipating public responses to resource price changes, as Kempton et al. point out, it is puzzling that the public does not take greater advantage of cost savings through energy conservation, even in the face of governmental efforts to promote cost savings through energy conservation [59].

Oil DA — No Link

**NextGen reduces fuel consumption but increases aviation capacity and efficiency**

AIA, 2010 [Aerospace Industries Association”“Aerospace and Defense: THE STRENGTH TO LIFT AMERICA” http://www.aia-aerospace.org/assets/NAD\_Booklet.pdf]

NextGen’s satellite-based air transportation network stresses adaptability by enabling aircraft to

immediately adjust to everchanging factors, such as weather, traffic congestion, aircraft position, flight trajectory patterns and security issues. By 2025, all aircraft and airports in U.S. airspace will be connected to the NextGen network and will continually share information in real time using cutting-edge innovations in areas such as weather forecasting and digital communications to improve efficiency and safety as well as absorb the predicted increase in air traffic.

NextGen will enable more aircraft to fly more closely together on more direct routes, thus reducing delays and helping to reduce aviation’s carbon emissions, fuel consumption and noise. Through targeted improvements in ground infrastructure, air traffic procedures and aircraft equipment, maximum benefits will be realized by the flying public. To take in NextGen’s full potential, experts believe an allocation from the U.S. Treasury’s general fund above 25 percent is needed until the program is fully implemented.

Politics (Regular)

#### No impact — ….

**Case turns the DA** — …

#### Case outweighs — economic collapse outweighs

#### Obama will lose --- unemployment numbers will crush Obama.

**CNN Money**, **7/19**/2012 (Election 2012: Economy does Obama no favors, p. <http://money.cnn.com/2012/07/19/news/economy/obama-election/>)

Unless the economy mounts a dramatic turnaround, President Obama will be forced to ask voters for a second term while the unemployment rate sits north of 8%. Any campaign consultant will tell you that's bad news for the incumbent -- and it could get worse. Robust labor market growth in the first three months of the calendar year has given way to three consecutive disappointing jobs reports. The housing market remains tied in knots. And growth is depressingly weak. Europe is mired in an intractable debt crisis that shows few signs of easing. At home, the impending fiscal cliff has the potential to unsettle businesses to the point where they are reluctant to make investments or hiring decisions. The resulting economic outlook -- especially from the Obama campaign's perspective -- is not especially rosy. With only four monthly jobs reports remaining before Election Day, it now seems unlikely that unemployment will drop below 8%. The current unemployment rate is 8.2%. Patrick Sims, a director at Hamilton Place Strategies, said that getting below 8.0% is "not going to happen" by Election Day.

Any public reaction to the plan will taper off before election day, which is over 3 months from now. Nominee gaffs, or other political or social issues will be more influential to a voter than a transportation modernization bill.

#### Public supports airport programs--- they see them as job creators

**Dye**, 3/26/**2012** (Morgan – Senior Management of Communications & Marketing at Airports Council International – North America, Poll Finds Americans See Airports’ Value, Centerline, p. http://www.aci-na.org/blog/2012/03/26/poll-finds-americans-see-airports-value/)

Americans love their local airports, but they’re still not sure how they work, according to a new national survey commissioned by Airports Council International-North America. A majority (61%) recognized the importance of airports to the economy, with 33% saying they are “extremely important” to their local economy, a finding that is consistent with a recent ACI-NA report that attributed 10.5 million jobs and $1.2 trillion in spending to the nation’s 490 commercial airports. “Americans know that airports are hubs of economic activity and job creation for the communities they support,” Greg Principato, president of ACI-NA, said.

Voters will determine the election based on job numbers and the direction of the economy

No political or industry opposition to NextGen means that the public won’t know or care about it for the election

Washington Post, 11

Washington Post, 6-3-11, [“New guidance system for skies could face delays,” Ashley Halsey III, http://www.washingtonpost.com/local/antidote-to-air-gridlock-is-complex-undertaking/2011/06/30/AG9bdnwH\_print.html] E. Liu

NextGen has virtually no credible enemies — not in the administration, not on Capitol Hill and not in the airline industry. But the seemingly simple concept is layered like an onion with complexities. In addition to demanding an enormous investment, there is a confluence of history and technology that creates a hurdle to progress. Airlines fear that the FAA will not meet its timetable for creation of the network of ground-based stations and satellite links that will make it all work. “The FAA’s track record on deployment hasn’t been good,” said Russ Chew, a former airline executive and former FAA chief operating officer. “The FAA could be perfect in meeting NextGen deadlines, but [private investors] are looking at past history.”

-------

STOP

-------

NextGen saves taxpayers money

Pearce 6 [Robert A., Mr. Pearce is a NASA executive serving as the Acting Director of the Next Generation Air Transportation System Joint Planning and Development Office. For the past two years, Mr. Pearce served as the Deputy Director of the office.

Previously, Mr. Pearce was responsible for strategy and program development for NASA’s Aeronautics Research Mission Directorate. January- March, ATCA Journal of Air Traffic Control.“The Next Generation Air Transportation System: Transformation Starts Now” http://www.jpdo.gov/library/ngats\_transformation.pdf]

And during this time of fiscal austerity, and as the Aviation Trust Fund continues to spend down, the JPDO was able to determine that Next Generation System costs are reasonable. Approximately $1.5 billion is spent annually on air transportation- related research and we cannot afford to go off in a dozen different directions. But by aligning every dollar, program and plan to the Next Generation System and with everyone pulling in the same direction, we can eliminate duplication and even save taxpayers money in the process.

#### Obama reelection results in unilateral disarm --- kills deterrence and results in nuclear war.

**Ferrara**, 4/4/**2012** (Peter – Director of Entitlement and Budget Policy for the Heartland Institute and General Counsel of the American Civil Rights Union, served in the White House Office of Policy development under President Reagan, Obama’s Unilateral Nuclear Disarmament, American Spectator, p. <http://spectator.org/archives/2012/04/04/obamas-unilateral-nuclear-disa>)

America's Nuclear Suicide Obama's literally crazy idea is that if we just lead by example and phase out our nuclear weapons, everyone else will realize we mean them no harm, and do the same. As a result, because of the messiah, the lion will lie down with the lamb, and the world will live as one. As Gaffney further explained, "He evidently is prepared to take such a step unilaterally in order to encourage by our example other nations to join his long-standing ambition to 'rid the world of nuclear weapons.'" The problem is if President Obama is reelected, he as the commander-in-chief would be free to carry out this flower child policy on his own authority, without Congressional approval. As Gaffney further explained in the March 27 Washington Times, "Mr. Obama's subordinates are signaling, however, that he is prepared to disarm us unilaterally through what one of them, Assistant Secretary of State Rose Gottemoeller, recently called 'executive action.'" Gaffney rightly concluded in his February 22 column, "It is an astonishing insight into the President's commitment to 'fundamentally transforming the United States of America' -- in the worst sense of the phrase -- that he is willing to take such steps in the midst of his reelection campaign. Imagine what he would do if the last vestiges of restraining accountability are removed in a second term." In these modern times, a full blown nuclear war would be over in a matter of days. America will not have four years to build up the arsenal of democracy if caught by surprise. A dew-eyed miscalculation on these matters literally threatens your very life, and the lives of your family and children. That is why not only President Obama must be held accountable for this national defense foolishness, but the entire Democrat party that supports and enables him. That includes his contributors, whose names are publicly available, and his voters. This is a Paul Revere moment. The survival of you, your family and your nation is at stake, far more so than even on that April night in 1775. Exercise your rights of freedom of speech and democratic participation while you still have them, indeed, while you are still alive.

Politics (ST Version)

Politics—Economy Key

#### Voters will decide the election based on the economy --- no other issue outweighs.

New York Times, 3/13/**2012** (Muddled Economic Picture Muddles the Political One, Too, p. <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/14/us/politics/economy-plays-biggest-role-in-obama-re-election-chances.html?_r=1>)

The final major economic turning point of President Obama’s first term seems to have arrived. The question is which way the economy will turn. Job growth has picked up nicely in the last few months, raising the prospect that the American economy is finally in the early stages of a recovery that will gather strength over time. But with gas prices rising, the government cutting workers and consumers still deep in debt, some forecasters predict that economic growth — and with it, job growth — will slow in coming months. Politically, the difference between the two situations is vast. In one, Mr. Obama will be able to campaign on a claim, as he has recently begun to do, that the country is back on track. In another, he will be left to explain that recoveries from financial crises take years, and to argue that Republicans want to return to the Bush-era policies that created the crisis — as he tried to argue, unsuccessfully, in the 2010 midterm election. His approval rating has slipped again in some polls recently, with higher gas prices possibly playing a role. As a result, the economic numbers over the next couple of months, including an unemployment report on April 6, will have bigger political implications than the typical batch of data. The Federal Reserve acknowledged the uncertainty in its scheduled statement on Tuesday, suggesting the economy had improved somewhat but still predicting only “moderate economic growth.” Economists say the economy’s near-term direction depends relatively little on Mr. Obama’s economic policies. The standoff over Iran’s nuclear program, the European debt crisis and other events will most likely affect the economy more. But many American voters are still likely to make their decision based on the economy. Historically, nothing — not campaign advertisements, social issues or even wars — has influenced voters more heavily than the direction of the economy in an election year. “If you could know one thing and you had to predict which party was going to win the next presidential election,” Lynn Vavreck, a political scientist at the University of California, Los Angeles, said, “**you couldn’t do better than knowing the change in economic growth**.”

Politics—Plan Popular – Bipartisanship

Congresspeople are in support of NextGen due to congestion benefits

Meehan 12

Patrick Meehan[Congressman Representing 7th District of Pennsylvania]/Meehan Says NextGen Air Traffic Control Investment Key to Regional Economy/February 14, 2012
http://meehan.house.gov/latest-news/meehan-says-nextgen-air-traffic-control-investment-key-to-regional-economy/

PHILADELPHIA – U. S. Rep. Patrick Meehan (PA-07) today urged President Obama to sign the Federal Aviation Administration reauthorization bill, saying key investments in the bill like the NextGen air traffic control system will boost our regional economy and improve the safety of our skies. Meehan made the comments while touring the air traffic control tower and meeting with controllers at the Philadelphia International Airport. Meehan, a member of the House Aviation Subcommittee of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, was joined by Don Chapman, a facility representative with the National Air Traffic Controllers Association, and Mark Gale, CEO of the Philadelphia International Airport. “This bipartisan bill means faster and safer travel, lower emissions, and an increase in private sector jobs,” said Meehan. “It will also advance badly needed modernization of our air traffic control system, which is essential in our congested mid-Atlantic airspace that sees one out of every six flights in the world. This is particularly important here at Philadelphia International – no airport in the northeast sees more takeoffs and landings. ” Meehan said the FAA reauthorization legislation will advance the modernization of the country’s air traffic control system to a GPS-based system known as NextGen. This will help ease congestion, decrease delay times and reduce fuel waste. NextGen technologies are expected to bring a net $281 billion to the overall U. S. economy. The FAA authorization bill contains no earmarks and does not raises taxes or passenger facility charges. The bill provides long-term stability for the aviation industry, which accounts for $1. 3 trillion in economic activity, and as much as 11 percent of GDP. The FAA authorization law expired five years ago and is currently on its 23rd short-term extension. The bill, which authorizes funding for four years, has been passed by the House and Senate and is awaiting signature from the President.

Politics—Plan Popular – Democrats

Democrats want NextGen and Republicans only dislike current implementation schedules

The Hill, 11

The Hill, 10-5-11, [“Dems battle GOP over cuts to new FAA air traffic control system,” Keith Laing, http://thehill.com/blogs/transportation-report/aviation/185771-faas-nextgen-future-funding-debated] E. Liu

Advocates for a Federal Aviation Administration plan to implement a satellite-based air traffic control system argued Wednesday against GOP cuts to the program. The FAA has proposed implementing its new navigation system to replace World War II-era radar technology in control towers by 2014 at the busiest airports, at a cost of about $22 billion. Backers of the navigation system argued the NextGen system should be evaluated by the benefits it produces when it is brought to fruition. “The basic measure of smart business spending – return on investment – should be the same in government and industry,” Airline Pilots Association President Lee Moak said Wednesday. “These are decisions that businessmen and women make in companies large and small every day,” Moak said. “It’s fundamental to long-term success.” Lawmakers in the Republican-led House have already cut about $200 million this year from the FAA’s budget that would have gone to the conversion, and on Wednesday they raised questions about the development of the project. “We cannot continue to rely on outdated technology if we are going to ensure our aviation system is as efficient and safe as possible,” House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Chairman John Mica (R-FL) said in a hearing of the panel’s Aviation Subcommittee Tuesday. “Unfortunately, as pointed out by the Inspector General and others, the very foundation of our modernization program is experiencing significant problems. “We need to get a better handle on this important program. It’s not a question of money, it’s a question of management,” Mica continued. FAA Deputy Administrator Michael Huerta said the long-term success of the NextGen proposal, which calls for airlines to spend about an additional $20 billion to upgrade their airplanes' computer systems, is dependent upon Congress’ support of the program. “The willingness of operators and other stakeholders to make these investments depends critically on the business case for them – analyses of how valuable these benefits will be, and that they have confidence that the FAA can deliver the infrastructure in the time frames and manner required for those benefits to be realized,” Huerta said. Democrats on the panel argued that cuts to the NextGen program’s budget now, when Republicans have criticized delays in its development, will only further push back its full implementation. “Because many NextGen programs are dependent on one or more systems, delays in one program mean delays in others,” Rep. Jerry Costello said Wednesday. “My concern is: What happens when we add severe budget constraints on top of logistical program delays?”

Politics—Plan Popular – Industry and GOP

Aviation infrastructure has industry and GoP support

Lochhead 11

Carolyn Lochhead[Senior Editor for Chronicle Washington Bureau]/Obama's infrastructure spending plan gains support/September 9, 2011
http://www.sfgate.com/politics/article/Obama-s-infrastructure-spending-plan-gains-support-2310834.php

President Obama's proposal to spend as much as $140 billion on highways, transit, air traffic control and other infrastructure projects has strong backing from business and labor groups, governors and mayors, and even a qualified embrace from House Republican leaders. The plan is substantially larger than the roughly $100 billion for infrastructure in Obama's first stimulus bill in 2009, which helped fund a fourth bore in the Caldecott Tunnel between Oakland and Orinda and reconstruction of the Doyle Drive access road to the Golden Gate Bridge, among nearly 60 projects statewide. Administration officials said they learned some lessons from the first stimulus and hope to streamline the process to get projects under way faster. The new plans also would seed an infrastructure bank with $10 billion in federal money that the administration hopes could attract several times that in private capital. "The bank is a very good idea," said Rep. John Garamendi, D-Walnut Grove (Sacramento County). He said such a bank could borrow money at interest rates as low as 1 percent and then provide loan guarantees "to projects that have cash flow: bridges, light rail, communications such as fiber optic, sanitation, water systems; these all have cash flow and can be used to pay back a loan. " House majority leader Eric Cantor, R-Va. , said this week that Republicans "believe in infrastructure spending. We know that our roads and bridges and highway networks are in need of repair, and we know that there are certain areas of the country that need additional roads. " But he said states need more flexibility to spend the money and should not be required to set aside 10 percent of their federal transportation money for such things as highway beautification, museums and bicycle and pedestrian programs.

Politics—Plan Popular—No Opponents

No political or industry opposition to NextGen

Washington Post, 11

Washington Post, 6-3-11, [“New guidance system for skies could face delays,” Ashley Halsey III, http://www.washingtonpost.com/local/antidote-to-air-gridlock-is-complex-undertaking/2011/06/30/AG9bdnwH\_print.html] E. Liu

NextGen has virtually no credible enemies — not in the administration, not on Capitol Hill and not in the airline industry. But the seemingly simple concept is layered like an onion with complexities. In addition to demanding an enormous investment, there is a confluence of history and technology that creates a hurdle to progress. Airlines fear that the FAA will not meet its timetable for creation of the network of ground-based stations and satellite links that will make it all work. “The FAA’s track record on deployment hasn’t been good,” said Russ Chew, a former airline executive and former FAA chief operating officer. “The FAA could be perfect in meeting NextGen deadlines, but [private investors] are looking at past history.”

 Politics—Plan Popular—AT: FAA Reauthorization Unpopular

Debate over FAA authorization is over trivia, not NextGen or spending

Collogan 10

*David Collogan[Editor of Business Aviation]/Aviation Waits While Congress Dithers/Aug. 2010*
http://ry2ue4ek7d.search.serialssolutions.com/?ctx\_ver=Z39.88-2004&ctx\_enc=info%3Aofi%2Fenc%3AUTF-8&rfr\_id=info:sid/summon.serialssolutions.com&rft\_val\_fmt=info:ofi/fmt:kev:mtx:journal&rft.genre=article&rft.atitle=Aviation+waits+while+Congress+dithers.%28Washington+Watch%29%28FAA+authorization%29&rft.jtitle=Business+%26+Commercial+Aviation&rft.au=Collogan%2C+David&rft.date=2010-08-01&rft.pub=The+McGraw-Hill+Companies%2C+Inc&rft.issn=0191-4642&rft.volume=106&rft.issue=8&rft.spage=64&rft.externalDBID=n%2Fa&rft.externalDocID=236210363

If you want an illustration of why the U. S. Congress gets such low ratings in public opinion polls, look no further than what transpired just before House and Senate members left Washington for the Fourth of July holiday weekend. Legislators in both chambers decided they once again couldn't reach agreement on FAA reauthorization legislation. So, for the 14th time since the last reauthorization measure originally was due to expire -- on Oct. 1, 2007 -- the legislators adopted yet another temporary extension of existing law before scurrying out of town to raise campaign cash and seek your votes in November. If Congress has been dilly-dallying without agreement on FAA reauthorization for nearly three years, this legislation must not be very important, huh. Well, obviously not to members of Congress. But it certainly is a high-priority matter for everyone in the aviation community. At a time when the FAA and the industry are trying to move forward on implementing the NextGen air traffic control system, Congress is letting petty partisan politics bog down that effort. The House passed its FAA reauthorization bill back in May 2009. The Senate finally adopted its version 10 months later, in March of this year. But the two bills have several significant differences, including one that most observers feel is the largest obstacle to final enactment. The impasse isn't a dispute over which NextGen technologies to pursue, or widely differing funding levels for particular FAA programs, or even funding sources. Nope, the primary holdup is a 230-word provision inserted in the House bill by Rep. James Oberstar (D-Minn. ), the chairman of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Politics—Plan Unpopular—Austerity

NextGen is impossible to defend – Deficit and benefits few

Alvania, FAA research manager 11

Stephen M. Alvania, FAA research manager for developing multiple advanced ATC automation systems, Lead aviation staff for a subcommittee of the U.S. House of Representatives, 9-30-11, [“Can NextGen Survive the Tea Party?,” http://ats-c.com/ats/ats-c\_blog/post/2011/09/30/Can-NextGen-survive-the-Tea-Party.aspx] E. Liu

How will this appalling new political reality impact NextGen? Well, given the recent “serious debates” over whether or not the United States of American should pay its outstanding bills, or whether or not the government should provide education grants so our kids can afford college, or whether or not the government should subsidize winter heating oil for poor and the elderly, I’d think that the probability of funding for aviation research looks pretty low. In this political environment how can anyone defend spending billions of tax dollars for research and development to make air travel more efficient for a relatively small and prosperous segment of the population?

Politics—Plan Unpopular—Funding

Disputes over funding source for NextGen cause fights

Bain 07

Ben Bain[Senior Editor at Federal Computer Week]/NextGen funding battle heats up/Oct 1, 2007
http://search.proquest.com/docview/218833476

Coming off a turbulent summer travel season of record flight delays, cancellations and air traffic congestion, nearly everyone seems to agree that the Federal Aviation Administration's Next Generation Air Transportation System would help fix those problems. But despite its popularity, the FAA's planned civil aviation overhaul has become mired in a politically charged funding battle. Controversy about how to fund the NextGen project, which could cost as much as $20 billion by its completion in 2025, sets the House against the White House and FAA. Unions and organizations that represent commercial airlines, general aviation pilots and owners also disagree about who should pay for the project. NextGen will replace the existing radar-based air traffic control system with one based on Global Positioning System satellites. The disagreement is about whether the government should replace the current taxbased metiiod of funding FAA with a funding model based on taxes and user fees. FAA, most large commercial airline companies and White House officials favor adding user fees. "For years, corporate aviation has been getting - and I use the term broadly - a free ride because tiieyVe been subsidized by commercial aviation," said David Castelveter, vice president of communications at the Air Transport Association of America. Meanwhile, general aviation proponents say that they already pay a fair share of aviation costs. "A strictly user-fee-funded system is going to price us out of the skies, and it will put the airlines in control of the system," said Andy Cebula, spokesman at the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, which represents more than 400,000 pilots and aircraft owners. Its members are concerned diat adding user fees now would eventually lead to a system funded entirely by user fees. The general aviation community is confident that the current tax-based system can fund NextGen, said Ed Bolen, president and chief executive officer of the National Business Aviation Association, which represents more than 8,000 businesses that operate noncommercial airlines. A majority of House lawmakers seem to agree with Bolen's assessment. They passed an FAA funding measure Sept. 20 that included no user fees. House members said they could raise the necessary funds by increasing the tax on general-aviation jet fuel. "We are providing more money man die administration asks," said Jim Berard, spokesman for the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. "The administration's problem is they are not satisfied that we didn't accept their changes in the way revenue is collected for those programs. " FAA spokeswoman Diane Spitaliere said user fees are necessary to pay for NextGen and ensure "mat everyone is paying their fair share. " The agency is hopeful that a final Senate bill will require user fees, she said. Despite FAA's objections to the House measure, the agency remains committed to NextGen. In August, FAA chose ITT to develop and deploy the Automatic Dependent Surveillance-Broadcast, a key component of NextGen. The $207 million initial contract is safe, Spitaliere said. The Senate most likely will vote on its funding proposal later this month, observers say. The White House has threatened to veto the House bill in its current form.

PTX Impact – CTBT

the united states hasn't tested weapons in a while, it's just a question on wether we test it or not.

ctbt is never going to happen. has to go through congress.

**5. CTBT doesn’t prevent war – Davis evidence just indicates that it streghthens non proliferation. The Davis ev is really old – talking about Bush’s administration. Also the evidence isn’t qualified at all – Davis wrote this article for the Huffington Post.**

**6. It’s irrelevant if the US repeals CTBT – countries will proliferate and test nuclear weapons based on security reasons, not on whether or not the US repeals it.**

**7. This the most dysfunctional Congress ever – no reason they’d pass it.**

**8. They don’t read a piece of evidence saying Obama is pushing now**

\*\*\*Kritiks

Security—1ar—Economy

Worrying about America’s economy is distinct from their securization impacts

Schweller, 11 (Randall Schweller, Professor of Political Science at Ohio State University, “ Rational Theory for a Bygone Era”, Security Studies Vol. 20 Issue 3, 8/25/2011, http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09636412.2011.599196, RM)

Modern leaders seem to understand that, in the twenty-first century, states move up the ladder of international power and prestige by means of knowledge economies that generate dynamic growth; that the present and future competition among states will be decided by technological inno- vation, connectedness within global networks, the ability to steer complex technological innovation processes, and who best creates environments that facilitate flexible and timely innovation choices. These are the kinds of issues Americans focus on—or should focus on—when they consider how to prevent their country’s declining global position from accelerating. At present, Americans maintain fears that have little to do with security defined narrowly in terms of whether other states will attack the United States or its allies.12 They understand that America’s position in the world will be largely determined by the health of its economy—an economy saddled by enormous public debt set to double in the coming decade from $5.8 trillion in 2008 to $14.3 trillion in 2019. They have seen America’s share of world product fall 32 percent since 2000;13 unemployment remains at nearly ten percent; foreclosures have forced millions of Americans out of their homes; and real incomes have fallen faster and further than at any time since the Great Depression. Americans worry about having less influence in the world, about putting the country’s fate in the hands of others. They worry about China and other emerging countries taking market share from US companies, about danger- ously high current account deficits, about the effects of globalization and outsourcing on the average American’s standard of living, about the wel- fare and education of their children and grandchildren, about terrorism, cyberspace crime and attacks, the spread of infectious diseases and the po- tential emergence of a new pandemic, nuclear proliferation, climate change, energy, healthcare, savings, pensions, and biosecurity.

1AR—Threats aren’t arbitrary

#### Threats aren’t arbitrary – we need to develop strategies for coping with threat perceptions.

**Knudsen 2011** Olav. F. Knudsen, Prof @ Södertörn Univ College, ‘1 [Security Dialogue 32.3, “Post-Copenhagen Security Studies: Desecuritizing  Securitization,” p. 360]

In the post-Cold War period,  agenda-setting has been much easier to influence than the securitization approach assumes. That change cannot be credited to the concept; the change in  security politics was already taking place in defense ministries and parlia-  ments before the concept was first launched. Indeed, securitization in my view  is more appropriate to the security politics of the Cold War years than to the  post-Cold War period.  Moreover, I have a problem with the underlying implication that it is unim-  portant whether states ‘really’ face dangers from other states or groups. In the  Copenhagen school, threats are seen as coming mainly from the actors’ own  fears, or from what happens when the fears of individuals turn into paranoid  political action. In my view, this emphasis on the subjective is a misleading  conception of threat, in that it discounts an independent existence for what-  ever is perceived as a threat. Granted, political life is often marked by misper-  ceptions, mistakes, pure imaginations, ghosts, or mirages, but such phenom-  ena do not occur simultaneously to large numbers of politicians, and hardly most of the time. During the Cold War, threats – in the sense of plausible  possibilities of danger – referred to ‘real’ phenomena, and they refer to ‘real’  phenomena now. The objects referred to are often not the same, but that is a  different matter. Threats have to be dealt with both in terms of perceptions and in  terms of the phenomena which are perceived to be threatening.  The point of Wæver’s concept of security is not the potential existence of  danger somewhere but the use of the word itself by political elites. In his 1997  PhD dissertation, he writes, ‘One can view “security” as that which is in  language theory called a speech act: it is not interesting as a sign referring to  something more real – it is the utterance itself that is the act.’   The deliberate  disregard of objective factors is even more explicitly stated in Buzan & Wæver’s joint article of the same year.   As a consequence, the phenomenon of  threat is reduced to a matter of pure domestic politics.   It seems to me that the  security dilemma, as a central notion in security studies, then loses its founda-  tion. Yet I see that Wæver himself has no compunction about referring to the  security dilemma in a recent article.  This discounting of the objective aspect of threats shifts security studies to  insignificant concerns. What has long made ‘threats’ and ‘threat perceptions’  important phenomena in the study of IR is the implication that urgent action  may be required. Urgency, of course, is where Wæver first began his argu-  ment in favor of an alternative security conception, because a convincing sense  of urgency has been the chief culprit behind the abuse of ‘security’ and the  consequent ‘politics of panic’, as Wæver aptly calls it.   Now, here – in the case  of urgency – another baby is thrown out with the Wæverian bathwater. When  real situations of urgency arise, those situations are challenges to democracy;  they are actually at the core of the problematic arising with the process of  making security policy in parliamentary democracy. But in Wæver’s world,  threats are merely more or less persuasive, and the claim of urgency is just an-  other argument. I hold that instead of ‘abolishing’ threatening phenomena  ‘out there’ by reconceptualizing them, as Wæver does, we should continue  paying attention to them, because situations with a credible claim to urgency  will keep coming back and then we need to know more about how they work  in the interrelations of groups and states (such as civil wars, for instance), not  least to find adequate democratic procedures for dealing with them.

1AR AT: Biopower Impact

#### Biopolitics does not inevitably result in genocide

Ojakangas 2005 (Mika, U of Helsinki, May, Foucault Studies, No. 2, http://www.foucault-studies.com/no2/ojakangas1.pdf)

Admittedly, in the era of biopolitics, as Foucault writes, even “massacres have become vital.” This is not the case, however, because violence is hidden in the foundation of biopolitics, as Agamben believes. Although the twentieth century thanatopolitics is the “reverse of biopolitics”, it should not be understood, according to Foucault, as “the effect, the result, or the logical consequence” of biopolitical rationality. Rather, it should be understood, as he suggests, as an outcome of the “demonic combination” of the sovereign power and biopower, of “the city-citizen game and the shepherd-flock game” or as I would like to put it, of *patria potestas* (father’s unconditional power of life and death over his son) and *cura maternal* (mother’s unconditional duty to take care of her children). Although massacres can be carried out in the name of care, they do not follow from the logic of biopower for which death is the “object of taboo”. They follow from the logic of sovereign power, which legitimates killing by whatever arguments it chooses, be it God, Nature, *or* life.

1AR — Perm Ext.

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

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

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

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

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

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