## Negative

## Solvency

### NextGen Solvency Neg

#### NextGen doesn’t solve- still supply demand imbalances

Barkowski, Justin T. (2010) "Managing Air Traffic Congestion Through the Next Generation Air Transportation System: SatelliteBased Technology, Trajectories, and - Privatization?," Pepperdine Law Review: Vol. 37: Iss. 1, Article 3. http://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/plr/vol37/iss1/3

The fundamental goal of NextGen is to "[e]stablish an agile air traffic system that accommodates future requirements and readily responds to shifts in demand from all users."' As such, the system will be designed specifically to "respon[d] to market elasticity, hav[ing] the flexibility to deliver capacity and efficiency improvements, and ensur[ing] that equipment and personnel are able to support a wide range and number of operations tailored to customer needs." Undoubtedly the technology needed to incorporate such a system is currently available. But NextGen leaves one significant issue unaddressed, namely, the lack of governmental accountability needed to keep pace with rapidly changing technology." As one author noted, the FAA "develop[s] capacity in terms of a 10-year time frame," while the airlines and consumers generating the demand "are changing decisions every three months."l Forming an increasingly accountable FAA to engineer a successful transition to NextGen, however, would only address part of the air traffic congestion issue, leaving government-operated airports to continue mismanaging access to the national airspace system. Given the relatively fixed amount of airport facilities available," the fact that the demand from air carriers has continuously outpaced supply has resulted in significant flight delays that have rippled throughout the country.14 Yet Congress continues to impose regulatory control over municipally owned airports across the country, forcing them to provide nondiscriminatory access to the airfield." With the non-discriminatory access requirement, airports are not allowed to use pricing as a method of allocating ground facilities, which, in turn, renders them unable to control access to the national airspace system. Solely focusing on NextGen and expanding airspace capacity without corresponding corrections in these demand management policies will only provide greater incentive for airlines to overschedule in order to fill in the marginal increases in capacity. To avoid this escalation of congestion, the socially efficient solution is for local governments to transfer these "high-density airports" to the private sector on the condition that private owners focus on eliminating congestion. The societal gains from eliminating congestion would outweigh any societal costs incurred from potential airport discrimination against airlines.' As a result, airport privatization may be the proper catalyst for exploiting the full potential of NextGen.

### NextGen Solvency Neg

#### NextGen doesn’t solve- demand side issues

Barkowski, Justin T. (2010) "Managing Air Traffic Congestion Through the Next Generation Air Transportation System: SatelliteBased Technology, Trajectories, and - Privatization?," Pepperdine Law Review: Vol. 37: Iss. 1, Article 3. http://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/plr/vol37/iss1/3

Merely increasing the availability of landing and takeoffs at a highdensity airport may not have the desired cure-for-all effect that industry participants might expect. For example, in 2004 American and United Airlines agreed with the FAA to voluntarily reduce the number of scheduled flights out of Chicago O'Hare by 12.5% in order to help fight congestion. 227 In effect, this increased the number of potential flights out of that airport during the agreed upon times through its voluntary reduction, just as NextGen would do. However, the opening up of more space simply resulted in other airlines adding "flights while the hub carriers cut their schedules," providing no relief to the airport congestion problem. 228 NextGen essentially creates this increased capacity without any supplemental FAA policies to address how this extra space in the system will be allocated to air carriers that are continuously demanding more flights than the system can handle. 229 To prevent air traffic congestion from resulting after the implementation of NextGen, like it had in Chicago, effective demand-management policies are therefore critically in need. Given the historical struggles, 230 this may be difficult to accomplish. NextGen is not the sole answer for air traffic congestion at the increasing number of high-density airports. When airports cannot develop infrastructure, or when demand exceeds the marginal increases in capacity, the FAA needs allocation policies to arrange the airports' limited ground facilities and take-off and landing slots. 23 1 Commentators tend to analyze airport demand-management solutions by only looking at either the FAA or the publicly-owned airport's perspective. 232 A straight-forward and thorough analysis must examine functions of both actors in order to propose effective solutions.

### NextGen Solvency Neg

#### Government control of airports prevents effective management of demand

Barkowski, Justin T. (2010) "Managing Air Traffic Congestion Through the Next Generation Air Transportation System: SatelliteBased Technology, Trajectories, and - Privatization?," Pepperdine Law Review: Vol. 37: Iss. 1, Article 3. http://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/plr/vol37/iss1/3

Presently, all major commercial airports throughout the United States are operated by state or local government agencies. 241 Under the Anti-Head Tax, state agencies do not have the power to levy any taxes or fees on "an individual traveling in air commerce," or on anyone transporting individuals by air commerce, 242 unless the fees are reasonable rental charges, landing fees, or "other service charges from aircraft operators for using airport facilities." 243 The federal government has historically provided funding to local governments for infrastructure improvements in exchange for certain guarantees, a grant program still used today. 2 44 To receive federal grants under the Airports and Airways Improvement Act (AAIA), 24 5 airport proprietors are required to give the DOT written assurances that the "revenues generated by a public airport will be expended for the capital or operating costs of. . . the airport"246 and the airport will be "available for public use on reasonable conditions and without unjust discrimination." 24 7 The DOT has published standards for determining "reasonable terms" and "discrimination" under the Policy Regarding Airport Rates and Charges (Rates and Charges). 248 Under this policy, the DOT established two principal provisions aimed at preventing an airport from discriminating between two airlines. First, the airport proprietor must apply a "consistent methodology in establishing fees for comparable [airlines using] the airport."249 Second, any airport revenues from fees on users may not exceed the costs of the airport's assets and providing those services. 250 Though airlines may also be subjected to further, relatively minor restrictions, 25 1' an airline's challenge to any of these written assurances on the federal-aid program must be in the form of a written complaint to the Secretary of Transportation, who has the sole power to enforce these conditions. 252 Congress's policies of airport regulation have generally attempted to promote competition at airports by leveling the playing field for all air carriers and preventing any private parties from exploiting users of the airport. 253 Although this may be effective at non-congested airports where the supply and demand equilibrium is more aligned, these policies lead to an airport environment that cannot effectively manage excess demand while promoting competition.

### Not Feasible

#### No expertise and too complex

Susan Fleming, Acting Director Physical Infrastructure Issues “Progress and Challenges in Planning and Implementing the Transformation of the National Airspace System” GAO March 22 2007

In the past, a lack of expertise contributed to weaknesses in FAA’s management of air traffic control modernization efforts, and industry experts with whom we spoke questioned whether FAA will have the technical expertise needed to implement NextGen. In addition to technical expertise, FAA will need contract management expertise to oversee the systems acquisitions and integration involved in NextGen. In November, we recommended that FAA examine its strengths and weaknesses with regard to the technical expertise and contract management expertise that will be required to define, implement, and integrate the numerous complex programs inherent in the transition to NextGen. In response to our recommendation, FAA is considering convening a blue ribbon panel to study the issue and make recommendations to the agency about how to best proceed with its management and oversight of the implementation of NextGen. We believe that such a panel could help FAA begin to address this challenge. To conclude, transforming the national airspace system to accommodate much greater demand for air transportation services in the years ahead will be an enormously complex undertaking. JPDO has made strides in meeting its planning and coordination role as set forth by Congress, and FAA has taken several steps in recent years that better position it to successfully implement NextGen. If JPDO and FAA can build on their recent achievements and overcome the many challenges they face, the transition to NextGen stands a much better chance for success.

### Not Feasible

#### Management structure of the FAA prevents success

GAO 2008 “Status of Systems Acquisition and the Transition to the Next Generation Air Transportation System” September http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d081078.pdf

To address the inadequacy they saw in the management structure for NextGen, some stakeholders we spoke with called for the establishment of a NextGen management position or program office that would report directly to the FAA Administrator to ensure accountability for NextGen results. Some of these stakeholders expressed frustration that a program as large and important as NextGen does not follow the industry practice of having one person designated with the authority to make key decisions. They pointed out that although FAA’s COO is nominally in charge of FAA’s NextGen efforts, the COO must also manage the agency’s day-to-day air Page 17 GAO-08-1078 Next Generation Air Transportation System traffic operations and may therefore be unable to devote enough time and attention to managing NextGen. In addition, these stakeholders noted that many of NextGen’s capabilities span FAA operational units whose heads are at the same organizational level as the Vice President for Operations and Planning Services or are outside ATO all together. Thus, they believed that a position or office above the Vice President for Operations and Planning Services and the other operational units is needed. In prior work, we have found that programs can be implemented most efficiently when managers are empowered to make critical decisions and are held accountable for results. 16 In addition, over the last several years questions have been raised by members of Congress and stakeholders about the appropriateness of JPDO’s placement within FAA and its dual reporting to both the FAA Administrator and the COO of ATO. We have reported that JPDO’s dual reporting status hinders its ability to interact on equal footing with ATO and other federal agencies. 17 On one hand, JPDO must counter the perception that it is a proxy for ATO and, as such, cannot act as an “honest broker.” On the other hand, JPDO must continue to work with ATO and the other federal agencies in a partnership in which ATO is the lead implementer of NextGen. Therefore, we reported that it is important for JPDO to have some independence from ATO and suggested that one change that could begin to address this issue would be to have the JPDO Director report directly to the FAA Administrator. Such a change may also lessen what some stakeholders perceive as unnecessary bureaucracy and red tape associated with decision making and other JPDO and NextGen activities. In May 2008, FAA announced a reorganization of its NextGen management structure and named a Senior Vice President for NextGen and Operations Planning who reports to the COO. According to ATO’s COO, a purpose for the reorganization was to respond to industry stakeholders concerns about the fragmentation of authority over NextGen within FAA by creating one “team” that included NextGen implementation, planning, and oversight with one identified person in charge. According to FAA, the Senior Vice President for NextGen and Operations Planning is responsible for integrating and implementing all elements of NextGen, most of which are executed by other FAA offices within and outside of ATO. The NextGen Senior Vice President also has authority over the allocation of the entire $5.4 billion NextGen budget requested for fiscal years 2009 through 2013, no matter where that budget is spent within FAA. However, it is too early to tell if this reorganization sufficiently addresses concerns raised by stakeholders about the fragmented management structure for NextGen since other executives continue to have responsibility for parts of NextGen mentioned earlier in this report, and the division of responsibility for NextGen efforts among the senior vice presidents and associate administrators is not clear. A senior FAA executive noted that internal ATO executives are knowledgeable and supportive of the reorganization, but that the agency could better communicate the changes to stakeholders outside of FAA. A focused outreach to industry stakeholders would help to get their buy-in and support of FAA’s efforts.

### Not Feasible

#### Multiple structural barriers to Next Gen implementation

GAO 2008 “Status of Systems Acquisition and the Transition to the Next Generation Air Transportation System” September http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d081078.pdf

FAA’s ability to implement NextGen will be affected by how it addresses research and development, human capital, and infrastructure challenges. Although research and development are critical for NextGen, research gaps exist because of a recent decline in NASA’s aeronautical research funding and the expanded requirements of NextGen. FAA faces a human capital challenge of having the necessary knowledge and skills, such as contract management and system engineering expertise, to implement NextGen. In response to GAO’s prior recommendation, in September 2008, FAA expects to complete an analysis comparing the skills needed for NextGen with its current staff resources. However, it may take considerable time to hire what FAA estimates could be up to 200 more staff with the needed skills. FAA also faces the challenge of maintaining and repairing existing ATC infrastructure, such as radar stations, while consolidating or realigning its facilities to accommodate NextGen technologies and operations. An additional infrastructure challenge is increasing airport runway capacity to handle the expected increases in traffic. While FAA’s plans call for building or expanding runways at the nation’s 35 busiest airports, its analyses indicate that 14 more airports will still need additional runway capacity. These efforts to expand capacity by means of runway development could be delayed without significant reductions in emissions and noise around some airports.

#### Human error means no solvency – not more efficient

GAO 2008 “Status of Systems Acquisition and the Transition to the Next Generation Air Transportation System” September http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d081078.pdf

Our work indicates that a research gap also exists in the area of human factors research. Human factors research explores what is known about people and their abilities, characteristics, and limitations in the design of the equipment they use, the environments in which they function, and the jobs they perform. Seven of eight stakeholders that discussed the issue expressed concern that NextGen plans do not adequately address human factors research. For example, a central assumption of the NextGen system is an increased reliance on automation, which dramatically changes the roles and responsibilities of both air traffic controllers and pilots. These changes in roles and responsibilities raise significant human factors issues for the safety and efficiency of the national airspace system. According to an FAA official, verbal communication is an example of a human factors area that requires further research and development. Currently, air traffic controllers primarily rely on verbal communication to direct aircraft. Because NextGen will rely more on data link and other automated communications, controllers will require training in both understanding and operating in an automated communications environment. The research to support such training has not been conducted, according to FAA. 21 FAA plans to invest $180.4 million in human factors research from fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013. Furthermore, NASA recently adjusted the size of its human factors research staff starting in fiscal year 2005, reassigning some staff to other programs and reducing the contractor and academic technical support for human factors research. However, according to NASA, human factors research continues to be a critical component of its aeronautics research program, with activity focused at the foundational level. It remains to be seen if FAA’s planned research and development in this area will offset NASA’s reductions, since FAA’s research is typically at a more applied level.

## Economy Adv

### Doesn’t Solve Econ

#### Long timeframe to jobs – it takes 10 years to become qualified for high pay in aerospace AND American kids are stupid.

National Aerospace Week, September 11-17, 2011. “Aerospace and Defense: Second to None,”

http://www.nationalaerospaceweek.org/wp-content/uploads/2010/04/whitepaper.pdf

Many of these jobs are unique and require skills that take time to develop. It takes 10 years for a degreed aerospace engineer to master the intricacies of aerospace vehicle design. Technicians skilled in applying stealth coatings, programmers fluent in satellite-control algorithms, metallurgists expert in high-temperature jet engine design — these skills and many more are very hard to replace. However, the American workforce is in trouble. Recent student assessments show that American youth ranked 21st out of 30 in science literacy and 25th out of 30 in math literacy. Developing the science, technology, engineering and math — the socalled STEM skillset — is a priority for our industry. And, because the stakes are so high — the average aerospace worker is 45 years old — the aerospace and defense industry has been a leader in investing in STEM. We’re increasingly working with educators at federal, state and local levels in many ways — adopting schools, sponsoring competitions, providing internships and scholarships and other measures. The challenges extend beyond attracting young people to our industry. We need to better incorporate flexible work styles into our workplace to reduce the voluntary attrition rate of young professionals and increase the representation of women and minorities among our numbers.

### No Oil Shocks

#### Oil supply not tightening

UPI June 20, 2012 “Crude oil slips on supply report” http://www.upi.com/Business\_News/2012/06/20/Crude-oil-slips-on-supply-report/UPI-42711340204427/?spt=hs&or=bn

Crude oil prices turned lower in New York Wednesday, closing near $81 per barrel after a supply report defied expectations. Traders expected crude oil supplies to have tightened for the third consecutive week. Instead, supplies rose by 2.9 million barrels in the week ending Friday, reaching 387.3 million barrels. The Energy Information Administration said crude oil inventories are above the upper limit for the average range for this time of year.

#### Oil market is stable- no shocks

Jacob Gronholt-Pedersen 6-22-2012 Wall Street Journal “Oil Market Well Balanced; OPEC to Determine Short-Term Outlook -BP Economist” http://online.wsj.com/article/BT-CO-20120622-703070.html

"If you set aside concerns about supply and the Iran issue, the oil market looks more balanced now than it was last year," Paul Appleby, BP's head of energy economics, told reporters. Mr. Appleby said a combination of higher production by Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries, oil inventory levels getting back to normal and relatively weak consumption growth has weakened the market and caused prices to fall in recent months. ICE Brent future prices averaged a record of around $111 a barrel last year as supply disruptions, mainly from Libya, raised fears of a tightening oil market. But the benchmark has come down in recent months, dropping a quarter of its value since mid-March due to worries over global economic growth, while Saudi Arabia increased production. "There is still plenty of spare capacity, and Saudi Arabia could increase production further if they wanted," Mr. Appleby said.

#### No supply shocks- new oil finds

UPI 6-21-2012 “OPEC threatened by shale oil revolution” http://www.upi.com/Business\_News/Energy-Resources/2012/06/21/OPEC-threatened-by-shale-oil-revolution/UPI-78811340301950/?spt=hs&or=er

But, says former U.S. Treasury Deputy Secretary Roger Altman, "the threat of disruptions is actually diminishing, given new finds of unconventional oil and gas in the Western Hemisphere. "These discoveries will reduce price and supply volatility. They will also reset and profoundly improve international relations," he wrote in the Financial Times. "The days of OPEC, the oil producers' cartel, are numbered. Unstable oil states, from Iraq to Venezuela, will be marginalized." Advanced technology has given the United States, Canada and other countries dependent on oil flows from the highly volatile Middle East new sources of supply from deposits once considered inaccessible.

### Trade Defense 1NC

#### No trade wars

Dani Rodrik (professor of political economy at Harvard, recipient of the Social Science Research Council’s Hirschman Prize) 2009 “The myth of rising protectionism”, http://www.business-standard.com/india/news/dani-rodrikmythrising-protectionism/373102/

There was a dog that didn’t bark during the financial crisis: protectionism. Despite much hue and cry about it, governments have, in fact, imposed remarkably few trade barriers on imports. Indeed, the world economy remains as open as it was before the crisis struck. Protectionism normally thrives in times of economic peril. Confronted by economic decline and rising unemployment, governments are much more likely to pay attention to domestic pressure groups than to upholding their international obligations. As John Maynard Keynes recognised, trade restrictions can protect or generate employment during economic recessions. But what may be desirable under extreme conditions for a single country can be highly detrimental to the world economy. When everyone raises trade barriers, the volume of trade collapses. No one wins. That is why the disastrous free-for-all in trade policy during the 1930’s greatly aggravated the Great Depression. Many complain that something similar, if less grand in scope, is taking place today. An outfit called the Global Trade Alert (GTA) has been at the forefront, raising alarm bells about what it calls “a protectionist juggernaut”. The GTA’s latest report identifies no fewer than 192 separate protectionist actions since November 2008, with China as the most common target. This number has been widely quoted in the financial press. Taken at face value, it seems to suggest that governments have all but abandoned their commitments to the World Trade Organization and the multilateral trade regime. But look more closely at those numbers and you will find much less cause for alarm. Few of those 192 measures are, in fact, more than a nuisance. The most common among them are the indirect (and often unintended) consequences of the bailouts that governments mounted as a consequence of the crisis. The most frequently affected sector is the financial industry. Moreover, we do not even know whether these numbers are unusually high when compared to pre-crisis trends. The GTA report tells us how many measures have been imposed since November 2008, but says nothing about the analogous numbers prior to that date. In the absence of a benchmark for comparative assessment, we do not really know whether 192 “protectionist” measures is a big or small number. What about the recent tariffs imposed by the United States on Chinese tires? President Barack Obama’s decision to introduce steep duties (set at 35 per cent in the first year) in response to a US International Trade Commission (USITC) ruling (sought by US labour unions) has been widely criticised as stoking the protectionist fires. But it is easy to overstate the significance of this case, too. The tariff is fully consistent with a special arrangement negotiated at the time of China’s accession to the WTO, which allows the US to impose temporary protection when its markets are “disrupted” by Chinese exports. The tariffs that Obama imposed were considerably below what the USITC had recommended. And, in any case, the measure affects less than 0.3 per cent of China’s exports to the US. The reality is that the international trade regime has passed its greatest test since the Great Depression with flying colours. Trade economists who complain about minor instances of protectionism sound like a child whining about a damaged toy in the wake of an earthquake that killed thousands. Three things explain this remarkable resilience: ideas, politics and institutions. Economists have been extraordinarily successful in conveying their message to policymakers—even if ordinary people still regard imports with considerable suspicion. Nothing reflects this better than how “protection” and “protectionists” have become terms of derision. After all, governments are generally expected to provide protection to their citizens. But if you say that you favour protection “from imports”, you are painted into a corner with Reed Smoot and Willis C. Hawley, authors of the infamous 1930 US tariff bill. But economists’ ideas would not have gone very far without significant changes in the underlying configuration of political interests in favour of open trade. For every worker and firm affected by import competition, there is one or more worker and firm expecting to reap the benefits of access to markets abroad. The latter have become increasingly vocal and powerful, often represented by large multinational corporations. In his latest book, Paul Blustein recounts how a former Indian trade minister once asked his American counterpart to bring him a picture of an American farmer: “I have never actually seen one,” the minister quipped. “I have only seen US conglomerates masquerading as farmers.” But the relative docility of rank-and-file workers on trade issues must ultimately be attributed to something else altogether: the safety nets erected by the welfare state. Modern industrial societies now have a wide array of social protections – unemployment compensation, adjustment assistance, and other labour-market tools, as well as health insurance and family support — that mitigate demand for cruder forms of protection.

### Trade Defense 1NC

#### Their historical examples are exactly why trade won’t collapse

Daniel Ikenson (director of Cato's Center for Trade Policy Studies) 2009 “A protectionism fling”, http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=10651

A Little Perspective, Please Although some governments will dabble in some degree of protectionism, the combination of a sturdy rules-based system of trade and the economic self interest in being open to participation in the global economy will limit the risk of a protectionist pandemic. According to recent estimates from the International Food Policy Research Institute, if all WTO members were to raise all of their applied tariffs to the maximum bound rates, the average global rate of duty would double and the value of global trade would decline by 7.7 percent over five years.8 That would be a substantial decline relative to the 5.5 percent annual rate of trade growth experienced this decade.9 But, to put that 7.7 percent decline in historical perspective, the value of global trade declined by 66 percent between 1929 and 1934, a period mostly in the wake of Smoot Hawley's passage in 1930.10 So the potential downside today from what Bergsten calls "legal protectionism" is actually not that "massive," even if all WTO members raised all of their tariffs to the highest permissible rates. If most developing countries raised their tariffs to their bound rates, there would be an adverse impact on the countries that raise barriers and on their most important trade partners. But most developing countries that have room to backslide (i.e., not China) are not major importers, and thus the impact on global trade flows would not be that significant. OECD countries and China account for the top twothirds of global import value.11 Backsliding from India, Indonesia, and Argentina (who collectively account for 2.4 percent of global imports) is not going to be the spark that ignites a global trade war. Nevertheless, governments are keenly aware of the events that transpired in the 1930s, and have made various pledges to avoid protectionist measures in combating the current economic situation. In the United States, after President Obama publicly registered his concern that the "Buy American" provision in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act might be perceived as protectionist or could incite a trade war, Congress agreed to revise the legislation to stipulate that the Buy American provision "be applied in a manner consistent with United States obligations under international agreements." In early February, China's vice commerce minister, Jiang Zengwei, announced that China would not include "Buy China" provisions in its own $586 billion stimulus bill.12 But even more promising than pledges to avoid trade provocations are actions taken to reduce existing trade barriers. In an effort to "reduce business operating costs, attract and retain foreign investment, raise business productivity, and provide consumers a greater variety and better quality of goods and services at competitive prices," the Mexican government initiated a plan in January to unilaterally reduce tariffs on about 70 percent of the items on its tariff schedule. Those 8,000 items, comprising 20 different industrial sectors, accounted for about half of all Mexican import value in 2007. When the final phase of the plan is implemented on January 1, 2013, the average industrial tariff rate in Mexico will have fallen from 10.4 percent to 4.3 percent.13 And Mexico is not alone. In February, the Brazilian government suspended tariffs entirely on some capital goods imports and reduced to 2 percent duties on a wide variety of machinery and other capital equipment, and on communications and information technology products.14 That decision came on the heels of late-January decision in Brazil to scrap plans for an import licensing program that would have affected 60 percent of the county's imports.15 Meanwhile, on February 27, a new free trade agreement was signed between Australia, New Zealand, and the 10 member countries of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations to reduce and ultimately eliminate tariffs on 96 percent of all goods by 2020. While the media and members of the trade policy community fixate on how various protectionist measures around the world might foreshadow a plunge into the abyss, there is plenty of evidence that governments remain interested in removing barriers to trade. Despite the occasional temptation to indulge discredited policies, there is a growing body of institutional knowledge that when people are free to engage in commerce with one another as they choose, regardless of the nationality or location of the other parties, they can leverage that freedom to accomplish economic outcomes far more impressive than when governments attempt to limit choices through policy constraints.

### 2NC – Trade Defense

#### Also, Trade conflicts don’t escalate – governments err on the side of reducing trade conflict – countries learned from the 1930s – ensures no spillover into conflict. No country would risk war over commodities

David Bearce (Associate Professor of Political Science at Pittsburg University) 2003 “Grasping the commercial institutional peace” ebsco

Even as we accept that such trade dispute settlement mechanisms help resolve economic conflict, it is not clear that this finding should have any strong application to the dependent variable of inter-state military conflict. On this point, it is important to distinguish between different types of inter-state conflict economic versus military (McMillan, 1997:39)Fand recognize that disputes about banana tariffs, for example, are not likely to escalate into military confrontations. While military conflict often has economic antecedents, there is little evidence that trade wars ever become shooting wars. In terms of inter-state disagreements with real potential for military conflict, scholars highlight territorial disputes (Vasquez, 1993; Hensel, 2000; Huth, 2000). The trade dispute settlement mechanisms embedded in regional commercial institutions simply have no jurisdiction or power to resolve highly contentious territorial disagreements. In short, these two possible explanations offer little leverage in understanding the commercial institutional peace. We have accumulating empirical evidence associating joint membership in commercial (and other types of international) institutions with the resolution of inter-state military conflict. But it remains difficult to explain this relationship. The next section will address this theoretical gap.

#### The literature is on our side

Yoram Haftel (Department of Political Science University of Illinois-Chicago) 2004 “From the Outside Looking In” ebsco

These findings have several theoretical implications as well. First, as my empirical analysis reveals, the growing number of disputes in the WTO reflects the tension between the U.S. and Europe. This rising commercial discord, however, is accompanied by continued peaceful relations among the same states. Thus, fears that economic conflicts might escalate into more severe, militarized conflicts seem unwarranted (see, e.g., Copeland, 1996; Levy and Ali, 1998). In addition, this observation reinforces recent calls by IR scholars to refine the concept of ‘‘conflict’’ and to make a more elaborated distinction between economic conflicts and military conflicts

## Aerospace Adv

### A2 Airline industry collapse

#### The airline industry won’t collapse – history proves resilience.

Alan Levin, USA Today, newspaper covering multiple issues “Government urged to help fund navigation upgrade” DEC 16, 2010 http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/detail?vid=11&hid=106&sid=b86f2cce-d0e4-47bd-b111-80b2ac7a3ae3%40sessionmgr104&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#db=a9h&AN=J0E195396478110

WASHINGTON -- An influential aviation advisory panel is urging the government to help airlines pay for high-tech navigation equipment and to revisit whether airline passengers should be allowed to carry young children in their laps. In wide-ranging recommendations, the Future of Aviation Advisory Committee said Wednesday that it was attempting to improve the economic viability of the aviation industry, make flights less environmentally damaging and streamline the way the government collects and spends aviation-related taxes. Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood, who convened the group in April, called the recommendations a "blueprint for the industry." "This is all about stepping back and saying, 'This industry is very, very critical to our overall economy,' " said Jack Pelton, a committee member who is president and CEO of Cessna Aircraft. Though it has become profitable in the past year, the airline industry has lived through a decade of losses, bankruptcies, employee pay cuts and job losses.

#### American airline industry will continue to thrive off of Canadian travelers.

TRACY SHERLOCK, POSTMEDIA NEWS JUNE 18, 2012, “Millions of Canadians flying out of U.S. airports,” http://www.thestarphoenix.com/travel/Millions+Canadians+flying+airports/6799426/story.html

Henning is not alone. A Senate committee report on airports - The Future of Canadian Air Travel: Toll Booth or Spark Plug - says that millions of Canadians are opting to drive across the line to take advantage of cheaper flights. About 950,000 Canadian passengers use Bellingham and Seattle airports instead of YVR each year, according to a report prepared by the Canadian Airports Council in March. Canadian airports are losing 4.5 million Canadian passengers to airports just across the line, which has the Senate committee report calling for the establishment of a national air travel strategy, and an end to the practice of charging airports ground rent. Senator Dennis Dawson is chair of the senate committee that wrote the report, and he says Canada is losing $1 billion a year in air travel alone from Canadians who choose to travel out of U.S. airports. He says it's quite natural for people to look for the best deal, and that a family of four could save as much as $1,000 by flying out of the United States because the Americans subsidize their airports while the Canadians charge them rent and expect users to cover costs like security and air traffic control.

### Terrorism Defense 1NC

#### No nuclear terrorism –statistically insignificant cumulative probability

John Mueller (Woody Hayes Chair of National Security Studies, Mershon Center, and is professor of Political Science, at Ohio State University) 2010 “Atomic Obsession: Nuclear Alarmism from Hiroshima to Al Qaeda” p, 187-190

Assigning a probability that terrorists will be able to overcome each barrier is, of course, a tricky business, and any such exercise should be regarded as rather tentative and exploratory, or perhaps simply as illustrative-though it is done all the time in cost-benefit analysis. One might begin a quantitative approach by adopting probability estimates that purposely, and heavily, bias the case in the terrorists' favor. In my view, this would take place if it is assumed that the terrorists have a fighting chance of 50 percent of overcoming each of the 20 obstacles displayed in Table 13-1, though for many barriers, probably almost all, the odds against them are surely much worse than that. Even with that generous bias, the chances that a concerted effort would be successful comes out to be less than one in a million, specifically 1,048,576. Indeed, the odds of surmounting even seven of the 20 hurdles at that unrealistically, even absurdly, high presumptive success rate is considerably less than one in a hundred. If one assumes, somewhat more realistically, that their chances at each barrier are one in three, the cumulative odds they will be able to pull off the deed drop to one in well over three billion specifically 3.486,784,401. What they would be at the (still entirely realistic) level of one in ten boggles the mind. One could also make specific estimates for each of the hurdles, but the cumulative probability statistics are likely to come out pretty much the same-or even smaller. There may be a few barriers, such as numbers 13 or absolute loyalty trump the one oftechnical competence. This would increase the chances that the bomb-making enterprise would go undetected, while at the same time decreasing the likelihood that it would be successful. However, given the monumentality of the odds confronting the would-be atomic terrorist, adjustments for such issues are scarcely likely to alter the basic conclusion. That is, if one drastically slashed the one in 3.5 billion estimate a thousandfold, the odds of success would still be one in 3.5 million. Moreover, all this focuses on the effort to deliver a single bomb. If the requirement were to deliver several, the odds become, of course, even more prohibitive. Getting away from astronomical numbers for a minute, Levi points out that even if there are only ten barriers and even if there were a wildly favorable 80 percent chance of overcoming each hurdle, the chance of final success, following the approach used here, would only be 10 percent. Faced even with such highly favorable odds at each step, notes Levi, the wouldbe atomic terrorist might well decide "that a nuclear plot is too much of a stretch to seriously try." Similarly, Jenkins calculates that even if there are only three barriers and each carried a 50/50 chance of success, the likelihood of accomplishing the full mission would only be 12.5 percent.14 Odds like that are not necessarily prohibitive, of course, but they are likely to be mind-arrestingly small if one is betting just about everything on a successful outcome. Multiple Attempts The odds considered so far are for a single attempt by a single group, and there could be multiple attempts by multiple groups, of course. Although Allison considers al-Qaeda to be "the most probable perpetrator" on the nuclear front, he is also concerned about the potential atomic exploits of other organizations such as Indonesia's Jemaah Islamiyah, Chechen gangsters, Lebanon's Hezbollah, and various doomsday cults. IS However, few, if any, groups appear to have any interest whatever in striking the United States except for al-Qaeda, an issue to be discussed more fully in the next chapter. But even setting that consideration aside, the odds would remain long even with multiple concerted attempts.16 If there were a hundred such efforts over a period of time, the chance at least one of these would be successful comes in at less than one in over 10,000 at the one chance in two level. At the far more realistic level of one chance in three, it would be about one in nearly 35 million. If there were 1,000 dedicated attempts, presumably over several decades, the chance of success would be worse than one in a thousand at the SO/50 level and one in nearly 3.5 million at the one in three level.I7 Of course, attempts in the hundreds are scarcely realistic, though one might be able to envision a dozen or so. Additionally, if there were a large number of concerted efforts, policing and protecting would presumably become easier because the aspirants would be exposing themselves repeatedly and would likely be stepping all over each other in their quest to access the right stuff. Furthermore, each foiled attempt would likely expose flaws in the defense system, holes the ...,. defenders would then plug, making subsequent efforts that much more dif• ficult. For example, when the would-be peddler of a tiny amount of pur loined highly enriched uranium was apprehended in 2006, efforts were made to trace its place of origin using nuclear forensics. IS ." Also, the difficulties for the atomic terrorists are likely to increase over time because of much enhanced protective and policing efforts by ... self-interested governments. Already, for example, by all accounts Russian nuclear materials are much more adequately secured than they were 10 or ~, .-s 15 years ago.19

### Terrorism Defense 1NC

#### Not an existential threat – no overreaction

John Mueller (Woody Hayes Chair of National Security Studies, Mershon Center, and is professor of Political Science, at Ohio State University) 2010 “Atomic Obsession: Nuclear Alarmism from Hiroshima to Al Qaeda” p. 232

From this perspective, then, rhetorical declamations insisting that terrorism poses an existential threat are profoundly misguided. And so self-destructive overreactions (like the war in Iraq) which are also encouraging to the terrorists. As Osama bin Laden crowed in 2004: It is easy for us to provoke and bait .... All that we have to do is to send two mujahidin ... to raise a piece of cloth on which is wtitten al-Qaeda in order to make the generals race there to cause America to suffer human, economic, and political losses. Our policy is one -...... of bleeding America to the point of bankruptcy. The terrorist attacks cost al-Qaeda $500,000 while the attack and its aftermath .. inflicted a cost of more than $500 billion on the United States. .... Or perhaps, it is even worse. To the extent that we "portray the terrorist nuclear threat as the thing we fear most," notes Susan Martin, "we ow--. ture the idea that this is what terrorists must do if they want to be taka. ; seriously:'48 Existential bombast can be useful for scoring political points, selling. newspapers, or securing funding for pet projects or bureaucratic expansion. However, it does so by essentially suggesting that, if the terrorists really want to destroy us, all they have to do is hit us with a terrific punch, particularly a nuclear one. Although the attack may not in itself be remotely" enough to cause the nation to cease to exist, purveyors of bombast assure the terrorists that the target country will respond by obligingly destroying itself in anguished overreaction. The suggestion, then, is that it is not ' only the most feared terrorists who are suicidal. As Sageman points out, the United States hardly faces a threat to its existence, because even a nuclear strike by terrorists "will not destroy the nation:' As things stand now, he.. adds, "only the United States could obliterate the United States:'49 Atomic terrorism may indeed be the single most serious threat to the national security of the United States. Assessed in an appropriate context, however, the likelihood that such a calamity will come about seems breathtakingly small. Sensible, cost-effective policies designed to make that probability even lower may be justified, given the damage that can be inflicted by an atomic explosion. But unjustified, obsessive alarmism about the likelihood and imminence of atomic terrorism has had policy consequences that have been costly and unnecessary. Among them are the war in Iraq and the focus on WMD that seduced federal agencies away from due preparation 5o for disasters that have actually happened, such as Hurricane Katrina. Arch-demon Zawahiri once noted that the group only became aware of biological weapons "when the enemy drew our attention to them by repeatedly expressing concerns that they can be produced simply with easily available materials;'5! By constantly suggesting that the United States will destroy itself in response to an atomic explosion, the existential bombast about a terrorist bomb that follows so naturally from decades of atomic obsession encourages the most diabolical and murderous terrorists to investigate the possibility of obtaining one. Fortunately, however, would-be atomic terrorists are exceedingly unlikely to be successful in such a quest, however intense the inspiration and encouragement they receive from the unintentional cheerleaders among their distant enemies.

### 2NC - Terrorism – Retaliation/Overreaction

#### No public pressure – they accept terrorism as inevitable no pressure – crackdown would be domestic

Ian Bremmer, 9-13-2004, New Statesman, “Suppose a new 9/11 hit America”

What would happen if there were a new terrorist attack inside the United States on 11 September 2004? How would it affect the presidential election campaign? The conventional wisdom is that Americans - their patriotic defiance aroused - would rally to President George W Bush and make him an all but certain winner in November. But consider the differences between the context of the original 9/11 and that of any attack which might occur this autumn. In 2001, the public reaction was one of disbelief and incomprehension. Many Americans realised for the first time that large-scale terrorist attacks on US soil were not only conceivable; they were, perhaps, inevitable. A majority focused for the first time on the threat from al-Qaeda, on the Taliban and on the extent to which Saudis were involved in terrorism. This time, the public response would move much more quickly from shock to anger; debate over how America should respond would begin immediately. Yet it is difficult to imagine how the Bush administration could focus its response on an external enemy. Should the US send 50,000 troops to the Afghan-Pakistani border to intensify the hunt for Osama Bin Laden and 'step up' efforts to attack the heart of al-Qaeda? Many would wonder if that wasn't what the administration pledged to do after the attacks three years ago. The president would face intensified criticism from those who have argued all along that Iraq was a distraction from 'the real war on terror'. And what if a significant number of the terrorists responsible for the pre-election attack were again Saudis? The Bush administration could hardly take military action against the Saudi government at a time when crude-oil prices are already more than $45 a barrel and global supply is stretched to the limit. While the Saudi royal family might support a co-ordinated attack against terrorist camps, real or imagined, near the Yemeni border - where recent searches for al-Qaeda have concentrated - that would seem like a trivial, insufficient retaliation for an attack on the US mainland. Remember how the Republicans criticised Bill Clinton's administration for ineffectually 'bouncing the rubble' in Afghanistan after the al-Qaeda attacks on the US embassies in Kenya and Tanzania in the 1990s. So what kind of response might be credible? Washington's concerns about Iran are rising. The 9/11 commission report noted evidence of co-operation between Iran and al-Qaeda operatives, if not direct Iranian advance knowledge of the 9/11 hijacking plot. Over the past few weeks, US officials have been more explicit, too, in declaring Iran's nuclear programme 'unacceptable'. However, in the absence of an official Iranian claim of responsibility for this hypothetical terrorist attack, the domestic opposition to such a war and the international outcry it would provoke would make quick action against Iran unthinkable. In short, a decisive response from Bush could not be external. It would have to be domestic. Instead of Donald Rumsfeld, the defence secretary, leading a war effort abroad, Tom Ridge, the homeland security secretary, and John Ashcroft, the attorney general, would pursue an anti-terror campaign at home. Forced to use legal tools more controversial than those provided by the Patriot Act, Americans would experience stepped-up domestic surveillance and border controls, much tighter security in public places and the detention of a large number of suspects. Many Americans would undoubtedly support such moves. But concern for civil liberties and personal freedom would ensure that the government would have nowhere near the public support it enjoyed for the invasion of Afghanistan.

### 2NC - Terrorism – Nuclear

#### Too many obstacles to overcome – even if overcoming isn’t impossible – even generous odds ensure the chances of success are 1 in 3 billion statistically – small enough to vote on presumption

John Mueller (Woody Hayes Chair of National Security Studies, Mershon Center, and is professor of Political Science, at Ohio State University) 2010 “Atomic Obsession: Nuclear Alarmism from Hiroshima to Al Qaeda” p. 197-8

As Allison appropriately points out, it is important to consider not only the likelihood that an event will take place but also its consequences. Therefore, one must be concerned about catastrophic events even if their likelihood is small.33 At some point, however, probabilities, become so low that, even for catastrophic events, it begins to make sense to ignore, or at least to backburner, them: the risk becomes "acceptable:' Consider the odds that a wheel on a speeding automobile will suddenly shear off. That horror is surely"not impossible;' yet legions of motorists effectively find it so improbable that they are routinely willing to risk their lives that it will not happen-it is, in short, an acceptable risk. The British could at any time attack the United States with their submarine-launched missiles and kill millions of Americans-far more than even the most monumentally gifted and lucky terrorist group. Yet the risk that this potential (and fully possible) calamity might take place evokes little concern; essentially, it is "accepted:' Meanwhile, Russia, with whom the United States enjoys a rather strained relationship, could at any time do vastly more damage with its nuclear weapons, a fully imaginable calamity that goes substantially ignored. In constructing what he calls "a case for fear," Cass Sunstein notes that if there is a yearly probability of one in 100,000 that terrorists could launch a nuclear or massive biological attack, the risk would cumulate to one in 10,000 over 10 years and to one in 5,000 over 20 years. These odds, he suggests, are "not the most comforting:'34 Comfort, ofcourse, lies in the viscera of those to be comforted, and, as he suggests, many would probably h~ difficulty settling down with odds like that. But there must be some point at which the concerns even of these people would ease. Just perhaps it is at some of the levels suggested here: one in a million or one in three billion per attempt. The same consideration holds for Vice President Dick Cheney's "one percent doctrine:' A top CIA analyst late in 2001 told him that al-Qaeda probably did not have a nuclear weapon, but that he couldn't "assure yoo that they don't:' To this, Cheney replied, "If there's a one percent chance that they do, you have to pursue it as if it were true:'35 Cheney'S observation : is a somewhat confused, but effective, way of saying that one should t:ake low probability events that could have an exceedingly high impact very seriously indeed. And a one percent chance of a terrorist atomic attack would dearly fit into that category. It's just that the chances, while perhaps not zero, .:: do not seem to be anywhere remotely near one percent. It's not that they are necessarily one in 3.5 billion, but they aren't anything like one in ten, one in a hundred, or one in a thousand. Perhaps, in fact, they are comparable to, or even lower than, those for a thermonuclear attack from Russia.’

### 1NC North Korea Defense

#### No North Korea war—Fear of US response

Andrew Scobell (Associate Research Professor at the Strategic Studies Institute, U.S. Army War College) July 2005 “North Korea’s strategic intentions” http://www.nautilus.org/napsnet/sr/2005/0569Scobel.pdf

At a minimum, the North Korean leadership probably believes that in any major force-on-force conflict with the United States the Korean People’s Army would be defeated, leading to the collapse or overthrow of the regime. The clearest indication of this fear and the existence of this logic in the north is that, for more than half a century, Pyongyang has not launched an attack southward across the DMZ. In other words, the presence of U.S. Forces in Korea (USFK) immediately below the DMZ appears to have deterred North Korea. Pyongyang’s leaders know that from the very start of any attack on South Korea, they would be battling U.S. military forces and be at war with the United States.36 In short, deterrence seems to have worked.

### 2NC No North Korea War

#### No North Korea war—Leadership fears US response—Fifty years of no attacks across the DMZ proves—Prefer Scobell, he’s a professor at US Army War College

#### North Korea nukes would be suicidal—Instant retaliation and SK army would crush them

Carlton Meyer (Editor – G2 Military) 2003 The Mythical North Korean Threat, http://www.g2mil.com/korea.htm

Even if North Korea employs a few crude nuclear weapons, using them would be suicidal since it would invite instant retaliation from the United States. North Korea lacks the technical know-how to build an Intercontinental Ballistic Missile, despite the hopes and lies from the National Missile Defense proponents in the USA. North Korea's industrial production is almost zero, over two million people have starved in recent years, and millions of homeless nomads threaten internal revolution. The US military ignores this reality and retains old plans for the deployment of 450,000 GIs to help defend South Korea, even though the superior South Korean military can halt any North Korean offensive without help from a single American soldier. American forces are not even required for a counter-offensive. A North Korean attack would stall after a few intense days and South Korean forces would soon be in position to overrun North Korea. American air and naval power along with logistical and intelligence support would ensure the rapid collapse of the North Korean army.

#### Death count low

Stanley Kurtz (writer for the national Review Online) March 3, 2003 “The Other Imminent Danger” http://www.nationalreview.com/kurtz/kurtz030303.asp

And so we come to the option of war. Yet war with North Korea would be a horror. True, the United States and South Korea would ultimately win. North Korea lacks fuel, and thus staying power, and would immediately cede control of the air to the United States. But in the initial stages, the North would probably kill hundreds of thousands of South Koreans. They would quickly destroy Seoul with a massive artillery barrage from hardened bunkers, and would at first overrun much of the Korean and American army with a massive land attack. The Department of Defense estimates that a million people would die in a new Korean war, perhaps as many as one hundred thousand of those being Americans (nearly twice the death toll of Vietnam). And while we cannot say for sure that they have perfected missiles that can reach California, or have successfully learned how to place a small-sized nuclear devise atop a missile, the chance of one or two North Korean nuclear missiles launched against the Hawaii, Alaska, or California cannot be excluded.

## Warming Adv

### Airlines Not Key

#### Airlines account for at most 3 percent

David Armstrong 12-7-2007 Live Science “Airline Global-Warming Battle Heats Up Fast” http://www.livescience.com/2092-airline-global-warming-battle-heats-fast.html

While commercial aviation accounts for just 2 percent of global carbon emissions, that percentage will grow to 3 percent in coming years, according to number-crunchers at the International Air Transport Association.

## Disad Links

### Politics links

#### NextGen links to politics

Poole and Edwards 2010. Robert W. Poole, Jr.∗ and Chris Edwards. CATO institute report June 2010. “Airports and Air Traffic Control” http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/airports-atc

A third impediment to ATC reform is political. The redesign of the ATC system foreseen in NextGen could potentially deliver major cost savings and greatly expand ATC capacity. However, realizing those gains would require retirement of large numbers of costly radars and other ground-based navigation aids and the consolidation of ATC facilities. One current proposal would replace 21 en route centers and 171 terminal radar approach control (TRACON) facilities with just 35 air traffic service hubs in a redesign of U.S. airspace.28 Physical control towers located at many smaller airports would gradually be phased out as "virtual tower" functions are built into the new super-hubs. However, Congress tends to resist consolidating ATC facilities because of concerns about job losses and the like, which is similar to the political resistance to closing post offices and military bases. A major 1982 proposal for consolidating ATC facilities was quietly dropped after it became clear that getting it through Congress would be very difficult. Similarly, Congress came extremely close to forbidding the FAA's recent success in outsourcing its Flight Service Station system, which involved reducing the system from 58 facilities to 20. The prohibition was defeated only by a credible veto threat from the White House. In sum, as long as ATC remains government-owned and controlled, making the needed reforms to improve efficiency and implement NextGen will be very difficult.

#### Consolidation of airports for NextGen is politically controversial

GAO 2007 “Next Generation Air Transportation System: Status of the

Transition to the Future Air Traffic Control System” 09 May 2007 http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/GAOREPORTS-GAO-07-784T/html/GAOREPORTS-GAO-07-784T.htm

7EVM is a project management technique that combines measurements of technical performance, schedule performance, and cost performance with the intent of providing an early warning of problems while there is time for corrective action. We previously reported that FAA should pursue further cost control options, such as exploring additional opportunities for contracting out services and consolidating facilities. However, we recognize that FAA faces challenges with consolidating facilities, an action that can be politically sensitive. In recognition of this sensitivity, the administration's reauthorization proposal presents an initiative in which the Secretary of Transportation would be authorized to establish an independent, five-member Commission, known as the Realignment and Consolidation of Aviation Facilities and Services Commission, to independently analyze FAA's recommendations to realign facilities or services. The Commission would then send its own recommendations to the President and Congress. In the past, we noted the importance of potential cost savings through facility consolidations; however, any such consolidations must be handled through a process that solicits and considers stakeholder input throughout and fully considers the safety implications of both proposed facility closures and consolidations.

### Spending link

#### NextGen links to spending.

Poole and Edwards 2010. Robert W. Poole, Jr.∗ and Chris Edwards. CATO institute report June 2010. “Airports and Air Traffic Control” http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/airports-atc

Making the transition to NextGen will require billions of dollars of new investments in advanced technologies. The FAA's capital budget is still focused mostly on patching up the existing system, such as replacing antiquated display consoles. Such investments are needed in the short-term, but won't add very much capacity to the system. But that is nearly all the FAA can afford under the current funding structure.Some people argue that Congress could solve the funding problem by appropriating a larger amount of general federal revenue for the ATC system. But given the giant federal budget deficit, federal discretionary spending is going to be severely squeezed in coming years. The solution, as discussed below, is to create a commercialized ATC system that can flexibly respond to changing conditions and access private capital markets for investment.

### DA Turns the Case

#### If we win our econ disad, it controls the fate of airlines, anyways.

Seeking Alpha, June 21, 2012. “Which Airlines To Buy?”

http://seekingalpha.com/article/675321-which-airlines-to-buy

The Airline Industry is widely known to be highly cyclical in nature. Despite the global economic outlook being sluggish in the wake of a looming debt crisis spilling over from Europe, there are still several airlines that have positioned themselves to benefit from this prevailing scenario. After a detailed analysis, we have come up with few actionable investment opportunities for our investors. Depending on individual stock drivers and their expected movement, we advise long positions in Delta Airline (DAL) and US Airways Group, Inc. (LCC), while maintaining a neutral stance on JetBlue (JBLU). Additionally, we recommend investors to take a short position in Southwest Airlines CO. (LUV). A detailed analysis of the industry and key individual players is given below. Industry Overview The U.S. Passenger Airline Industry is a hyper-competitive industry and is susceptible to the tide of both the U.S., as well as the global economy. An industry that carries one-third of the world's passengers is subject to intense regulation. It is for this purpose that the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is made responsible to oversee all aspects of the industry. Dominated traditionally by major U.S. airlines like United Continental Holdings (UAL), DAL, LUV and LCC, the industry can be classified into network, low-cost and regional airlines. In the wake of the recent global economic downturn, threats of terrorism, war, and disease, as well as increased competition from low-cost carriers, many incumbent U.S. airlines have been attempting a fundamental re-structuring of their operations.

### A2 Winners Win – Neg

#### The link is still true in the short-term.

Schaller, 2009 (Tom Schaller, Five Thirty Eight.com, “Is Obama spending his political capital” August 18, google)

Obama is investing now with an eye toward medium- and long-range returns. Call this the "you've got to spend political capital to make political capital" theory, in which Obama knows that the first summer is a good time to make a big investment, with sufficient time to recover his losses and maybe even come out ahead by the 2010 midterms, or at least by the time his own 2012 re-election campaign rolls around. If you have to do health care at some point in the first term, it's now or never...and so, after taking an initial hit, his capital reserves will slowly rise back to pre-Summer '09 levels.

#### Studies are on our side.

Bond & Fleisher, 1996 (Jon R. Bond, professor of Political Science at Texas A&M, and Richard Fleisher, Professor of Political Science at Fordham, "The President in Legislation" p.223)

Presidency-centered variables, however, provide an even weaker explanation of presidential success. We found little support for the thesis that the weakness of legislative parties increases the importance of presidential skill or popularity for determining presidential success on roll call votes. Our analysis reveals that presidents reputed to be highly skilled do not win consistently more often than should be expected given the conditions they faced. Similarly, presidents reputed to be unskilled do not win significantly less often than expected. The analysis of presidential popularity reveals that the president's standing in the polls has only a marginal impact on the probability of success or failure.

#### Only true for top agenda items.

Mathews and Todd, 2009 (Chris and Todd, political director at NBC, Hardball, June 22, google)

MATTHEWS: What are the political stakes for Obama get health care passed this year? Does the success of Obama`s presidency ride on it? Chuck Todd is NBC News chief White House correspondent and NBC News political director, as well. Eugene Robinson‘s an MSNBC political analyst, and of course, lest we forget—I never will—Pulitzer Prize-winning columnist for “The Washington Post.” MATTHEWS: Gentlemen, let‘s start and I want to start with Chuck, our guy on the beat. One thing we`ve learned, it seems, from presidents is you better win that first year. Reagan won the first year. Bush won the first year. If you win the first year, you really get it going. If you don`t win on your big issue, your pet project, if you will -- and it`s more important than that -- you really set a standard for defeat and you go down to further losses down the road. Your thoughts on this. CHUCK TODD, NBC CORRESPONDENT/POLITICAL DIRECTOR: Well, no, you`re -- A, you`re absolutely right. And B, it`s, like, people that are familiar with the way Rahm Emanuel thinks on trying to strategize when it comes to a legislative agenda and getting these big things done, you know, this is the lessons he feels like he learned the hard way in that first two years of the Clinton administration, `93, `94, when a lot of their big things went down. Sure, they got their big stimulus package, but they never did get health care. And that is what defines those first two years when you look back on it.

### A2 Winners Win – Neg

#### Not true for Obama.

Ryan, 2009 (Selwyn Ryan, Professor of Social Science at the Sir Arthur Lewis Institute of Social and Economic Studies, University of West Indies. Ph.D. in Political Science from Cornell, Trinidad Express, January 18, google)

Like many, I expect much from Obama, who for the time being, is my political beast of burden with whom every other politician in the world is unfavourably compared. As a political scientist, I however know that given the structure of American and world politics, it would be difficult for him to deliver half of what he has promised, let alone all of it. Reality will force him to make many "u" turns and detours which may well land him in quick sand. Obama will, however, begin his stint with a vast accumulation of political capital, perhaps more than that held by any other modern leader. Seventy-eight per cent of Americans polled believe that his inauguration is one of the most historic the country will witness. Political capital is, however, a lumpy and fast diminishing asset in today's world of instant communication, which once misspent, is rarely ever renewable. The world is full of political leaders like George Bush and Tony Blair who had visions, promised a lot, and probably meant well, but who did not know how to husband the political capital with which they were provided as they assumed office. They squandered it as quickly as they emptied the contents of the public vaults. Many will be watching to see how Obama manages his assets and liabilities register. Watching with hope would be the white young lady who waved a placard in Obama's face inscribed with the plaintive words, "I Trust You." Despite the general optimism about Obama's ability to deliver, many groups have already begun to complain about being betrayed. Gays, union leaders, and women have been loud in their complaints about being by-passed or overlooked. Some radical blacks have also complained about being disrespected. Where and when is Joshua going to lead them to the promised land, they ask? When is he going to pull the troops out of Iraq? Civil rights groups also expect Obama to dis-establish Guantanamo as soon as he takes office to signal the formal break with Dick Cheney and Bush. They also want him to discontinue the policy which allows intelligence analysts to spy on American citizens without official authorisation. In fact, Obama startled supporters when he signalled that he might do an about-turn and continue this particular policy. We note that Bush is signalling Obama that keeping America safe from terrorists should be his top priority item and that he, Bush, had no regrets about violating the constitutional rights of Americans if he had to do so to keep them safe. Cheney has also said that he would do it again if he had to. The safety of the republic is after all the highest law. Other groups-sub-prime home owners, workers in the automobile sector, and the poor and unemployed generally all expect Obama to work miracles on their behalf, which of course he cannot do. Given the problems of the economy which has not yet bottomed out, some promises have to be deferred beyond the first term. Groups, however, expect that the promise made to them during the campaign must be kept. Part of the problem is that almost every significant social or ethnic group believes that it was instrumental in Obama's victory. White women felt that they took Obama over the line, as did blacks generally, Jews, Hispanics, Asians, rich white men, gays, and young college kids, to mention a few of those whose inputs were readily recognisable. Obama also has a vast constituency in almost every country in the world, all of whom expect him to save the globe and the planet. Clearly, he is the proverbial "Black Knight on a White Horse." One of the "realities" that Obama has to face is that American politics is not a winner-take-all system. It is pluralistic vertically and horizontally, and getting anything done politically, even when the President and the Congress are controlled by the same party, requires groups to negotiate, bargain and engage in serious horse trading. No one takes orders from the President who can only use moral or political suasion and promises of future support for policies or projects. The system was in fact deliberately engineered to prevent overbearing majorities from conspiring to tyrannise minorities. The system is not only institutionally diverse and plural, but socially and geographically so. As James Madison put it in Federalist No 10, one of the foundation documents of republicanism in America, basic institutions check other basic institutions, classes and interests check other classes and interests, and regions do the same. All are grounded in their own power bases which they use to fend off challengers. The coalitions change from issue to issue, and there is no such thing as party discipline which translated, means you do what I the leader say you do. Although Obama is fully aware of the political limitations of the office which he holds, he is fully aware of the vast stock of political capital which he currently has in the bank and he evidently plans to enlarge it by drawing from the stock held by other groups, dead and alive. He is clearly drawing heavily from the caparisoned cloaks of Lincoln and Roosevelt. Obama seems to believe that by playing the all-inclusive, multipartisan, non-ideological card, he can get most of his programmes through the Congress without having to spend capital by using vetoes, threats of veto, or appeals to his 15 million strong constituency in cyberspace (the latent "Obama Party").

### Political Capital Theory True – Neg

#### Obama bargaining overwhelms ideology—lame duck proves.

Shows, 2010 (Ronnie Shows, former Congressman, Mississippi's 4th District, Huffington Post, “Obama Can Win by Securing the Middle” December 27, google)

The President's press conference, just a few weeks ago, where he chastised both the far left and the far right for putting ideological purity over the need for compromise to achieve legislative progress, was a bold and welcome step by Mr. Obama. That willingness to compromise gave him the necessary political capital to move several Republicans and conservative Democrats to supporting passing the START Treaty and ending Don't Ask Don't Tell. So, while moderation and compromise aren't perfect, they are better than never-ending stalemate. Even progressives must applaud the President's recent efforts to keep this year's lame duck session from being lame.

#### Studies prove issues spillover—the president is key.

Soha, 2008 (Eshbaugh-Soha, M. Policy Priorities and Presidential Success in Congress. Conference Papers -- American Political Science Association, 1-26. Retrieved from Political Science Complete database)

Presidential-congressional relations are a central topic in the scientific study of politics. The literature is clear that a handful of variables strongly influence the likelihood of presidential success on legislation. Of these variables, party control of Congress is most important (Bond and Fleisher 1990), in that conditions of unified government increase, while conditions of divided government decrease presidential success, all else equal. The president’s approval ratings (Edwards 1989) and a favorable honeymoon (Dominguez 2005) period may also increase presidential success on legislation. In addition, presidential speeches that reference policies or roll-call votes tend to increase the president’s legislative success rate (Barrett 2004; Canes-Wrone 2001; Eshbaugh-Soha 2006). In their landmark examination of presidential success in Congress, Bond and Fleisher (1990, 230) identify yet another condition that may facilitate presidential success on legislation when they write that “the president’s greatest influence over policy comes from the agenda he pursues and the way it is packaged.” Moreover, the policies that the president prioritizes have “a major impact on the president’s relationship with Congress.” Taken together, these assertions strongly suggest that the policy content of the president’s legislative agenda—what policies the president prioritizes before Congress—should be a primary determinant of presidential success in Congress.

## Private CP

### Private CP Solvency

#### Airport privatization solves- greater efficiency

Barkowski, Justin T. (2010) "Managing Air Traffic Congestion Through the Next Generation Air Transportation System: SatelliteBased Technology, Trajectories, and - Privatization?," Pepperdine Law Review: Vol. 37: Iss. 1, Article 3. http://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/plr/vol37/iss1/3

Airport privatization has numerous potential benefits that cannot be understated. Those most commonly identified include diversified sources of private capital for development, 343 greater efficiency in airport operations, 344 and increased customer satisfaction. 345 However, private operators could al- so more effectively fight congestion than a government-run airport by conditioning the transfer on the elimination of congestion, measured by monthly or quarterly performance results. 346 This technique has been recognized for various forms of privatization, predicated on the notion that "governments should shift their focus from specifying inputs to specifying some desired outcome, leaving private sector providers with the opportunity of formulating means of realizing that outcome in the most cost-efficient way possible." 347 The transfer of interests in airports from government operations to a private regulated monopoly could provide a solution for demand management if three conditions are met: the operator is given the ability to price discriminate against carriers for ground facilities; 348 transparent, periodic slot auctions are held; 349 and efficient regulation of an airport's monopoly power exists.

#### The private sector is K2 U.S leadership and competivitness

Marion Clifton Blakey 12/12/04 is president and chief executive officer of the Aerospace Industries Association. The Aerospace Industries Association represents the nation's leading manufacturers and suppliers of civil, military, and business aircraft, helicopters, unmanned aerial vehicles, space systems, aircraft engines, missiles, homeland and cybersecurity systems, material, and related components, equipment, services, and information technology. <http://www.jpdo.gov/library/ngats_v1_1204r.pdf>

**The United States has been a leader in aviation since its very inception 100 years ago**. **That leadership is a result of** the energy and creativity **of America’s private sector** which has supported our economic health through developing a highly skilled workforce, encouraging technical innovations, and producing aviation products used around the globe. **The private sector has also been supported by the U.S. leadership in establishing the institutional framework and standards necessary for this sector**. **Unless we establish a vision and framework that encourages and enables further private sector innovation, our competitiveness in aviation is likely to diminish.** **Loss of competitiveness in this area would mean a loss in highpaying jobs and a weakening of our economic strength through a shift in the balance of trade.** We cannot aﬀord to be a second-tier aviation supplier in the second century of aviation.

### Private CP Solvency

#### Companies will invest in NextGen

RTCA 2012 RTCA, Inc. is a private, not-for-profit corporation that develops consensus-based recommendations regarding communications, navigation, surveillance, and air traffic management (CNS/ATM) system issues. RTCA functions as a Federal Advisory Committee “RTCA Annual Symposium: Industry Focus Shifts from Planning to Execution” http://www.rtca.org/

Luncheon Keynote speaker Clay Jones, President and CEO of Rockwell Collins, stressed that with the plans, technologies and architecture all in place the challenge now is to the necessary funding for NextGen. With the authority from congress, Jones advocated giving more authority and responsibility for building the ATM system to the private sector, including securing funding from commercial market sources. Ending on a positive note, Jones stated, "I believe if we work together, playing to our traditional strengths, and united in a common goal to see NextGen become a reality, in our lifetime, then we just might be able to pull this off."

#### Private Sector Solves for Warming

**Rosenzweig and Solecki 2012** Cynthia Rosenzweig, Goddard Institute for Space Studies

(http://www.giss.nasa.gov/)William Solecki, Hunter College, City University of New

York (http://www.hunter.cuny.edu/)<http://ccir.ciesin.columbia.edu/nyc/pdf/q3c.pdf>

**The private sector has begun to address the issue of adaptation to climate change. Although many private sector activities are focused on reducing greenhouse gas emissions through energy efficiency, such activities improve the region’s capacity to deal with warming in general and heat waves in particular.** Most private sector activities to date have involved large multi-national corporations, many of which are based in the region, and/or coalitions of regional businesses and associated trade or professional organizations. **The multinational corporations taking the lead in examining and in some cases responding to the threat of climate change are often financial institutions, particularly insurance companies.**

### Private CP Solvency

#### Private Sector solves aerospace

Joint Planning and Development Committee 2004. “Next Generation Transport System—the Integrated Plan.” December 12, 2004. http://www.jpdo.gov/library/ngats\_v1\_1204r.pdf

The United States has been a leader in aviation since its very inception 100 years ago. That leadership is a result of the energy and creativity of America’s private sector which has supported our economic health through developing a highly skilled workforce, encouraging technical innovations, and producing aviation products used around the globe. The private sector has also been supported by the U.S. leadership in establishing the institutional framework and standards necessary for this sector. Unless we establish a vision and framework that encourages and enables further private sector innovation, our competitiveness in aviation is likely to diminish. Loss of competitiveness in this area would mean a loss in highpaying jobs and a weakening of our economic strength through a shift in the balance of trade. We cannot aﬀord to be a second-tier aviation supplier in the second century of aviation. Just as in the domestic arena, the government should avoid picking winners and losers in the international economy. However, it does accept responsibility for ensuring that international competition provides U.S. ﬁrms with a fair opportunity to compete for markets. The air transportation and aerospace markets, in particular, are highly inﬂuenced by international agreements that set standards and provide for market access. In some cases, the air transportation system and key suppliers are owned or ﬁnanced by governments in other countries. Federal research and institutional arrangements to support transformation will assist U.S. negotiators as they strive to provide for a fair and equitable international competitive environment for U.S. ﬁrms. As the U.S. “Hushkit” controversy with Europe demonstrated, the ability of U.S. ﬁrms to operate overseas is closely interconnected with trade policy, international standards and our ability to generate technological advances to global problems.The economic stake of maintaining leadership is high. Civil aviation products and services generate a signiﬁcant surplus for U.S. trade accounts and contribute to the $100 billion a year in tourism from abroad. Air transportation has spawned a highly technical workforce. Aviation technologies, products, and services underpin the advanced capabilities of our national defense and homeland security.7Congress, commissions, state authorities, and others have all recognized that government and industry need to take a diﬀerent approach to the business of aviation. If the United States is going to be ready for the changes that are to come in the next two decades, we need an integrated plan—one where government creates a stable institutional framework that encourages the creativity of the private sector.

### A2 Space debris

#### Little risk—NASA can predict and maneuver spacecrafts.

O’Neill, 2009 (Ian O'Neill September 13th, 2009 Space Junk: It’s Not as Bad as It Looks http://www.astroengine.com/2009/09/space-junk-its-not-as-bad-as-it-looks-what/ )

But space is big, so although it might look a little grim up there, it’s very unlikely a spaceship will collide with anything. A statement from NASA agrees: The dots are not to scale, and space is a very big place. Collisions between large objects are fairly rare. The orbit of each piece is well known. If any debris comes into the path of an operating NASA satellite, flight controllers will maneuver the satellite out of harm’s way.

#### No internal link—additional debris will burn up or can be tracked.

Springer, 2009 (Matt Springer March 17, 2009 [Space Debris](http://scienceblogs.com/builtonfacts/2009/03/space_debris.php) Built On Facts http://scienceblogs.com/builtonfacts/2009/03/space\_debris.php)

Space debris is mostly temporary. There's very very little atmosphere at space shuttle and ISS altitudes, but there is enough to cause orbits to decay over a period of years. Most low-orbiting space debris will burn up in the atmosphere over a period of years or decades. The period gets longer as orbits get higher. Debris in geosynchronous orbit will be there indefinitely. But there's more room in each orbital shell as you go higher and so the debris is thinner. Debris can also be tracked by radar. Your satellites and space stations can dodge most of the sizable pieces given warning from the ground.

### A2 Space debris

#### \*\*\*Space Debris threats are overblown-no chance of a collision.

HACKETT, 2007 [JAMES HACKETT, April 25, 2007, “Much ado about space debris”, THE WASHINGTON TIMES, LexisNexis];

When the space age began 50 years ago there were no man-made objects in space. Since then, Space Command has tracked more than 25,000 objects of baseball size or larger. More than 10,000 have fallen into the atmosphere and disintegrated or landed, but in 50 years not one person anywhere on Earth has been killed or injured by falling debris. Space debris is only slightly more likely to strike one of the 850 active spacecraft. Most are in low Earth orbit below about 800 miles. These operational spacecraft are only 6 percent of the objects tracked. The rest is space junk that includes inactive satellites, spent rockets, debris from exploding rockets and just plain trash. Space Command monitors debris to identify threats and alerts operators of satellites to move out of the way if they appear to be in danger. Some 80 percent of debris orbits between 500 and 600 miles altitude. The Chinese test, at 527 miles, created more debris right where traffic is heaviest. Air Force Space Command is tracking more than 1,000 pieces of debris from the Chinese test, plus 14,000 that were there before. So far, none has hit an active spacecraft. In fact, over the last 50 years there have been only three documented debris impacts with operational spacecraft, and none have been destroyed. A Space Command Web site describing the Space Surveillance Network that tracks debris notes there is only a small amount in the low orbits of the space shuttle and space station, and gives a worst-case estimate of 1 chance in 10,000 years of a piece of debris of baseball size or larger hitting either one. Even in the debris-heavy area around 500 miles altitude, Space Command says normally there are only three or four objects orbiting in an area equivalent to the airspace over the continental United States up to an altitude of 30,000 feet. Thus, it states, the likelihood of a collision is very small. Now there are reports U.S. intelligence agencies knew about and monitored Chinese preparations for the ASAT test, but senior administration officials decided to say nothing to deter Beijing in orderto protect intelligence methods. That shows that despite the anguish about space debris the creation of more was not considered a serious danger. Most debris eventually migrates down and burns up in the atmosphere. The main efforts are to avoid existing debris, design spacecraft and rockets that will not explode in space, limit the release of debris on orbit, and at the end of their mission de-orbit satellites or move them to parking orbits where there is little traffic.

#### Miscalculation is a concept that only applies to conventional warfare – nuclear implications are obvious.

Kenneth Waltz (Professor of Political Science @ Columbia, inventor of structural realism and father of deterrence theory) 2003 “The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: A Debate” p 44

Second, nuclear weaponry makes miscalculation difficult because it is hard not to be aware of how much damage a small number of warheads can do. Early in this century Norman Angell argued that war would not occur because it could not pay. 51 But conventional wars have brought political gains to some countries at the expense of others. Among nuclear countries, possible losses in war overwhelm possible gains. In the nuclear age Angell's dictum becomes persuasive. When the active use of force threatens to bring great losses, war becomes less likely. This proposition is widely accepted but insufficiently emphasized. Nuclear weapons reduced the chances of war between the United States and the Soviet Union and between the Soviet Union and China. One must expect them to have similar effects elsewhere. Where nuclear weapons threaten to make the cost of wars immense, who will dare to start them?