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### 1NC

#### The farm bill will pass now but Obama’s political capitol is key to overcome initial GOP backlash against spending

AP, 6/29 [“Agriculture secretary presses House on farm bill”, Originally Posted on the Sacramento Bee, http://www.sacbee.com/2012/06/29/v-print/4599206/agriculture-secretary-presses.html]

**The Senate last week voted 64-35 to pass a five-year bill**. It ends direct payments to farmers regardless of whether they plant crops, sets up new crop support programs and reduces the federal deficit by $23 billion over the next 10 years. Obstacles to passage are greater in the House, where **conservatives are seeking deeper cuts in the federal food stamp program, which makes up about 80 percent of the nearly $100-billion-a-year spending under the legislation. The Senate bill targets $4 billion in savings from the expected $770 billion in food stamp costs over the next decade.** The chairman of the House Agriculture Committee told the AgriTalk radio show on Thursday that the House's farm bill, which has yet to be introduced, would probably look for $14 billion or $15 billion in food stamp savings. Rep. Frank Lucas, R-Okla., aid **the entire bill would reduce spending by about $30 billion**. Lucas has scheduled a **committee vote on a farm bill for July 11**, and said that once the committee has acted, he will ask Republican leaders for floor time. "I don't care if it's 8:00 in the morning or if it's 3:00 in the afternoon, or if it's 10 minutes till midnight, just give me time." **GOP leaders have not ruled out action on a farm bill,** but have indicated **they want to devote much of the House's time to jobs and regulatory bills that draw a contrast with Obama administration policies, and with 2013 spending bills.** Vilsack said he was confident that **Lucas and the top Democrat on the committee**, Rep. Collin Peterson of Minnesota, **were committed to getting a bill passed**. "**I want to strengthen their hand as they deal with House leadership,**" Vilsack said. The secretary said that **without a new farm bill in place, farmers would be unable to make decisions about future production**, there would be **a lack of clarity about trade promotion programs** and **uncertainty about conservation** programs, He said the farm bill could become a part of expected yearend talks on how to handle expiring tax cuts and automatic cuts in defense and domestic programs, resulting in deeper reductions to farm programs. "I don't think that's in the best interest of rural America," he said. **The House bill**, in addition to seeking greater savings, **is expected to retain some aspect of price support programs, supported by Southern rice and peanut farmers,** that are eliminated in the Senate bill. Lucas said he thought differences with the Senate version could be worked out quickly. But he also said there might have to be a one-year extension even if a new bill is passed because of the time needed to phase in new programs. "I have carried for a year a draft copy of an extension in my pocket," he said in the radio interview. He said he hoped it wouldn't be needed but would be used "**if an extension is in the best interests of the folks back home on the farm**."

<<< insert link>>>

Subidies within the Farm Bill are the death knell for free trade

Edwards ‘7

[Chris. Dir of Tax Studies @ CATO. “Agricultural Subsidies” [www.cato.org](http://www.cato.org), June 2007//GBS-JV]

Farm Subsidies Damage U.S. Trade Relations. Global stability and U.S. security are enhanced when less developed countries achieve stronger economic growth. America can further that end while helping itself by encouraging the lowering of trade barriers and the expansion of trade by poor nations. However, U.S. and European farm subsidies and agriculture import barriers are a serious hurdle to making progress in global trade agreements. U.S. sugar protections, for example, benefit only a very small group of U.S. growers but are blocking broader free trade within the Americas. The World Trade Organization estimates that even a one-third drop in all tariffs around the world would boost global output by $686 billion, including $164 billion for the United States.30 Trade liberalization would boost the exports of U.S. goods that are competitive on world markets, including many agricultural products, but U.S. farm subsidies and protections stand in the way of that goal.

Free trade’s the firewall against nuclear conflict—extinction

Spicer ‘96

[The Challenge from the East and the Rebirth of the West, p. 121]

More fundamentally, it will guarantee the emergence of a fragmented world in which natural fears will be fanned and inflamed. A world divided into rigid trade blocs will be a deeply troubled and unstable place in which suspicion and ultimately envy will possibly erupt into a major war. I do not say that the converse will necessarily be true, that in a free trading world there will be an absence of all strife. Such a proposition would manifestly be absurd. But to trade is to become interdependent, and that is a good step in the direction of world stability. With nuclear weapons at two a penny, stability will be at a premium in the years ahead.

## UQ Wall\*

### Will Pass

#### **Will pass—even with cuts—but PC is critical**

Johnson 6/30 [Ryan Johnson, “Peterson: House farm bill includes more cuts than Senate version”, INFORUM, http://www.inforum.com/event/article/id/365955/group/News/]

MOORHEAD – The final details of the Houseʼs 2012 farm bill were “settled” last Thursday in the Agriculture Committee, ranking Democrat and Minnesota Rep. Collin Peterson said Saturday. But during a news conference at the Hjemkomst Center, Peterson said the bill will contain “significantly more” funding cuts than the $23 billion already cut in the Senate version that passed June 21. While he said there is enough support to pass the bill out of the Agriculture Committee, a vote now scheduled for July 11, Peterson said the next federal farm bill still faces its “own challenges” in getting through the House. Sen. Amy Klobuchar, D-Minn., praised the Senate version as a “good, strong bill” that eliminated direct payments, bolstered crop insurance and maintained the sugar program. She said the bill had strong support in the Senate – it passed 64-35 – because of its $23 billion in cuts, with $16 billion coming from farm programs despite 86 percent of the billʼs overall funding going to nutrition and conservation programs. “That was a very strong argument that had to be able to garner support from senators that were from states that didnʼt have a lot of farming,” she said. But Peterson said the House version will increase those cuts, primarily to nutrition programs, as a way of gaining more support from Republicans. “It is going to make a lot of Democrats angry; it will make the Republicans a little more happy, but for some of them, it still wonʼt be enough for them,” he said. “But itʼs something I think that is justified and we can live with.” Peterson said because of terms of the committee discussions, he could not disclose the full bill details. But he said the language of the bill should be made public Thursday or Friday, and he expects it to move ahead with the markup July 11 and pass the committee on a voice vote. After that, Peterson said he will give Republican leaders “a couple days” to schedule it for a full vote on the House floor because it needs to pass by Aug. 3, when Congress will break for the August recess, in order to be enacted before the current farm bill expires Sept. 30. “But if they donʼt give us some indication of putting this on the floor, then Iʼm going to turn the heat up, and if I have to, Iʼm going to spend all day every day calling every farm radio station in the United States in every state and ratchet up the heat on them, and I encourage everybody else to do that as well,” he said. “I think that in the end, theyʼll come around.” If the bill passes the full House, it would then go to a conference committee to work out the differences in the Senate version. Klobuchar said she will try to keep pressure on the House by arguing the farm bill is important for the entire country, not just states that rely heavily on agriculture like Minnesota. “The last thing we want to do is be dependent on foreign food like weʼre dependent on foreign oil,” she said.

#### **Will pass—GOP will be compromise and vote predictions show passage**

AP, 6/29 [“Agriculture secretary presses House on farm bill”, Originally Posted on the Sacramento Bee, http://www.sacbee.com/2012/06/29/v-print/4599206/agriculture-secretary-presses.html]

WASHINGTON -- **Agriculture Secretary Tom Vilsack on Friday urged the Republican-led House to vote on a long-term farm policy bill, saying failure to act could leave livestock producers exposed to disasters and other farmers uncertain about the future.**

**Vilsack**, in an interview with The Associated Press**, dismissed apparent concerns among House GOP leaders that the half-trillion-dollar farm and food bill could lead to an election-year rebellion among conservatives**. "**If they put it up on the board,** there would be enough votes," he said. "It just needs to get done and **there's no excuse for it not to be done**," he said. The former Iowa governor said he was particularly concerned about livestock producers now coping with fires in the West and drought in the Midwest. **Federal livestock disaster programs ended last September and would not be renewed if the current farm bill,** which expires Sept. 30, **is extended because Congress is unable to pass a new bill.**

**Political Pressure ensures House passage despite GOP backlash**

**SF Chronicle, 6/22 [Carolyn Lochead, “Senate OKs huge farm bill, puts House GOP on spot”, SF Chronicle Bay Area & State, http://www.sfgate.com/politics/article/Senate-OKs-huge-farm-bill-puts-House-GOP-on-spot-3654219.php ]**

Washington -- The Senate's passage Thursday of a nearly $1 trillion farm bill with bipartisan support presented House Republicans and their antideficit Tea Party faction with a huge spending bill that subsidizes large corn and other commodity farmers while spending record sums on food stamps. The House Agriculture Committee delayed consideration of its version until after Congress returns from its recess July 11. **House Majority Leader Eric Cantor, R-Va., ordered a slowdown to assess the political ramifications**. **The House Republican majority includes several lawmakers from rural states whose championship of farm subsidies has often trumped their claims of fiscal austerity**. **The 64-35 Senate passage has House Republican leaders "worried** about bringing a nearly $1 trillion bill to the floor this summer when all the talk about been about cut, cut, cut," said Steve Ellis, vice president of Taxpayers for Common Sense, a budget watchdog group, especially because the bill is 60 percent more expensive than the last farm bill in 2008. The farm bill, renewed every five years, helps shape the American diet and sets environmental policy on 922 million acres of land, or 40 percent of the nation, including a quarter of California. Food stamps consume about 80 percent of the Senate bill's $969 billion cost over the coming decade. Food stamp spending has doubled since 2008 as a result of the recession, with about 1 in 7 Americans receiving assistance. State preserves funds **The bill would make crop insurance the primary means of direct farm support. T**otal spending on corn and other commodities would reach $142 billion at a time when farmers are riding a historic commodity boom. The bill trimmed overall spending by $23 billion, or 2.3 percent, and cut conservation programs by 10 percent. California produce growers, after decades of being ignored in federal farm programs, flexed their newfound muscle by preserving funds won five years ago that purchase fresh fruits and vegetables for schools and other federal food programs. Food activists, environmentalists and fiscal conservatives won key amendments that require farmers to conserve soil, wetlands and grasslands in return for federal aid, and that trim crop insurance subsidies to farmers who earn more than $750,000 a year. Still**, the Senate bill represents incremental change**, not the overhaul that the food movement, born in the Bay Area, has been demanding with increasing ferocity over the past decade. The bill continues to direct most of its farm support to corn, wheat, soybeans, cotton, rice, dairy and other commodities, just as it has since farm programs began in 1933. Those benefits, as they have for decades, continue to accrue to the largest farms, hastening farm industrialization and specialization. **The bill was a debut for the new committee chair, Rep. Debbie Stabenow, D-Mich., whose state farms mainly produce. Stabenow and top committee Republican Pat Roberts of Kansas hailed the bill as a major reform that cut the deficit and consolidated hundreds of programs while killing traditional commodity subsidies and shifting farm support to crop insurance**. Although taxpayers pick up on average two-thirds of the cost of the crop insurance premiums, farmers also have to pony up money and do not collect payouts unless they show losses. Rare alliances Still, Midwestern corn and soybean growers and Southern cotton growers won new entitlement programs that will have taxpayers cover the cost of small dips in their incomes that most businesses routinely weather without aid. **Senate leaders allowed 73 amendments, with little debate. Unlike most partisan issues that consume Washington**, the farm bill pitted rural against urban interests, encouraging rare bipartisan alliances of liberal and conservative lawmakers. Oklahoma Republican Tom Coburn joined Illinois Democrat Dick Durbin on the amendment that limited insurance subsidies to wealthy farmers.

**Will Pass—Immense pressure from Agriculture lobbies and Senate Passage**

**Stenzel 6/29 [Tom Stenzel, United Fresh Produce Association , The Grower, “Farm Bill victory sets stage for House Work”,** [**http://www.printthis.clickability.com/pt/cpt?expire=&title=Farm+bill+victory+sets+stage+for+House+work+-+The+Grower&urlID=483246571&action=cpt&partnerID=753944&cid=135253928&fb=Y&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.thegrower.com%2Fnews%2FFarm-bill-victory-sets-stage-for-House-work-160824265.html**](http://www.printthis.clickability.com/pt/cpt?expire=&title=Farm+bill+victory+sets+stage+for+House+work+-+The+Grower&urlID=483246571&action=cpt&partnerID=753944&cid=135253928&fb=Y&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.thegrower.com%2Fnews%2FFarm-bill-victory-sets-stage-for-House-work-160824265.html)**]**

**The industry’s victories on Capitol Hill can be infrequent and are always the result of considerable effort, so United Fresh, the produce industry and our specialty crop allies should take a brief moment to savor the recent passage of the Senate farm bill.** This important measure builds on the historic accomplishments in the 2008 bill, showing continued support for produce industry priorities, an impressive feat when you consider the tone of our nation’s political and budget discussions. Passage of this vital bill happened because of the leadership and support of Sen. Debbie Stabenow, D-Mich., chairwoman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry; ranking member Pat Roberts, R-Kan.; and the committee members as well as the rest of the Senate. On the morning of the final vote, the chairwoman invited United’s Robert Guenther, senior vice president of public policy, to participate on a call with reporters to review key aspects of the bill. Chairwoman Stabenow thanked Guenther and United Fresh for our efforts to get the bill out of the ag committee and to the Senate floor for a successful vote. **Cooperation in the Senate and within agriculture got the bill done.** United Fresh provides leadership as a member of the Specialty Crop Farm Bill Alliance, a national coalition of more than 120 organizations representing growers of fruits, vegetables, dried fruit, tree nuts, nursery plants and other products. **The Alliance Steering Committee, meeting at United’s Pennsylvania Avenue headquarters each week, has joined forces to rally support for critical farm bill provision**s. By working together**, we’ve won Senate support for state block grants, research, market promotion, nutrition and a lot more**. When you look at a few of the more noteworthy provisions, you see that this bill makes a very real and meaningful investment for the fruit and vegetable industry.

### Yes PC

#### **Yes PC—Health Care**

Silver, 6/28 [Nate, Nathaniel Read "Nate" Silver (born January 13, 1978) is an American statistician, sabermetrician, psephologist, and writer. New York Times, “In Health Ruling, Relief for Obama but a Blow to Conventional Wisdom”, <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/06/28/in-health-ruling-relief-for-obama-but-a-blow-to-conventional-wisdom/?pagewanted=print> ]

**The Supreme Court's 5-to-4 decision on Thursday to uphold most of President Obama's health care law represents a hurdle cleared for Mr. Obama.** **He had been at risk of seeing his most ambitious policy initiative - and most expensive, in terms of the political capital it required - neutered or overturned by the court.** If **Mr. Obama is the victor from the standpoint of public policy**, however, some observers have claimed that the decision could help Mitt Romney in terms of electoral politics. With due respect, I think this counterintuitive conclusion is too cute by half. It may involve the same sort of wishful thinking that liberals were guilty of when some began to argue that the court striking the health care bill would actually help Mr. Obama politically. Other analyses issued before the decision had implausibly argued that both Mr. Romney and Mr. Obama could benefit from the law being upheld. They seem to forget that **in contrast to public policy, electoral politics is largely a zero-sum game. The health care law is likely to remain fairly unpopular; opinions about it have been essentially unchanged for most of the last two years**. **The bill was probably partially responsible for the significant losses that Democrats endured in the 2010 midterm elections.** But continued dissatisfaction over the health care bill was presumably already priced into the polls. A decision that upholds the status quo is not likely to change that much. To the extent there are marginal effects of the court's decision, they would seem to be positive for Mr. Obama. The framework of the bill has now been endorsed by the court, including by John G. Roberts Jr., the relatively conservative and relatively well-respected Chief Justice who wrote the majority opinion. To be clear, the risks to Mr. Obama may have been somewhat asymmetric. A decision to strike the law might have harmed him more than the decision to uphold it will help. And be wary of whatever the polls say for the next week or two - the short-term reaction to the news of the ruling may not match its long-term political effects. As before, the presidential election is mostly likely to be contested mainly on economic grounds. Next week's jobs report is likely to have a larger effect on the election than what the Supreme Court ruled on Thursday. But particularly given the public's confusion over the health care law, my view has been to keep it simple: **Mr. Obama got the good headline here, and that is likely to be most of what the public reacts to**. It is not as though, if the law had been struck down, Republicans would have stopped talking about the folly of the legislation. Members of the public, in mostly opposing the law, had not been objecting to its technical details, some of which they actually supported when quizzed about the specific aspects of the health care overhaul. Instead, it was to the impression that it represented an overreach on behalf of Mr. Obama - at a time when there is profound skepticism about the direction of government and the efficacy of its policy - that left him vulnerable. When the dust settles, it seems implausible that Mr. Obama would have been better off politically had his signature reform been nullified by the court. Then Mr. Obama's perceived overreach would have had the stench of being unconstitutional. Some of the analyses that claim the law could help Mr. Romney instead argue that Thursday's decision could motivate the Republican base. But the Republican base was already reasonably well motivated for the election. A decision to strike down the law, meanwhile, would have represented a victory for movement conservatism - and victory can be its own motivating force. Although some liberals had claimed that a decision to strike the law could have motivated Democratic turnout in anger against the Supreme Court's decision, it can likewise be argued that it would have left Democrats despondent, particularly given that any efforts to replace an overturned law would have faced huge political obstacles in the near term. **The effects on the party bases are hard to sort out. It is what passes for conventional wisdom that may have been the clearest loser with the court's decision.** Sentiment in prediction markets and among pundits had been that the law was more likely than not to be overturned. As I wrote on Wednesday, some of these analysis may have gotten ahead of themselves in trying to read the tea leaves. Statistical methods to predict the court's decision, which have been more reliable than expert judgment in the past, had pointed to a case that was too close to call. In another blow to conventional wisdom, the decision to uphold the law came in a 5-to-4 vote, but with Chief Justice Roberts voting with the four liberals on the court while Justice Anthony M. Kennedy voted with the conservatives - and he signed a strongly worded dissenting opinion that claimed the entire law should have been struck down**. This permutation had been considered unlikely** by experts, most of whom had predicted a 6-to-3 ruling for the law, or a 5-to-4 ruling against it, with Justice Roberts and Justice Kennedy voting together in either case. And if the decision had been 5 to 4 in favor of the law, it was thought that Justice Kennedy and not Chief Justice Roberts would have been more likely to join the majority. Who came out looking better than the pundits? Interestingly, it may be high school students. High school students participating in a Supreme Court "fantasy league" sponsored by the nonprofit Harlan Institute had been about evenly divided in predicting the court's decision, with 57 percent thinking the mandate would be overturned and 43 percent saying it would be upheld. Nor did the oral arguments in the case, which substantially affected the conventional wisdom, alter the students' opinions much. Instead, they had seen the case as a tossup from the beginning. **I suspect these students would have been wise enough to avoid some of the counterintuitive speculation about the decision's political effects that you will now be seeing on television.**

#### Obama’s political capitol from the post-Health care high means he’ll have to fight to win Republicans back—PC is key and Obama has it.

Politics365, 6/28 [“President Obama Won The Day”, <http://politic365.com/2012/06/29/president-obama-won-the-day/> ]

**The Affordable Care Act was upheld by the US Supreme Court. It is President Obama’s signature piece of legislation. He spent the bulk of his political capital as an incoming president on passing this law.** Had it been found unconstitutional, it would have been a moral defeat and a waste of his political resources. **Winning at the Supreme Court allows the President to take a victory lap. It’s been a hard, long slog.** However, this could end up being short term gain and long term pain for the President and the Democrats. **The signing of the Affordable Care Act in March of 2010 galvanized the Republican base and those opposed to big government**. It helped the Republicans pick up a net total of 63 seats in the House of Representatives and ushered in a GOP majority in the lower chamber. **If those flames are re-kindled, today’s ruling could be a short-lived celebration for President Obama. But today, he should be doing a little happy dance** at the White House. It’s unarguable: President Obama won the day.

### Obama Push

#### **Obama is pushing the farm bill—its critical to his administrations’ priorities**

Wallbank, Derek [Bloomberg Online, Washington Correspondent at MinnPost.com Researcher and reporter at Congressional Quarterly Reporter at Lansing State Journal Capitol Reporter (intern) at Gongwer News Service Correspondent at Capital News Service President at Michigan State University – RHA, “Obama Backs Senate Farm Bill Ending Direct Payments to Growers”, <http://mobile.bloomberg.com/news/2012-06-07/obama-backs-senate-farm-bill-ending-direct-payments-to-growers?category>= ]

**The** Obama **administration today said it** supports passage of the farm bill **being considered by the Senate,** legislation that would overhaul U.S. agriculture policy by ending direct payments to growers. **“With authorization for farm- and food-related programs set to expire this year, it is critical that the Congress pass legislation that provides certainty for rural America and includes needed reforms and savings,**” **President Barack Obama’s Office of Management and Budget said** in a policy statement. Under the bill approved by the Senate Agriculture Committee in April, direct payments -- made regardless of crop prices -- would be replaced with an expanded insurance initiative called the “shallow-loss” program. The change would provide the bulk of savings in the bill, which the Congressional Budget Office estimates at $23.6 billion over 10 years. The Senate cleared a procedural hurdle on the measure this morning, advancing the bill on a 90-8 vote. Dozens of amendments have already been filed to the measure. The measure is S. 3240.

### PC is key

#### Obama’s political capitol from the post-Health care high means he’ll have to fight to win Republicans back—PC is key and Obama has it.

Politics365, 6/28 [“President Obama Won The Day”, <http://politic365.com/2012/06/29/president-obama-won-the-day/> ]

**The Affordable Care Act was upheld by the US Supreme Court. It is President Obama’s signature piece of legislation. He spent the bulk of his political capital as an incoming president on passing this law.** Had it been found unconstitutional, it would have been a moral defeat and a waste of his political resources. **Winning at the Supreme Court allows the President to take a victory lap. It’s been a hard, long slog.** However, this could end up being short term gain and long term pain for the President and the Democrats. **The signing of the Affordable Care Act in March of 2010 galvanized the Republican base and those opposed to big government**. It helped the Republicans pick up a net total of 63 seats in the House of Representatives and ushered in a GOP majority in the lower chamber. **If those flames are re-kindled, today’s ruling could be a short-lived celebration for President Obama. But today, he should be doing a little happy dance** at the White House. It’s unarguable: President Obama won the day.

#### **Political Capitol is key to passage—amendments guarantee fights but can be overcome**

Politico 6/7 [“Farm Bill 2012: Bill wins measured White House support”, David Rogers, http://dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=CC792F67-C8ED-4AEC-450DE731F420E1CF]

**The Senate’s new farm bill sailed through its first floor test Thursday morning and won long-awaited support from the White House, which must keep its own eye on swing states like Iowa in the November presidential election**. “We have to get this done,” Agriculture Secretary Tom Vilsack told POLITICO. “**We have an extraordinarily robust farm economy, and if you want that to continue, you have to have certainty about policies going forward.” Major hurdles remain, but the lopsided 90-8 procedural vote was a boost for proponents hoping to win Senate passage this month.** And the House Agriculture Committee is moving up its own markup to the week of June 18 in anticipation of House floor debate in July. The promised savings — $23.6 billion over 10 years — are significantly less than President Barack Obama and House Republicans have demanded in their budget alternatives. **But the bill still represents a real down payment, and given the importance of farm exports to the faltering U.S. economy, both parties have reason to avoid a major confrontation that will slow progress in Congress.** This was very much the tone of the formal statement on administration policy issued after the Senate vote. Coming off the sidelines, **the White House said it “looks forward to working with the Congress to achieve crop insurance and commodity program savings that are not contained” in the Senate bill. But the statement carefully avoids any veto threat, and instead congratulates senators for making “meaningful progress” toward the president’s goals. Vilsack, a former Iowa governor, has worked** himself behind the scenes to provide technical advice while staying away from the past practice of having his department write its own alternative farm bill. In a short interview, he **cited specific concerns about the level of nutrition spending cuts being discussed by House Republicans and proposed Senate changes affecting agricultural research. But he seemed confident that the two chambers can heal the regional divide over commodity programs and target price supports**, most important to Southern growers. “At the end of the day you have to have 60 votes in the Senate, and it’s going to require 218 votes in the House so I’m confident that can be worked out,” Vilsack said. “The big untold story is the rural economy is changing and getting stronger …We need to continue what is already happening. We need to continue that momentum.”

## Impact Wall\*

### Farm Lobby Turns case

#### The Farm Lobby will backlash against congress if the Bill Fails—they’ll exploit loopholes in foreign policy and undermine US legitimicay in the middle east—that’s a Key internal link to their advantage

FPIF, 11 [Foreign Policy in Focus, January 7, 2011, “How the Farm Lobby Distorts US Foreign Policy”, <http://www.fpif.org/articles/how_the_farm_lobby_distorts_us_foreign_policy>]

Thanks to the hard work of the U.S. Farm Lobby, America’s love of cheap food has stretched more than an engorged waistline. It now stretches the limits of American foreign policy. Over the past century, the Farm Lobby’s influence on the U.S. government has increased alongside the consolidation and growth of U.S. agribusinesses, the principle recipients of federal farm subsidies. The redistribution of taxpayer dollars to American agribusinesses not only creates artificially cheap global prices, it also continues to undermine the development of agrarian-oriented economies throughout the world. Now it appears the Farm Lobby’s efforts are hamstringing American national security, as well. The New York Times has just discovered that the Farm Lobby has been circumventing U.S. economic sanctions against the world’s leading rogue states. Bypassing Sanctions In other words, at the same time that war hawks in government denounce economic sanctions as ineffective, their American Farm Lobby allies, among other groups, have been quietly bypassing the regulations. After filing a Freedom of Information lawsuit and overcoming strong resistance from the Treasury Department, The New York Times has revealed that, for the past decade, the Farm Lobby has ignored economic sanctions by using a Treasury Department legal loophole—a loophole the Farm Lobby helped craft—in order to trade with Iran and other countries listed as state sponsors of terror. The Treasury Department law, drawn up in 2000, included the loophole principally to help American farmers export their devalued surplus goods. Falling under the vague label of “humanitarian aid,” nearly 4,000 U.S. businesses have since done billions of dollars in trade with blacklisted countries. So-called humanitarian products even include cigarettes and hot sauce. A spokesperson for the American Pop Corn Company, for instance, defended his product as humanitarian, noting that “popcorn has fibers which are helpful to the digestive system.” The law was defined so broadly that “humanitarian aid” included any item on the Department of Agriculture’s list, from seeds to soda, and grains to gum. U.S. exports to Iran, for instance, have skyrocketed from almost nothing to about $1.7 billion, and those to Cuba have reached about $3 billion since passage of the law. It's not just gum and soda. "In one instance," reports the Times, "an American company was permitted to bid on a pipeline job that would have helped Iran sell natural gas to Europe, even though the United States opposes such projects. Several other American businesses were permitted to deal with foreign companies believed to be involved in terrorism or weapons proliferation." Damaging Loopholes The Obama administration has since dismissed the report as minor. But the foreign policy community can't ignore the creation of loopholes “that you can drive a Mack truck through,” says Stuart Eizenstat, who was in charge of sanctions policy in the Clinton administration. “You are giving countries something for nothing, and they just laugh in their teeth. I think there have been abuses.” Eizenstat told the BBC in a related interview that U.S. sanctions policy was “riddled with exceptions that are neither humanitarian nor related to democracy promotion,” and could undermine support for international sanctions. As the Times also points out, “some diplomats and foreign affairs experts worry that by allowing the sale of even small-ticket items with no military application, the United States muddies its moral and diplomatic authority,” especially in countries like Iran where “it is increasingly difficult to separate exceptions that help the people from those that enrich the state.” The heavily redacted files obtained by the Times “offer a snapshot—albeit a piecemeal one—of a system that at times appears out of sync with its own licensing policies and America’s goals abroad. In some cases, licensing rules failed to keep pace with changing diplomatic circumstances,” as evinced, for example, by the continuation of outdated and loose trade restrictions with North Korea and Cuba. Specialists of U.S.-Cuban relations are already expressing their outrage, and Jewish groups are indignant over revelations concerning Iran. American sales of marinades, cake sprinkles, and salt substitutes have ended up in Iranian stores whose investors include blacklisted banks and high-ranking officials from the Islamic Revolutionary Guards Corps.But selling luxury food products to stores owned by IRGC officials and banks on the American blacklist is just scratching the surface of the Farm Lobby’s insidious influence upon American foreign policy. And it all leads back to the Farm Lobby and federal subsidies of American agriculture. Inordinate Influence The U.S. Farm Lobby maintains an inordinate amount of governmental influence, and it pays—literally. Despite promises to the contrary, taxpayer money keeps on feeding the Farm Lobby coffers; agricultural subsidies now average between $10 and $35 billion year. With such overt federal support and at least tacit federal approval, the Times’s most recent revelation is only the newest in an ongoing list of the Farm Lobby’s injurious impact on U.S. foreign relations. For many years now, poor nations throughout the globe have complained that U.S. agricultural subsidies encourage enormous crop overproduction, which in turn drives massive exportation, thereby glutting the global market and depressing prices worldwide. U.S. farmers, completing the vicious self-perpetuating protectionist cycle, turn to the U.S. government for subsidies in order to supplement these lower global prices their overproduction created. Corn subsidies, which received $41.9 billion from 1995 to 2004 alone, are particularly detrimental to the world economy and ecology, and this December’s compromise tax deal unsurprisingly included further taxpayer subsidies to corn ethanol production. Since NAFTA was enacted in 1994, for instance, subsidized U.S. corn has been overflowing Mexican markets, destroying Mexican corn-growing, and thereby displacing Mexican farmers. USAID, meanwhile, has consistently threatened to cut off food aid to various African countries that are unwilling to accept genetically modified crops, particularly corn. Other studies show how U.S. corn subsidies are even tied to the destruction of the Amazon. Furthermore, over the past decade the World Trade Organization has castigated the United States for its ongoing and massive program of agricultural subsidization. In recent years, the European Union, Australia, Brazil, Argentina and Canada embarrassingly took America’s illegal corn subsidization to task, and Brazil also recently won a similar World Trade Organization victory over American cotton subsidies.

#### Backlash over the farmbill will kill any global warming or environment efforts precedents prove

LA Times 9 [June 26, 2009, “The farm lobby vs the global warming bill”, <http://articles.latimes.com/print/2009/jun/26/opinion/ed-climate26>]

Conspiracy theorists point to an assortment of groups they think secretly run the country -- the gun lobby, Big Oil, the New World Order and even Yale's Skull and Bones society have all been fingered as the shadowy Illuminati who rule Washington. Yet the nation's real power brokers are in plain sight, amid amber waves of grain: the farmers.

The farm lobby demonstrates its awesome might every few years with the passage of a new farm bill, which invariably shovels billions in corporate welfare to agribusiness while damaging U.S. trade relationships and in many cases raising consumer prices for agricultural goods. But its power goes beyond the farm bill; it's hard to pass any legislation even tangentially related to farming without the support of a bipartisan bloc of lawmakers from Midwestern states. Which is why, when congressional Democrats bring their sweeping 1,200-page bill to fight climate change to the House floor today, the farm lobby's loamy thumbprints will be all over it.

The American Clean Energy and Security Act of 2009 from Reps. Henry A. Waxman (D-Beverly Hills) and Edward J. Markey (D-Mass.) is an ambitious effort to cut U.S. greenhouse gas emissions 17% below 2005 levels by 2020. It would do this by capping emissions and allowing polluters to trade carbon credits; regulating cleaner fuels; investing in clean energy development; and boosting energy efficiency and renewable power.

What does that have to do with farming? Not a lot. Although agriculture plays a key role in global warming -- clearing forest land for farms eliminates trees that absorb carbon, and livestock generate hefty emissions of climate-altering methane -- the bill largely ignores such issues. That didn't stop Rep. Collin C. Peterson (D-Minn.), chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, from holding up the bill to wrest seed money for his constituents under the theory that heading off global catastrophe is only worthwhile if agribusiness can profit from it.

Peterson got what he wanted. Under the bill, polluters can buy "offsets," meaning they can invest in carbon-reduction programs on farms or forests rather than cutting their own emissions. Originally, the Environmental Protection Agency was to be in charge of regulating these offsets, because it's the agency with the scientific expertise to do the job. Instead, Peterson ensured that offsets will be governed by the industry-focused Department of Agriculture, with the EPA playing a secondary role; this will help bring rich payouts to farmers while probably reducing the offsets' effectiveness.

Also gutted was a provision requiring the EPA to consider the indirect climate impacts of biofuels. This would have imposed penalties on fuels, such as ethanol produced from corn, that encourage landowners to clear forests in order to grow the feedstock. That posed a threat to corn growers and ethanol refiners, whose inefficient and food-price-distorting fuel would most likely have been phased out. Now, the government will merely be required to study the links between such land-use change and carbon emissions.

Farmers aren't the only ones who have weakened the Waxman-Markey bill. To win votes from coal-producing and Southern states, its authors agreed to water down the renewable energy standard. The nation will still be required to get 20% of its electricity from renewable sources by 2020, but "renewable" has been redefined to include electricity derived by burning trash or landfill gas, which are highly polluting fuels. What's more, states can reduce their renewable power requirement by improving energy efficiency; as a result, the bill probably won't spur any more renewable power development than would have occurred without it.

If the bill is far from perfect, that doesn't mean it isn't good. It's the first significant attempt by the United States to join other responsible nations that are trying to wean themselves off fossil fuels and build a better future for their children. Its provisions are weak and will be almost unnoticeable at first, but they will strengthen over time, and the framework it creates can be improved on later if it's not producing the intended cuts.

Opponents complain that the bill would be too costly, raising the prices of energy, fuel and consumer goods. That's based on the mindless notion that doing nothing to fight climate change would have zero economic cost. Yet if the globe warms as much as climatologists predict, the cost of adapting would dwarf the cost of prevention. A report released last week by the U.S. Global Change Research Program found that, without efforts to stem the problem, average temperatures in the U.S. could rise by 7 to 11 degrees Fahrenheit by 2100. The result: large-scale flooding and destruction along the Gulf and Atlantic coasts, ruined crops in the Midwest, rampant fires in California, worsening incidence of insect-borne and plant diseases, skyrocketing heat deaths and a host of other woes.

The bill's costs are also being grossly exaggerated. House Minority Leader John Boehner (R-Ohio) claims it would raise annual energy costs by $3,128 per household by 2015, an imaginary figure that he apparently derived from an estimate drawn up by MIT professor John M. Reilly -- who sent Boehner a letter saying the congressman was inflating the cost tenfold. The Congressional Budget Office released its estimate last week, saying the legislation would cost the average household $175 a year by 2020. Even that is probably an exaggeration, because it doesn't take into account improvements in energy efficiency. Though electricity would undoubtedly be more expensive if the bill passes, consumers and businesses would use less of it, meaning they could actually end up saving money. That's what happened after California started imposing energy-efficiency programs in the 1970s.

The House should pass the Waxman-Markey bill, and the Senate should speedily follow suit. Even congressional Republicans can't generate as much hot air as the billions of metric tons of carbon dioxide it would eliminate.

### AT: Farm Bill Fails

#### Kills Subsidies and Helps rural agriculture

USN 6-6

[The US Newswire. 6/6/12 ln//GBS-JV]

**The measure ends direct payments to farmers who may or may not actually plant crops, saving some $5 billion a year**. That's replaced with a greater emphasis on federally subsidized [crop insurance](http://www.usnews.com/news/us/articles/2012/06/05/senate-takes-up-farm-bill-that-changes-safety-net) and a new program that compensates farmers for "shallow losses" in revenues as measured over a five-year average. "**We're not going to be paying farmers for crops they don't grow. We're not going to be paying farmers when they are already doing very well,"** Stabenow said. The new Agriculture Risk Coverage program has the backing of most major [farm groups](http://www.usnews.com/news/us/articles/2012/06/05/senate-takes-up-farm-bill-that-changes-safety-net), but faces resistance from Southern rice and peanut growers who say it hurts their bottom lines. **They are seeking the retention of some kind of target pricing to protect their crops.** The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the Senate bill would save about $8.5 billion over five years by ending direct payments as well as other commodity support payments, and moving to the new ARC program and save another $1.8 billion by streamlining conservation programs. It says $1.7 billion over five years and $4.5 billion over 10 years will be saved through **changes to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or food stamps, mainly by ending an automatic qualification for food stamps for households receiving less than $10 a year in the federal low-income heating assistance program. Some 46 million Americans are now receiving food stamps.**

#### Key to ag efficiency

Rogers 5-25

[David. Staffer for Politico. 5/25/12 ln//GBS-JV]

**New cost estimates Friday from the Congressional Budget Office predict that the Senate farm bill will save an estimated $23.6 billion over the next 10-years, about three-quarters of which would come from a net reduction in subsidies for major commodities.** Beneath the surface, the 20-page report confirms a huge shift of resources toward new government-backed **crop insurance options that would help farmers cover the deductibles they now pay.** But even allowing for this investment, **the Senate bill would save about $17 billion from what are generally seen as traditional support programs.** A second wave of cuts from nutrition and conservation programs would save an additional $10.1 billion, about **half of which would go to deficit reduction and half to pay for smaller energy, agricultural research, and specialty crop initiatives.** The $23.6 billion total is less than the White House and House Republicans have demanded in their own budgets. But the Senate bill stands out for this Congress as one example of a bipartisan effort to achieve real savings prior to the November elections and the threat of automatic spending cuts in January. Senate Agriculture Committee Chairwoman Debbie Stabenow (D-Mich.) has repeatedly promised to meet the $23 billion target, and with CBO’s blessing in hand, she could have some added momentum on the Senate floor next month. As filed late Thursday, **the more than 1,000-page bill begins by eliminating the current system of direct cash payments, which has endured since the mid-90’s but no longer is politically defensible given high farm incomes. The resulting savings, about $44.6 billion over 10 years, would be combined with another $6 billion achieved by also ending several smaller programs, including countercyclical and disaster assistance.** From this pot of $50.6 billion in savings, the Senate bill then reallocates about $33.6 billion to new revenue and crop insurance options, the largest of which — the Agriculture Risk Coverage plan — would cover a narrow band of potential losses but be financed entirely by the government. Midwest corn and soybean producers have pushed hardest for the ARC option, which would cost $28.5 billion over 10 years and almost guarantee a profit for many producers, at least in the short term.

#### More ev – leads to better crop insurance

Rogers 5-25

[David. Staffer for Politico. 5/25/12 ln//GBS-JV]

The biggest sleeper in the CBO’s numbers may be a new insurance program that has received less attention to date, the so-called Supplemental Coverage Option, or SCO. Just weeks ago CBO had pegged the costs at $682 million over 10 years, but **the new report assumes much higher participation by farmers, raising the subsidy costs to $3 billion — a more than fourfold increase.** Part of this increase is offset by a reduction in the participation rate in ARC, for which the CBO cost estimates are down from April. But to stem the tide, Stabenow’s panel adopted revisions Thursday to make clear to CBO that all SCO participants would face at least a 10 percent deductible. CBO said the benefits for farmers under SCO are greater if they choose not to participate in ARC, and **the new higher participation rate suggests that it could prove attractive to producers looking for a low cost way to hedge their individual crop insurance.** About **half the individual crop insurance policies, for example, cover around 70-75 percent of losses, but that leaves 25 to 30 percent not protected, the deductible.** SCO is designed to be based on county-wide losses, and therefore a bit of a gamble compared to individual farm-level coverage**. But a farmer could use it as a low cost way — since the government would subsidize 70 percent of the premium costs — to cover half or two-thirds of that 25-30 percent deductible. ARC, by comparison, will appeal to those wanting farm-level coverage like their individual policies**. And it is financed totally by the government. But the band covered is narrower – only those losses in the 79 percent to 89 percent bracket. And even then, the compensation for losses would be based on 65 percent to 80 percent of a farmer’s acreage, whereas SCO doesn’t have that limit.

#### Subsidies bad/rural ag good IL

WP 6-6

[The Wash Post. 6/6/12 ln//GBS-JV]

Much of **the savings in the Senate bill would come from cutting $15 billion in direct subsidies to farmers, which essentially pay them not to grow certain crops**. Subsidies were a coveted perk of long standing embraced by Southern and Midwestern lawmakers, but with Washington eager to demonstrate its newly-found fiscal restraint, supporters said Wednesday that **the funding was becoming harder to justify politically.** “**You’ve got a lot of people here who aren’t going to support direct payments,”** said [Sen. Mike Johanns (R-Neb.)](http://projects.washingtonpost.com/congress/members/J000291), who served as agriculture secretary for President George W. Bush. Despite the cuts, Johanns said, “**I could count on one hand the number of farmers who pushed back and said, ‘No, I still want the direct payment.’ ” The changes are fueled in part by the fact that in a relatively robust agricultural economy, most farmers have been less reliant on government subsidies to survive.** Stabenow said that they also understand the realities of the times. “Agriculture families, farmers, communities understand that we’re in a time of deficits and we’re willing to do our part,” she told reporters. “**We know that the era of direct payments are over, that we’re not paying for crops that farmers don’t grow or when they’re doing well.”**

#### Key to end subsidies

Miller 5-31

[Mary – Drovers Cattle Network. Cites a Congressional Budget Office Report. 5/31/12 <http://www.cattlenetwork.com/cattle-news/CBO-estimates-Senate-farm-bill-savings-155740115.html?ref=115> //GBS-JV]

**The U.S. Senate’s proposed version of the Agriculture Reform, Food and Jobs Act of 2012 would cut direct program spending by an estimated $23.6 billion over a 10-year period,** according to a Congressional Budget Office (CBO) report. The 20-page report outlines nearly a **75 percent savings from reduced commodity subsidies from 2013 to 2022. The changes are largely driven by moving away from subsidies to government-backed crop insurance**. But add up all of the farm bill spending and CBO projects a 10-year total of $969 billion. The Senate bill reallocates about $33.6 billion to new revenue and crop insurance options, including the controversial Agriculture Risk Coverage (ARC) plan. CBO estimates it at $28.53 billion for the 10-year period and would **cover a narrow band of potential losses, but would be financed entirely by the government.**

### Heg Impact

( ) Subsidies doom hegemony and invite terrorism – they are protectionist and turn other nations against us

Griswold et al ‘6

[Dan, and Stephen Slivinski and Chris Preble. Scholars at CATO’s Center for Trade. “Six Reasons to Kill Farm Subsidies and Trade Barriers” [www.cato.com](http://www.cato.com), Feb 2006//GBS-JV]

The collective effect of American farm policies is to depress the income of agricultural producers worldwide, exacerbating poverty in areas, such as sub-Saharan Africa and Central Asia, where people are heavily dependent on agriculture. **The frustration** and despair **caused by these policies undermine American security.** **Many people who depend on agriculture for their survival**, both as a source of nourishment and a means of acquiring wealth, **perceive U.S. farm policy as part of an anti-American narrative in which Washington wants to keep the rest of the world locked in poverty**. Indeed, in a survey of anti-American sentiment around the world, the Pew Research Center found a majority of respondents in more than a dozen countries were convinced that U.S. farm and trade policies increased the "poverty gap" worldwide. These sentiments transcended geographic, ethnic, or religious boundaries. **In such an environment, terrorist ringleaders find fertile ground for their message of hate and violence.** Nicholas Stern, chief economist at the World Bank, is blunt about America's leadership role. "**It is hypocritical to preach the advantages of free trade** and free markets," Stern told the U.N. publication *Africa Recovery*, "**and then erect obstacles in precisely those markets in which developing countries have a comparative advantage.**" Johan Norberg, of the Swedish think tank Timbro, argues that farm protection in developed countries amounts to a "deliberate and systematic means of undermining the very type of industry in which the developing countries do have comparative advantages." (See "Poor Man's Hero," December 2003.) American subsidies and tariffs amount to much more money than its foreign aid to the developing world. According to Oxfam, "in crop year 2002, the U.S. government provided $3.4 billion in total subsidies to the cotton sector," including about 25,000 growers. "To put this figure into perspective," Oxfam says, "it is nearly twice the total amount of U.S. foreign aid given to sub-Saharan Africa. It is also more than the GDP of Benin, Burkina Faso, or Chad, the main cotton-producing countries in the region." The subsidies drive down world cotton prices, costing developing countries billions of dollars in lost export earnings. Poor countries don't want our pity; they want our respect. **To the extent that American security depends on the expansion of liberal democratic institutions and free market economics, Washington must be particularly sensitive to policies that exacerbate poverty in the developing world.**

< Terminal impact >

###  Ext. Conflict

( ) More ev

Griswold et al ‘5

[Dan, and Stephen Slivinski and Chris Preble. Scholars at CATO’s Center for Trade. “Ripe for Reform: Six Good Reasons to Reduce US Farm Subsidies and Trade Barriers” [www.cato.com](http://www.cato.com), September 2005//GBS-JV]

U.S. agricultural policies have remained fundamentally unchanged since the 1930s. Today the U.S. government continues to subsidize certain farm commodities through direct price supports and tariff rate quotas that limit imports. Americans pay a high price for this ongoing government intervention in agricultural markets. Reducing farm subsidies and trade barriers would benefit Americans in six important ways. One,reform would deliver lower food prices to tens of millions of American households, especially low-income families that spend a large share of their income on food. Last year U.S. farm programs transferred $16.2 billion from U.S. food consumers to producers. Two, reform would lower costs for U.S. industries, such as confectioners and other food processors, that use agricultural commodities in their final products and would promote trade negotiations to open markets abroad for U.S. exporters. Three, reducing farm subsidies would save U.S .taxpayers tens of billions of dollars during the next decade.Many of those subsidy payments currently go to large farms and agribusinesses, not to smaller “family farms.” Four,agricultural reform would enhance the environment by reducing the amount of top soil lost and damaging fertilizers and pesticides used by American farmers. It would liberate farmland to be used for reforestation, recreation, and other more environmentally friendly purposes. Five, agricultural reform would benefit farmers themselves by promoting production of crops that are in demand by consumers. Farm reform would stimulate innovation and productivity gains on the farm and promote more economic diversity and dynamism in rural communities. Six, lower farm trade barriers would raise incomes of farmers in poor countries, reduce global poverty, create a more hospitable climate abroad for U.S. foreign policy, and enhance U.S. security.

# Free Trade Impacts

### Ext—Heg and Econ

#### Free trade turns hegemony and the economy

Hormats ‘1—Vice Chairman, Goldman Sachs International, 01 (Robert D., “American Trade Policy: The Importance of Trade Promotion Authority,” Testimony Before the Committee on Finance, United Staes Senate, 20 Jun, http://www.senate.gov/~finance/062001rhtest.pdf)

**Expanding global trade** and investment **over the last 50 years have provided enormous benefits for American workers, farmers, consumers and, businesses.** We tend to take it for granted today, but **this experience is in sharp contrast to the horrible economic mess the US and world got themselves into after World War I** **— when American leadership faltered. Protectionist measures and international financial instability were among the major factors that led to the Depression.** We should not forget the lessons of this period — nor let our leadership of the global economy be derailed by internal divisions or by complacency that the world economy will work just fine whether the US is an effective leader or not! Nor should we let the current weakness in the US economy and the world economy block progress. **Trade liberalization can provide a boost to growth. Reduction in many kinds of trade barriers is equivalent to a stimulative tax cut. Access to growing foreign markets has been a vital factor in America’s economic growth for several decades, especially for our most productive sectors, such as high technology, agriculture, high value added manufactured goods, entertainment and financial services.** And competitive imports have reinforced the dynamism of our economy, while **broadening consumer choice**, **and holding down the prices of many products, to the benefit of millions of households**. Chairman Greenspan made this point eloquently in testimony before this committee earlier this year. **US leadership in promoting trade liberalization has been essential to secure these benefits for the American people**. **It also has been vital to this country’s ability to remain a strong and effective leader on global political and security matters for the last 50 plus years**. If we now turn our back on global trade leadership we will weaken our global political leadership as well. In recent years advocates of open, rules-based, transparent and nondiscriminatory trade — and supporters of American leadership in the world economy — have been on the defensive. **The benefits of expanding trade and investment are too often neglected, while vocal criticism of US trade policy, the WTO and globalization tend to get more visibility and public attention. The role of a strong global economy in maintaining a strong American economy is too often ignored.**

### Ext—Terrorism

**Free trade solves terrorism, acts as olive branch to the world**
Brink Lindsey, director of the Cato Institute's Center for Trade Policy Studies, August 5, 2003, “The Trade Front, Combating Terrorism with Open Markets”

In the immediate aftermath of the terrorist attacks on New York and Washington, U.S. Trade Representative Robert Zoellick characterized the administration’s trade agenda as an integral element of the “counteroffensive” against America’s terrorist adversaries. “Trade is about more than economic efficiency,” he wrote in a September 20, 2001, op-ed in the Washington Post. “It promotes the values at the heart of this protracted struggle.”36 The Bush administration deserves praise for drawing the connection between trade policy and combating terrorism—and then pursuing that connection with plans for FTAs with Morocco, Bahrain, and other Muslim countries. And as the administration recognizes, trade policy’s role in bolstering national security goes beyond initiatives with the Muslim world. In his provocative Washington Post oped, Zoellick called for responding to the 9/11 attacks with a vigorous assertion of American economic leadership across the board—in particular, through an aggressive policy of bilateral, regional, and multilateral market opening. How does reducing trade barriers around the world make America safer? First, by helping the global spread of markets and liberal democracy. Wherever it exists and in whatever form, tyranny spawns war and conflict and terror— and, consequently, threats to U.S. global interests and national security. Promoting promarket policies in other countries is one small but effective way for the United States to minimize those threats by fostering conditions more favorable to human freedom. Second, leading the world toward closer commercial ties can reduce threats to American interests and security by calming fears and resentment of American power. A nation as overwhelmingly dominant as ours will inevitably face some level of reactionary opposition—opposition that has now intensified after the recent exertions of U.S. military might. Although some of the backlash may be unavoidable, it is clearly true that, all things being equal, we would be better off with fewer detractors around the world. Accordingly, whenever we can avoid giving gratuitous offense or causing unintended harm, we would be wise to do so. Seen in this light, U.S. trade policy can serve as an olive branch to the world. By opening our markets to the rest of the world— whether unilaterally or in concert with other nations—we demonstrate that America’s interest lies, not in keeping other countries down, but in encouraging them to rise and prosper.

### Ext—Environment

**Free trade brings down environmental pollution through new production techniques**
Daniel K**. Benjamin**, March 20**02**, “Is Free Trade Good for the Environment?” PERC Reports: Volume 20,
No.1, http://www.perc.org/articles/article262.php

Rock-throwers at World Trade Organization meetings call themselves environmentalists. They protest that international trade is environmentally destructive, because it induces the emergence of "pollution-havens"—Third World nations that take on the dirty work of tanning leather, making paper, and the like. These nations become polluted and, it is claimed, total environmental damage also increases. Many economists are skeptical of the pollution-haven story, but the contention that trade harms the environment is difficult to assess systematically. The links between trade and the environment are subtle and complicated, and simply measuring such concepts in a convincing way is daunting. Recent research has made huge strides in cracking this problem and provides us with a compelling conclusion: Freer international trade improves the environment (Antweiler, Copeland, and Taylor 2001).  Whether it is between people, states, or nations, trade can have an impact on environmental quality through three channels. These are changes in (i) where goods are produced, (ii) the scale of economic activity, and (iii) the production techniques used. Antweiler et al. are able to distinguish the effects of each of these on environmental quality. Interestingly, changes in the location of production—the pollution-haven hypothesis—turn out to be empirically unimportant. The fact that freer trade induces increases in the scale of economic activity, on the other hand, has a modest adverse impact on environmental quality. But the third effect—changes in production techniques—swamps the other forces, and it is environmentally beneficial, not harmful. Overall, the authors estimate that for each one percent that freer trade raises per capita income in a nation, the result is that pollution (as measured by sulfur dioxide concentrations) falls by one percent. When trade expands, the composition of output from each nation changes because trading partners can now exploit their sources of comparative advantage—doing more of what each does best and less of those things at which each is not very good. Anti-trade protestors have argued that comparative advantage moves dirty production processes to developing countries, polluting these nations and increasing overall environmental damage. What this claim misses is that a staggering array of factors help determine the location of productive activity. Even for pollution-intensive goods, considerations other than pollution-abatement costs—such as capital abundance, labor market cconditions, and transportation costs—are generally the determining forces. On balance, the authors find little impact on the environment due to trade-induced changes in the location of production.

### Ext—Warming

**Free trade and liberalization causes requests for more environmental policies solving warming**
Daniel K. **Benjamin**, March 20**02,** “Is Free Trade Good for the Environment?” PERC Reports: Volume 20,
No.1, http://www.perc.org/articles/article262.php

The other effects of freer trade—increases in the scale of activity and changes in the techniques of production—are more important. Simply increasing the scale of economic activity means more material goods are produced, so more byproducts are formed, causing air and water pollution. This tends to reduce environmental quality. The authors find this effect clearly, albeit modestly, present in the data: Each one percent rise in economic activity induces about one-quarter of one percent rise in pollution concentrations due to this force. Overall, however, Antweiler et al. find that this negative effect is overwhelmed as economic growth, spurred by trade, takes place. When people get richer they demand more environmental amenities. As free trade expands, each one percent increase in per capita incomes tends to drive pollution concentrations down by 1.25 to 1.5 percent because of the movement to cleaner techniques of production. The conclusions one can draw from this research are limited in two dimensions. First, sulfur dioxide concentrations are the sole measure of pollution used in this paper, a fact driven simply by the need to select some measure. Free trade might worsen other measures of pollution, but sulfur dioxide concentrations are known to move closely with other airborne emissions. Hence, it seems unlikely that alternative measures of pollution would yield much different conclusions. Second, the authors do not investigate exactly what regulatory or institutional changes are driving the environmental improvement caused by rising incomes. In principle, the rising demand for environmental quality might get translated into environmental improvement through explicit government pollution abatement policy or through pollution-reducing changes in private contractual arrangements. The authors do not attempt to disentangle the relative roles of these two effects; they can, however, discern the combined effect. But the nature of these changes is clearly important in the debate over the efficacy of free market environmentalism. If rising incomes bring environmental improvement chiefly due to the growth of intrusive regulatory schemes, the environmentally beneficial effects are likely to be less appealing to many readers of this column. Still, there is little doubt about the quite conclusive finding of this research. In the words of the authors: "Free trade is good for the environment." Perhaps this will make attendance at future international trade conferences somewhat less hazardous—albeit less interesting—to all concerned.

### Farm Bill kt Free trade

( ) More evidence – farm subsidies are protectionist and lock us out of other emergent trade markets

Markheim and Riedl ‘7

[Daniella and Brian – Economic Policy Fellows at Heritage. “Farm Subsidies, Free Trade, and the Doha Round” [www.heritage.org](http://www.heritage.org), Feb 2007//GBS-JV]

Though farm policy reform will be difficult at best to achieve, it would have two positive benefits. It would end nonsensical, distorted subsidies for a handful of select crops, resulting in a more equitable domestic market. Unilateral reductions in farm subsidies and bailouts would give U.S. trade negotiators the second benefit: ammunition to break the impasse over agriculture protection with the EU and other countries in world trade talks, allowing them to continue to credibly lead the world in opening global markets. Successful conclusion of the current WTO round of negotiations would also expand economic opportunity and economic freedom and promote prosperity for all nations

# CCP Collapse Impact

( ) Agricultural subsidies are the primary cause of rising global food prices

Mitchell ‘8

[Don - senior economist at the World Bank. Prior to joining the World Bank, he was an Associate Professor of Agricultural Economics at Michigan State University. Mr. Mitchell holds a Ph.D. from Iowa State University in Agricultural Economics. July  “A Note on Rising Food Prices”//GBS-JV]

The increase in internationally traded food prices from January 2002 to June 2008 was caused by a confluence of factors, but the most important was the large increase in biofuels production from grains and oilseeds in the U.S. and EU. Without these increases, global wheat and maize stocks would **not have declined** appreciably and price increases due to other factors **would have been moderate**. Land use changes in wheat exporting countries in response to increased plantings of oilseeds for biodiesel production limited expansion of wheat production that could have otherwise prevented the large declines in global wheat stocks and the resulting rise in wheat prices. The rapid rise in oilseed prices was caused mostly by demand for biodiesel production in response to incentives provided by policy changes in the EU beginning in 2001 and in the U.S. beginning in 2004. The large increase in rice prices was largely a response to the increase in wheat prices rather than to changes in rice production or stocks, and was thus indirectly related to the increase in biofuels. Recent export bans on grains and speculative activity would probably **not have occurred** without the large price increases due to biofuels production because they were largely responses to rising prices. Higher energy and fertilizer prices would have still increased crop production costs by about 15-20 percentage points in the U.S. and lesser amounts in countries with less intensive production practices. The backto- back droughts in Australia would not have had a large impact because they only reduced global grain exports by about 4 percent and other exporters would normally have been able to offset this loss. The decline of the dollar has contributed about 20 percentage points to the rise in dollar food prices. Thus, the combination of higher energy prices and related increases in fertilizer prices and transport costs, and dollar weakness caused food prices to rise by about 35-40 percentage points from January 2002 until June 2008. These factors explain 25-30 percent of the total price increase, and most of the remaining **70-75 percent** increase in food commodities prices was due to biofuels and the related consequences of low grain stocks, large land use shifts, speculative activity and export bans. It is difficult, if not impossible, to compare these estimates with estimates from other studies because of different methodologies, widely different time periods considered, different prices compared, and different food products examined, however most other studies have also recognized biofuels production as a major factor driving food prices. The increase in grain consumption in developing countries has been moderate and did not lead to large price increases. Growth in global grain consumption (excluding biofuels) was only 1.7 percent per annum from 2000 to 2007, while yields grew by 1.3 percent and area grew by 0.4 percent, which would have kept global demand and supply roughly in balance. This was slower than growth during 1995-2000 when wheat, rice and maize consumption increased by 1.4, 1.4 and 2.6 percent per annum, respectively. The large increases in biofuels production in the U.S. and EU were supported by subsidies, mandates, and tariffs on imports. Without these policies, biofuels production would have been lower and food commodity price increases would have been smaller. Biofuels production from sugar cane in Brazil is lower-cost than biofuels production in the U.S. or EU and has not raised sugar prices significantly because sugar cane production has grown fast enough to meet both the demand for sugar and ethanol. Removing tariffs on ethanol imports in the U.S. and EU would allow more efficient producers such as Brazil and other developing countries, including many African countries, to produce ethanol profitably for export to meet the mandates in the U.S. and EU. Biofuels policies which subsidize production need to be reconsidered in light of their impact on food prices.

( ) Those high food prices will unite dissidents and destabilize China

Coonan ‘8

[Cliff. The Independent, 3/12/8 ln//GBS-JV]

But for now, food prices remain the primary concern. The breakdown of the inflation data makes for grim reading in a country where food is a **national obsession**. Pork prices soared 63 per cent from a year earlier, vegetables climbed 46 per cent, and edible oil rose 41 per cent, adding to the burden on the 300 million people that the World Bank reckons are still living below the poverty line in China. A street seller in Baodingin Hebei province, using atraditional Chinese weighing scales to weigh out oranges, tells of how she has seen a sharp rise in fruit prices. "Prices have trebled in a year, it's tough enough. People want fruit obviously, but they really have to pay for it," says the fruit merchant, who wears a bright orange jacket and gives her surname only, Zhang. A nearby food-stall owner, who smoothes the batter for a traditional bing pancake on to a hot plate with admirable dexterity, says he has the same problems. Food is getting expensive in China, especially if it comes from far away. Further down the crowded streets of the town, a vegetable seller says one jin (a Chinese measure for half a kilo) of green peppers will cost four yuan (28p), which is double what they cost a year previously. The peppers come from southern China, and the prices have been driven up since the coldest winter in half a century back in January meant moving goods around the country became a difficult proposition. Eastern and southern China were blasted by the blizzards and supply is only getting back to normal now. "The mushrooms are local, so they do quite well, but a lot of people cannot afford to eat these foods from the south, especially laid-off factory workers," said the stall-holder, who comes from Henan province and is surnamed Chang. Inflation has led to social unrest in China historically. It was dissatisfaction with prices spiralling out of control after the Second World War that led to strikes and social instability, which ultimately led to the **failure of the Nationalist** KMT **leader** Chiang Kai-shek **to assert control** after the end of the war. While the demonstrations in Beijing and other cities in China in 1989 are generally linked in the popular imagination to the student pro-democracy movement, it was soaring grain prices over the course of the late 1980s that **mobilised** many factory workers and peasants in China to **join** in the anti-government wave.

( ) CCP collapse causes extinction

Renxing ‘5

[Staffer for the EPOCH Times. “The CCP’s Last-Ditch Gamble: Biological and Nuclear War” 8 Aug 05. Lexis//JVOSS]

In any event, we, the CCP, will never step down from the stage of history! We’d rather have the whole world, or even the entire globe, share life and death with us than step down from the stage of history!!! Isn’t there a ‘nuclear bondage’ theory? It means that since the nuclear weapons have bound the security of the entire world, all will die together if death is inevitable. In my view, there is another kind of bondage, and that is, the fate our Party is tied up with that of the whole world. If we, the CCP, are finished, China will be finished, and the world will be finished.” 3) “It is indeed brutal to kill one or two hundred million Americans. But that is the only path that will secure a Chinese century, a century in which the CCP leads the world. We, as revolutionary humanitarians, do not want deaths. But if history confronts us with a choice between deaths of Chinese and those of Americans, we’d have to pick the latter, as, for us, it is more important to safeguard the lives of the Chinese people and the life of our Party. That is because, after all, we are Chinese and members of the CCP. Since the day we joined the CCP, the Party’s life has always been above all else!” Since the Party’s life is “above all else,” it would not be surprising if the CCP resorts to the use of biological, chemical, and nuclear weapons in its attempt to extend its life. The CCP, which disregards human life, would not hesitate to kill two hundred million Americans, along with seven or eight hundred million Chinese, to achieve its ends. These speeches let the public see the CCP for what it really is. With evil filling its every cell the CCP intends to wage a war against humankind in its desperate attempt to cling to life. That is the main theme of the speeches. This theme is murderous and utterly evil. In China we have seen beggars who coerced people to give them money by threatening to stab themselves with knives or pierce their throats with long nails. But we have never, until now, seen such a gangster who would use biological, chemical, and nuclear weapons to threaten the world, that all will die together with him. This bloody confession has confirmed the CCP’s nature: that of a monstrous murderer who has killed 80 million Chinese people and who now plans to hold one billion people hostage and gamble with their lives.

# Ext—China

( ) More evidence – experts conclude that subsidies are the driving factor behind high food prices

Boston Herald ‘8

[The Boston Herald. “UN Expert Faults US, EU Biofuel Use in Food Crisis” 9/10/8, ln//GBS-JV]

A United Nations expert said Wednesday that recent studies indicate that U.S. and European Union targets for biofuel production by their grain farmers have been the biggest cause of the world food crisis. Olivier de Schutter, a Belgian professor, also said an international monitor may be needed to supervise the production of energy sources such as ethanol, which may end up being less beneficial to the environment than expected, even as they cause global food prices to rise. Citing various reports, he said biofuel production targets outlined by the United States and European Union have led to increased speculation on agricultural land and commodities, and diverted cropland and feed away from food production. He said the International Monetary Fund estimated that 70 percent of the rise in corn prices was due to biofuels, with 40 percent for soybeans. The World Bank, de Schutter added, concluded that biofuels from grains and oilseed in the U.S. and EU were responsible for up to 75 percent of changes in commodity prices. "There is a consensus that these initiatives have had a significant impact," said de Schutter, who reports to the 47-nation U.N. Human Rights Council. His message to Washington and Brussels: "They should without further delay revise their policies."

( ) Subsidy price inflation is not limited – they drive up the cost of all foods globally

Runge and Senauer ‘7

[C. Ford,- prof of Econ and Law @ U of Minnesota Benhamin, Prof of Econ @ U of Minnesota “How Biofuels could Starve the Poor” Foreign Affairs, June 2007 ln//GBS-JV]

Now, thanks to a combination of high oil prices and even more generous government subsidies, corn-based ethanol has become the rage. There were 110 ethanol refineries in operation in the United States at the end of 2006, according to the Renewable Fuels Association. Many were being expanded, and another 73 were under construction. When these projects are completed, by the end of 2008, the United States' ethanol production capacity will reach an estimated 11.4 billion gallons per year. In his latest State of the Union address, President George W. Bush called on the country to produce 35 billion gallons of renewable fuel a year by 2017, nearly five times the level currently mandated. The push for ethanol and other biofuels has spawned an industry that depends on billions of dollars of taxpayer subsidies, and not only in the United States. In 2005, global ethanol production was 9.66 billion gallons, of which Brazil produced 45.2 percent (from sugar cane) and the United States 44.5 percent (from corn). Global production of biodiesel (most of it in Europe), made from oilseeds, was almost one billion gallons. The industry's growth has meant that a larger and larger share of corn production is being used to feed the huge mills that produce ethanol. According to some estimates, ethanol plants will burn up to half of U.S. domestic corn supplies within a few years. Ethanol demand will bring 2007 inventories of corn to their lowest levels since 1995 (a drought year), even though 2006 yielded the third-largest corn crop on record. Iowa may soon become a net corn importer. The enormous volume of corn required by the ethanol industry is sending shock waves through the food system. (The United States accounts for some 40 percent of the world's total corn production and over half of all corn exports.) In March 2007, corn futures rose to over $4.38 a bushel, the highest level in ten years. Wheat and rice prices have also surged to decade highs, because even as those grains are increasingly being used as substitutes for corn, farmers are planting more acres with corn and fewer acres with other crops. This might sound like nirvana to corn producers, but it is hardly that for consumers, especially in poor developing countries, who will be hit with a double shock if both food prices and oil prices stay high. The World Bank has estimated that in 2001, 2.7 billion people in the world were living on the equivalent of less than $2 a day; to them, even marginal increases in the cost of staple grains could be devastating. Filling the 25-gallon tank of an SUV with pure ethanol requires over 450 pounds of corn -- which contains enough calories to feed one person for a year. By putting pressure on global supplies of edible crops, the surge in ethanol production will translate into higher prices for both processed and staple foods around the world. Biofuels have tied oil and food prices together in ways that could profoundly upset the relationships between food producers, consumers, and nations in the years ahead, with potentially devastating implications for both global poverty and food security.

###  AT//High Food Prices Good

( ) High food prices can only be good when they’re stable – subsidies invite price volatility

Hamilton ‘7

[James. Research Advisor at the Federal Reserve and Prof Econ @ UC – San Diego. “Ethanol and Food Price Volatility” [www.econbrowser.com](http://www.econbrowser.com), 7/22/7 //GBS-JV]

American consumers are starting to see some of the consequences of our ill -fated ethanol policy in the prices of everything from meat to ice cream. While well-fed Americans may gripe, the implications for those in sub-Saharan Africa are quite alarming. All of these concerns arise from the higher average price of corn that necessarily results from an increase in the use of the corn crop for ethanol production. But another issue well worth considering is the effect on the volatility of corn prices. Food prices naturally are quite volatile because unpredictable and uncontrollable variation in weather can produce a bumper crop one year and a big shortfall the next. Usually consumers are able to mitigate somewhat the consequences of the volatility of supply by switching between foods depending on what is most cheap or expensive at the moment. However, whereas the demand for food is relatively price elastic, the demand for gasoline is quite inelastic. If the quantity of ethanol demanded does not fall much when there is a bad crop, the quantity of corn used for all other purposes must make an even bigger proportional adjustment. For example, if 1/2 of our corn crop were devoted to ethanol production and ethanol demand were completely price inelastic, a 10% reduction in corn production would require a 20% reduction in use of corn for other purposes. A recent analysis by University of Illinois Professors Darrel Good and Scott Irwin notes that over the last half-century, corn-production shortfalls as big as 30% are not that uncommon. Very inelastic demand means that having a stable, reliable source for fuel is a very high priority for consumers. Having the supply for such a commodity depend on something as volatile as U.S. corn production does not seem like such a brilliant idea.

( ) More evidence – price volatility erases any potential benefit of high food prices

Henriques ‘8

[Diana. Financial Investigative Reporter. “Price Volatility Adds to Worry on US Farms” The NYT, 4/22/8 ln//GBS-JV]

Mr. Grieder, 49, is shy about complaining amid so much prosperity. Prices for his crops are soaring on the updraft of growing worldwide demand, and a weak dollar is making the crops more competitive in global markets. But today’s crop prices are not just much higher, they also are much more volatile. For example, a widely used measure of volatility showed that traders in March expected wheat prices to swing up or down by more than 72 percent in the coming year, three times the average volatility for that month and the highest level since at least 1980. The price swing expected in March for soy beans was three times its monthly average, and the expected volatility in corn prices was twice its monthly average. Those wild swings in expected prices are damaging the mechanisms — like futures contracts and options — that in the past have cushioned the jolts of farming, turning already-busy farmers into reluctant day traders and part-time lobbyists. One measure of the farming industry’s frustration is the overflow crowd expected at a public forum on Tuesday at the Commodity Futures Trading Commission in Washington. Interest is so high that the commission, for the first time ever, will provide a Webcast of the forum, which it says is being held to gather information about whether crucial markets for hedging the price of crops “are properly performing their risk management and price discovery roles.” The Webcast link is available on the commission’s Web site, www.cftc.gov. The additional costs that stem from volatility in grain prices — higher crop insurance premiums, for example — are not just a problem for farmers. “Eventually, those costs are going to come out of the pockets of the American consumer,” said William P. Jackson, general manager of AGRIServices, a grain-elevator complex on the Missouri River. Prices of broad commodity indexes have climbed as much as 40 percent in the last year and grain prices have gained even more — about 65 percent for corn, 91 percent for soybeans and more than 100 percent for some types of wheat. This price boom has attracted a torrent of new investment from Wall Street, estimated to be as much as $300 billion. Whether new investors are causing the market’s problems or keeping them from getting worse is in dispute. But there is no question that the grain markets are now experiencing levels of volatility that are running well above the average levels over the last quarter-century. Mr. Grieder’s crop insurance premiums rise with the volatility. So does the cost of trading in options, which is the financial tool he has used to hedge against falling prices. Some grain elevators are coping with the volatility and hedging problems by refusing to buy crops in advance, foreclosing the most common way farmers lock in prices. “The system is really beginning to break down,” Mr. Grieder said. “When you see elevators start pulling their bids for your crop, that tells me we’ve got a real problem.”

###  AT//Your Ev All About Corn

( ) Yes – corn subsidies drive up the price of food globally – the new farm bill erases those subsidies – that was our 1NC Wasson evidence.

( ) Subsidies generally cause high food prices – regardless of corn’s particular effect

Griswold ‘6

[Dan. Dir of the Center for Trade Studies @ CATO. “Congress Milks Taxpayers Dry” [www.freetrade.org](http://www.freetrade.org), September 2006//GBS-JV]

Trade barriers and domestic price supports also force tens of millions of families to pay higher food prices. According to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, U.S. farm programs transferred an average of $10.5 billion a year from U.S. food consumers to producers from 2003 through 2005. That amounts to an annual food tax of $140 for a family of four -- a regressive tax that falls most heavily on poor families that spend a larger share of their budgets on food. Artificially high food prices also drive up production costs for the U.S. food processing firms, reducing their competitiveness and jeopardizing jobs. A recent report from the U.S. Commerce Department shows that import quotas have cost thousands of American jobs in sugar-using industries. Tens of thousands of U.S. bakeries, restaurants, and other businesses suffer lost sales and reduced profitability because of artificially high prices they must pay for food commodities.

# Bio Diversity Impact

( ) The new farm bill is vital to protect American biodiversity

AL 6-1

[Argus Leader. [http://www.argusleader.com/article/20120601/NEWS/306010035/Farm-bill-might-add-habitat-help 6/1/12](http://www.argusleader.com/article/20120601/NEWS/306010035/Farm-bill-might-add-habitat-help%206/1/12) //GBS-JV]

The next federal farm bill could discourage farmers from planting crops on unbroken soil. Sen. John Thune and Rep. Kristi Noem are supporting so-called “sodsaver” legislation that would reduce federal payments on land that never has been farmed before. Farmers wouldn’t be banned from breaking new ground but would have to endure lower federal support if they did. Noem said Thursday that the goal is to “promote conservation of habitats for pheasants, ducks and other game species on native sod and grasslands.”

( ) Extinction is a hidden threshold

Diner ‘94

[David. Judge Advocate in the US Army. The Military Law Review, 1994 ln]

No species has ever dominated its fellow species as man has. In most cases, people have assumed the God-like power of life and death -- extinction or survival -- over the plants and animals of the world. For most of history, mankind pursued this domination with a single-minded determination to master the world, tame the wilderness, and exploit nature for the maximum benefit of the human race. n67 In past mass extinction episodes, as many as ninety percent of the existing species perished, and yet the world moved forward, and new species replaced the old. So why should the world be concerned now? The prime reason is the world's survival. Like all animal life, humans live off of other species. At some point, the number of species could decline to the point at which the ecosystem fails, and then humans also would become extinct***.*** No one knows how many [\*171] species the world needs to support human life, and to find out -- by allowing certain species to become extinct -- would not be sound policy. In addition to food, species offer many direct and indirect benefits to mankind. n68 2. Ecological Value. -- Ecological value is the value that species have in maintaining the environment. Pest, n69 erosion, and flood control are prime benefits certain species provide to man. Plants and animals also provide additional ecological services -- pollution control, n70 oxygen production, sewage treatment, and biodegradation. n71 3. Scientific and Utilitarian Value. -- Scientific value is the use of species for research into the physical processes of the world. n72 Without plants and animals, a large portion of basic scientific research would be impossible. Utilitarian value is the direct utility humans draw from plants and animals. n73 Only a fraction of the [\*172] earth's species have been examined, and mankind may someday desperately need the species that it is exterminating today. To accept that the snail darter, harelip sucker, or Dismal Swamp southeastern shrew n74 could save humankind may be difficult for some. Many, if not most, species are useless to man in a direct utilitarian sense. Nonetheless, they may be critical in an indirect role, because their extirpations could affect a directly useful species negatively. In a closely interconnected ecosystem, the loss of a species affects other species dependent on it. n75 Moreover, as the number of species decline, the effect of each new extinction on the remaining species increases dramatically. n76 4. Biological Diversity. -- The main premise of species preservation is that diversity is better than simplicity. n77 As the current mass extinction has progressed, the world's biological diversity generally has decreased. This trend occurs within ecosystems by reducing the number of species, and within species by reducing the number of individuals. Both trends carry serious future implications. Biologically diverse ecosystems are characterized by a large number of specialist species, filling narrow ecological niches. These ecosystems inherently are more stable than less diverse systems. "The more complex the ecosystem, the more successfully it can resist a stress. . . . [l]ike a net, in which each knot is connected to others by several strands, such a fabric can resist collapse better than a simple, unbranched circle of threads -- which if cut anywhere breaks down as a whole." n79 By causing widespread extinctions, humans have artificially simplified many ecosystems. As biologic simplicity increases, so does the risk of ecosystem failure. The spreading Sahara Desert in Africa, and the dustbowl conditions of the 1930s in the United States are relatively mild examples of what might be expected if this trend continues. Theoretically, each new animal or plant extinction, with all its dimly perceived and intertwined affects, could cause total ecosystem collapse and human extinction. Each new extinction increases the risk of disaster. Like a mechanic removing, one by one, the rivets from an aircraft's wings, mankind may be edging closer to the abyss.

# Ext—Bio D

( ) Subsidies destroy biodiversity – they are an incentive to over-farm

Borders and Burnett ‘6

[Max and Hank – Scholars with the National Center for Policy Analysis. “Farm Subsidies: Devastating the World’s Poor and the Enrivonment”, [www.ncpa.org](http://www.ncpa.org), March 2006//GBS-JV]

In addition, wildlife populations in developing countries are devastated as an indirect result of agricultural subsidies. At current prices, poaching often provides more revenue than farming and wildlife is frequently seen as competition for land and a threat to crops. Furthermore, farmers are often unable to afford fertilizers and pesticides that increase the available yield from a given amount of land — thus they must use more and more land just for subsistence agriculture.

#  AT//Doesn’t End Corn Subsidies

( ) The new farm bill ends subsidies for corn

Rogers 5-31

[David. Staffer for Politico. 5/31/12 ln//GBS-JV]

Armed with new data and an old playbook, environmentalists are taking aim at the crop insurance industry, seeking to bolster the case for a cap on premium subsidies when the Senate farm bill hits the floor in June. At issue are government-backed premium discounts designed to make the insurance more affordable to farmers. While not truly cash subsidies, the costs have soared in recent years and fit neatly into the environmental narrative that Washington is too quick to help large-scale farm production at the expense of investments in conservation and the land itself. The Environmental Working Group, which successfully waged a similar campaign to end direct cash payments to farmers, is again taking the lead. On Thursday, the group released a wealth of new cost data gleaned from Freedom of Information requests filed with the Risk Management Agency, which oversees the multibillion-dollar program. The names of the individual policyholders remain shielded by law, but the numbers offer the most complete picture yet of the distribution of benefits under the current system. In 26 cases, policyholders received an annual discount — carried on the government’s books — of $1 million or more in 2011. In 10,152 cases, it was $100,000 or more, while the vast majority of farmers received far smaller discounts averaging closer to $5,000. “The eye-opening analysis shows crop insurance is not only very expensive,” said Craig Cox, EWG’s senior vice president of agriculture and natural resources, “but also very, very generous to large and highly profitable farm businesses**.” Corn**, soybeans, wheat and cotton are among the leading beneficiaries, just as they dominate American agriculture. At the same time, fruit and vegetable growers, which account for about one-fifth of farm receipts, are disproportionately represented since their crops tend to be high priced and therefore more likely subject to higher premiums.

#  AT//Agriculture-based Impact Turns

( ) Agricultural subsidies aren’t key to anything – the farm bill is vital to the health of the agriculture industry

WFP 6-8

[The Western Farm Press. 6/8/12 http://westernfarmpress.com/government/farm-bill-looking-good-next-generation-farmers//GBS-JV]

Ben LaCross, a young fruit grower and Farm Bureau member from Michigan, urged Congress to pass the Senate Agriculture Committee-passed farm bill this year. Speaking at a press event on Capitol Hill on behalf of the American Farm Bureau Federation, LaCross said without the bill, crop losses could be catastrophic, especially for beginning and young farmers. LaCross said that due to various weather conditions impacting farms this year, his state has lost an estimated 90 percent of its apple crop, 85 percent of its grapes, 95 percent of its peaches and 85 percent of its cherries. "If the committee's farm bill were in existence today, I would have the opportunity to cover more of my crops under crop insurance, using new programs that would provide better coverage at a lower cost," said LaCross. "It would also provide the ability to use more realistic production numbers by increasing the 'yield plug' in years like this one, when my production is going to be almost zero. Importantly, the bill also increases crop insurance assistance to beginning farmers. "In a normal year, my farm would produce 4 million pounds of cherries. This year, we will be lucky to harvest 40,000 pounds-only 1 percent of my normal production," continued LaCross. "Crop insurance helps keep families like mine in business." The Senate farm bill also continues the Beginning Farmer and Rancher Development Program, which offers education, training, outreach and mentoring programs to ensure the success of the next generation of farmers. Further, it increases access to capital and prioritizes the needs of beginning farmers to ensure they have access to programs like the Environmental Quality Incentives Program-a program that is critical to farmers and ranchers striving to be good stewards of the land and trying to meet tough environmental mandates. Lastly, the bill encourages older farmers to help beginning farmers get started in the business by providing two extra years of Conservation Reserve Program participation to retiring farmers who transition their expiring CRP land to beginning farmers. "The Senate Agriculture Committee's 2012 farm bill legislation would be very helpful to me personally and other fruit and vegetable producers in Michigan," said LaCross. "But, more importantly, it is a good bill for young and beginning farmers and ranchers."

#  AT//Economy Impact Turns

( ) Your impact is about the global economy – subsidies are worse for the global economy because they perpetuate poverty and prevent growth

Borders and Burnett ‘6

[Max and Hank – Scholars with the National Center for Policy Analysis. “Farm Subsidies: Devastating the World’s Poor and the Enrivonment”, [www.ncpa.org](http://www.ncpa.org), March 2006//GBS-JV]

 Every dollar, yen or euro poured into the agriculture sectors of rich nations makes developing countries' farm sectors that much less competitive. The "dumping" of agricultural commodities at prices lower than the cost of production is devastating to developing countries, since most depend almost entirely on only one or a few products. Every year, farm subsidies cost developing countries about $24 billion in lost agricultural income. Cotton is an excellent example: World cotton prices have fallen by half since the mid-1990s and, adjusted for inflation, are now lower than at any time since the Great Depression of the 1930s. Despite the plunge in prices, cotton production in the United States grew 42 percent between 1998 and 2001. Due to subsidies, American cotton farmers receive up to 73 percent more than the world market price for their crop. To compensate for falling prices, U.S. cotton subsidies have doubled since 1992, and in 2001-2002 America's 25,000 cotton farmers received a $230 subsidy for every acre of cotton planted — a total of $3.9 billion. By comparison, wheat and maize subsidies amount to $40 to $50 per acre.

( ) Subsidies also crush the US economy – they manipulate the market to create inefficiencies

Edwards ‘7

[Chris. Dir of Tax Studies @ CATO. “Agricultural Subsidies” [www.cato.org](http://www.cato.org), June 2007//GBS-JV]

2. Farm Subsidies Damage the Economy. The extent of federal micromanagement of the agriculture sector is probably unique in America industry. In most industries, market prices balance supply and demand, profit levels signal investment opportunities, market downturns lead to cost cutting, and entrepreneurs innovate to provide better products at lower prices. All of those market mechanisms are blunted or nonexistent in government-controlled agriculture markets. As a result, federal agriculture policies produce substantial "deadweight losses" and reduced American incomes. Farm programs result in overproduction, overuse of marginal farmland, and land price inflation, which results from subsidies being capitalized in land values. Subsidy programs create less efficient planting, induce excess borrowing by farmers, cause insufficient attention to cost control, and result in less market innovation. And policies often work against the claimed goals of Congress. As an example, while members of Congress say that they support small farms, owners of large farms receive the largest subsidies, and that has given them the financing they need to merge with and acquire smaller farms.23 In 2006 the Congressional Budget Office reviewed major studies that examined repeal of U.S. and foreign agriculture subsidies and trade barriers.24 The CBO found that all the studies they reviewed showed that both the U.S. and global economies would gain from the repeal of subsidies and trade barriers.

#  AT//Rural Ag / “Family Farms” Impact-Turns

( ) Their impact turn presupposes that nothing would fill the void after subsidies are repealed – this is incorrect – our 1NC Wasson evidence describes the new farm bill and says that crop insurance would be used as an efficient substitute for subsidies – family farms *wouldn’t* be put out of business because the government would still insure them against bad yields

( ) Now, current subsidies don’t even go to small farms – 98% of the time, they go to corporate agriculture

Griswold ‘6

[Dan. Dir of the Center for Trade Studies @ CATO. “Congress Milks Taxpayers Dry” [www.freetrade.org](http://www.freetrade.org), September 2006//GBS-JV]

A hearing in the House Agricultural Committee last week highlighted everything wrong with U.S. farm policy. In preparation for writing the 2007 farm bill, House members heard from 17 witnesses representing every possible farm lobby --from cotton to corn, sugar to potatoes, rice to eggs, and sorghum -- but not a single spokesperson for the interests of the American people as a whole. Fewer than two percent of Americans farm for a living, and only a third of those farmers receive subsidies. Yet the interests of subsidized and protected farmers dominate every farm bill discussion in Washington. The broader interests of the United States and the other 98 percent of Americans are systematically ignored. The biggest losers from U.S. farm policy are taxpayers. From 2000 to 2005, Congress spent an average of $17 billion a year in direct payments to farmers. That's real money, even in Washington. Most of those payments did not go to small "family farms," but to large operations and agribusinesses, including some Fortune 500 companies. Indeed, according to the Environmental Working Group, the top 10 percent of recipients collected two-thirds of the payments on offer, and the top 5 percent collected 55 percent.

( ) The subsidizing of corporate agriculture allows big agriculture to crush small farms – removing them helps rural agriculture

Reidl ‘7

[Brian M., Grover M. Hermann Fellow in Federal Budgetary Affairs in the Thomas A. Roe Institute Foundation, “How Farm Subsidies Harm Taxpayers, Consumers, and Farmers, Too” [http://www.heritage.org/Research/Agriculture/bg2134.cfmhttp://www.heritage.org/Research/Agriculture/bg2134.cfm](http://www.heritage.org/Research/Agriculture/bg2134.cfm) 2007//GBS-JV]

Farm subsidies are intended to raise farmer incomes by making up for low crop prices. Instead, subsidies promote overproduction, lowering prices even further. Expensive pro­grams to restrict plantings are then imple­mented to raise prices again. Ethanol mandates raise prices further. Farm subsidies are intended to help struggling family farmers. Instead, they harm those farmers by excluding them from most subsidies; financ­ing the consolidation of small, individually owned farms into business conglomerates; and raising land values to levels that prevent young people from entering farming. Farm subsidies allegedly are intended to be con­sumer- and taxpayer-friendly, but they cost Americans billions of dollars each year in higher taxes and higher food costs. The farm bill does not address any of these short­comings. Washington would continue to spend approximately $25 billion annually to subsidize a small, elite group of farmers through policies that do nothing to help the farm economy.

# AFF answers\*\*\*\*\*

### Farm Bill Fails

#### **The Farm Bill is overstated and mistargetted—welfare dooms its success**

Graves 6/27, [Rep Tom Graves (GA), http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/economy-a-budget/235179-a-vote-for-senate-farm-bill- is-a-vote-to-grow-government, The Hill’s Congress Blog, “A vote for Senate Farm Bill is a vote to grow government”]

Last week, **the U.S. Senate passed their version of the “Not-So-Farm Bill” because the current authorization is scheduled to expire on September 30, 2012. The Senate’s version is a bad deal for the American taxpayer because it means that Congress** **is preparing to take more of your money and hand it out to friends and cronies**. They called this bill the “Agriculture Reform, Food and Jobs Act of 2012.” **“Food” and “2012” are the only non-deceptive words in the title.** The first clue this bill was bad news was the enthusiastic reaction from the Obama Administration, which noted that it “makes meaningful progress toward the administration’s goals.” This should be a red flag to anyone paying attention. **The administration’s goals include increased “flexibility” in the delivery of international food aid, funding bio-energy programs, and rejecting any reductions in food stamp benefits. Most of those goals have little or nothing to do with helping farmers or encouraging fundamental agriculture research**. Simply put, **the modern day Farm Bill, as conceived by the Senate, is hardly about farmers anymore. It’s now about welfare.** The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office concluded in its latest budget estimates that, beginning in 2010, more than 80 percent of all spending from the Farm Bill will go towards domestic food assistance. **The primary recipient of that money is the food stamp program, now known as the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP). While SNAP has helped many struggling families, this program also makes it a SNAP to fraudulently abuse taxpayer dollars.** Do a web search for “food stamp fraud,” if you can stomach it. It gets worse.The past three Farm Bills authorized wasteful energy grants, loans, and subsidies – beyond what the Department of Energy already hands out. Not only are these programs duplicative, but they have the potential to be mini Solyndras. For example, the Biomass Crop Assistance Program, from the 2008 Farm Bill, was supposed to cost taxpayers $70 million over five years. But, in true Washington style, it ended up draining the Treasury of more than $500 million in the first year**. This program is supposed to end in 2012. Yet even with its obvious failures and skyrocketing costs, the Senate Farm Bill resurrects this clunker of a program and adds another $174 million in spending. If these alternative energies are to work in the long run, they must rise on their own two feet and stand the test of innovation and free market demand.** We cannot constantly nurse these selective programs at the taxpayers’ expense so they keep coming back for more of your money. It’s clear the Senate trotted down the road to ruin with a Farm Bill that proves to be a home-state, A vote for Senate Farm Bill is a vote to grow government - **The bring-home-the-bacon bill. It’s clearly not about fiscal sanity or reality. Apart from fostering continued dependence on the federal government, the Senate Farm Bill drastically undermines the fiscal foundations of the U.S. government and ignores our nearly $16 trillion national debt.** If the Senate Bill’s actual price tag increases by the same percentage as the 2008 Farm Bill (a likely scenario), then during the next ten years, it would end up costing American taxpayers nearly $1.4 trillion. The Obama Administration said the Farm Bill should reduce the deficit, and I agree. But, the Senate version of the Farm Bill fails miserably to meet this objective. Senators know what they have done, and are well aware of the projected versus actual costs. Yet, the Senate and the administration continue to push funny math on the American people and cross their fingers that nobody is watching. **A vote for the Senate Farm Bill is a vote to grow the size and reach of the federal bureaucracy, to increase cronyism and dependence on the government, and to raid the Treasury in a manner in which we simply cannot afford. With the bill so far from the core functions and roles of the federal government, such a vote would be philosophically wrong, intellectually dishonest, and politically suicidal**. If the Republicans in the House, who won the majority on the basis of limiting the size, scope, and spending of the federal government, vote for anything resembling the Senate version of the Farm Bill, voters should send them home. Graves is a member of the House Appropriations Committee.

#### Turn—the farm bill will weaken the agriculture industry and unnecessarily boost taxes to the public to help a program already swimming in profits

Chicago Tribune, 5/26 [“Growing profits ... Crop insurance has become a taxpayer ripoff”, <http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2012-05-26/news/ct-edit-crop-20120526_1_crop-insurance-free-insurance-farm-bill>,]

**It's hard to imagine a duller subject than crop insurance, and that suits the farm lobby just fine. If the facts about the billions of taxpayer dollars being wasted on this boondoggle were widely known, no one would stand for it.** Perhaps because it's poorly understood, crop insurance is on the verge of being expanded in the 2012 Farm Bill**. Lawmakers evidently see it as a way to stuff more money into the pockets of favored constituents whose pockets already are overflowing.** Unlike practically every other sector of the economy, farming is awash in profits. **The embarrassment of riches has made it difficult to justify any of the usual farm subsidies, especially in light of runaway budget deficits. Big agriculture and its supporters have settled on crop insurance as the means to keep federal dollars flowing**. It's not too late to stop it. You might assume that crop insurance is designed to insure farmers against a poor crop. Not so. **More than 80 percent of crop insurance protects farm revenues, regardless of crop yields. No drought or flood or plague of locusts is required for the policies to pay off.**  A farm might have a bumper crop, but if commodity prices fall short of its projections, it still could be eligible to collect on its crop insurance. **The coverage can be used to guarantee that these private businesses lock in a profit.** Any business would love insurance like that, but it would be unaffordable. It would be too expensive for farmers too, were it not for Uncle Sam. The federal government heavily subsidizes crop insurance. So **farmers sign up for top-of-the-line policies that cost much more than they would spend if they had to pay for it themselves**. Over the past decade, **taxpayers have committed $60 billion to crop insurance, according to an Iowa State University analysis. Of that money, about $30 billion was paid back to farmers who collected on their policies. The rest went to private insurance companies and their richly compensated agents**. So $1 is being siphoned off for every $1 in net benefits delivered. That amounts to a $30 billion windfall for the crop-insurance middleman. It came from you, taxpayers. You're being ripped off. The scale of the ripoff is growing year after year. In 2002, the federal government spent $1.7 billion on crop insurance premium subsidies. By 2011, it was spending $7.4 billion. **Crop insurance has become America's biggest farm subsidy.** Last month, the Senate Agriculture Committee approved a 2012 Farm Bill that would expand crop insurance. Among the goals: Cover the deductible that farmers now have to cover themselves before collecting on their policies, and add a new crop-insurance program for cotton growers. The Iowa State analysis showed that crop insurance already is so costly that it would be cheaper for taxpayers to give it away. We're not recommending that government give any business free insurance. But the facts reveal just how much money is being wasted**: By cutting out the middleman, the government could furnish every row-crop farmer in America with free insurance in the event yields fall short. The policies would not guarantee revenues. They would cover crop losses, at the full market price — providing the robust "safety net" that farmers claim is all they ever wanted.** Compared to the current system, handing out yield insurance would save taxpayers $6 billion over 10 years. It would deliver $5.6 billion more in benefits to producers over the same period, the Iowa State report calculated. **Besides wasting taxpayer money, agricultural subsidies like crop insurance distort the marketplace and ultimately** weaken American agriculture**.** When government shields an industry from the consequences of market forces, it creates what's called "moral hazard." We've seen it in banking: Traders were encouraged to make big bets that enriched them when they paid off, and led to federal bailouts when they didn't. **When crop insurance guarantees a profit on every planted acre, farmers face moral hazard too.** **The excessive coverage tends to reward poor land stewardship, conservation abuses and insurance fraud — problems that would barely exist if farmers had to personally bear more risk**. A few senators have proposed limits on crop insurance, including Sen. Dick Durbin, the Illinois Democrat, and Sen. Tom Coburn, the Oklahoma Republican. They are expected to offer an amendment that would cap the total amount of premium subsidies a single farm would receive. We support their efforts, and urge lawmakers in the House, who are still formulating their version of the Farm Bill, **to do a better job protecting taxpayers and saving a pampered industry from itself.**

#### The Farm Bill and Farm Lobby takes from the poor to give to the rich

Hitt and Etter ‘8 [Lauren Etter and Greg Hitt, WSJ, 3/27/08,”Farm Lobby Beats Back Assault on Subsidies”, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB120657645419967077.html>]

**With grain prices soaring, farm income at record highs and the federal budget deficit widening, the subsidies and handouts given to American farmers would seem vulnerable to a serious pruning.** But it appears that **farmers, at least so far, have succeeded in stopping the strongest effort in years to shrink the government safety net that doles out billions of dollars to them each year**. "At some point, you have to step back and ask, **'Does this make sense for the American taxpayer?**'" says Rep. Ron Kind. The Democrat from Wisconsin sponsored a measure that would have slashed about $10 billion over five years in subsidies -- and saw it get crushed on the House floor. **Grain prices are on a tear this year.** On Wednesday, corn prices closed at $5.52 a bushel, up from about $2.20 in 2006, and near the all-time high of $5.70 set earlier this month. U.S. farm income, buoyed by demand for grain from rising middle classes around the globe and the biofuels industry, is projected to reach a record $92.3 billion this year**. Still, farmers are expected to collect $13 billion in federal subsidies this year, according to the U.S. Agriculture Department, including payments for commodities, land conservation and emergency assistance.** A little more than a year ago**, the stars appeared to be aligned for significant changes to the complex piece of legislation known as the farm bill, which allots billions of dollars to farmers and landowners to help stabilize grain prices, make products more competitive abroad and provide a plentiful food supply.** President Bush wanted to cut subsidies. California Rep. Nancy Pelosi, who had backed a high-profile effort to reshape the system in 2002, had become House Speaker. And a broad coalition of advocacy groups was assembling to press lawmakers. But now serious reform is likely to be left behind like corn husks flung from a combine. As Congress tries to finish writing the new farm bill, the final tab is likely to be larger than the 2002 bill, which totaled more than $260 billion. **How did it happen? Influential interest groups -- which had toyed with supporting changes -- cut deals to get their own piece of the action. Lawmakers who supported an overhaul peeled off as the debate moved into the election year.** Historical alliances between rural and urban lawmakers proved difficult to untie. [chart] The agribusiness industry plowed more than $80 million into lobbying last year, according to the nonprofit Center for Responsive Politics, which tracks spending on lobbying. Much of that was focused on the farm bill. **"We got rolled," says Rep. Paul Ryan, a Wisconsin Republican who worked closely with Rep. Kind. "The agriculture community circled the wagons**." Farmers and their allies in Congress say a victory is all to the good because the bill, which is typically renewed every five years, is designed to provide farmers with a safety net through cycles of boom and bust. The heady times of the 1970s, when crop prices soared as the Soviet Union gobbled up American grain, devolved into the farm crisis of the 1980s, leaving farmers buried in debt. "We all know with the good times will come times that are less fortunate than now," says Dale Hadden, a grain farmer in Jacksonville, Ill., who recently traveled to Washington to talk with lawmakers about farm policy. The farm bill has its roots in the Great Depression, when about a quarter of the U.S. population lived on farms and endured extraordinary economic hardship. As first conceived in the 1930s, the bill was designed to be a temporary boost to farm income. It has since evolved into a thicket of hard-to-cut programs, providing payments and special loans to farmers to counteract swings in commodity prices and ensure market stability, as well as income. Subsidies flow to growers of corn, wheat and cotton, among other commodities. **The legislation has also become a vehicle for funding food stamps, land conservation and school lunches, to name a few things, attracting supporters whose constituents have little or nothing to do with farms. [photo] Minnesota Corn Growers Association Collin Peterson (D., Minn.) and Nancy Pelosi (D., Calif.) in August 2006 with Curt Watson, the former president of the Minnesota Corn Growers Association. That has helped create a powerful alliance that makes the farm bill difficult to challenge.** The bloc helps ensure all programs in the legislation live on, when they might be vulnerable if considered separately. The 2002 farm bill tab was one of the most expensive ever, with a yearly payout that roughly totaled what the federal government appropriates annually for the Education Department. Today, farmers make up less than 1% of the U.S. population, and agriculture production is dominated by large, industrial farms that have annual sales of $1 million or more. In 2006, average farm household income was $77,654, or about 17% more than average U.S. household income, according to the Department of Agriculture. Average farm household income is expected to be about $90,000 this year. Current law allows subsidies to farmers with annual adjusted gross income of as much as $2.5 million. "**If you're providing benefits to the wealthiest Americans, that's not a safety net," said Chuck Connor, deputy agriculture secretary and the Bush administration's lead farm-bill negotiator. "We felt that was fundamentally wrong."**

### Won’t Pass

#### **Won’t pass—amendments doom**

Karst, 6/14 [Tom Karst, The Packer, News Section, “Farm Bill Progress hits Snag”, <http://www.thepacker.com/fruit-vegetable-news/Farm-bill-progress-hits-snag-159062205.html> ]

**Lack of agreement among Senate Republican and Democratic leaders on how to slim down the list of nearly 300 amendments vying for attention in the 2012 farm bill could** kill the bill. “What’s happening right now is the leadership of the Senate Agriculture Committee are trying to some path toward getting amendments considered,” said Robert Guenther, senior vice president of public policy for the Washington, D.C.-based United Fresh Produce Association, Inclusion of amendments unrelated to the farm bill has hung up the bill, he said June 14. **Senators see the farm bill as one of the few opportunities to move legislation before the election.** “**We are at a snail’s pace and (leadership) is continuing to negotiate what kind of amendment will be considered**,” Guenther said. Guenther said if an agreement is not reached soon, the bill could risk being set aside. “They will just pull the bill and move forward,” he said. One source close to the agriculture committee, speaking on condition of anonymity, said leadership was making progress on an agreement on the amendments but a deal had not yet been reached. Guenther said the Specialty Crop Farm Bill Alliance is looking at various amendments that could affect fruits and vegetables. “We probably have 25 to 30 of those 300 we are looking at,” Guenther said. Some of those number are related to federal subsidies for crop insurance. Perhaps the most significant amendment is from Sen. Ron Johnson, R-Wis., that would change the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program for schools to allow processed produce, including frozen, canned and dried. Another amendment the alliance opposes seeks to reduce funding for the Market Access Program. Guenther said if the Senate does not pass the bill, it will likely take some of the steam out of House Agriculture Committee’s work on its version. **The fallback plan will be for lawmakers to extends the 2008 farm bill — which expires at the end of September — for some period of time. “Extension (of the farm bill) is not as easy as people think it is going to be in this Congress,” Guenther said.**

#### Farm bill won’t pass in House

Johnson 6/30 (2012, Ryan, staff writer Inforum “Peterson: House farm bill includes more cuts than Senate version” http://www.inforum.com/event/article/id/365955/group/News/)

The final details of the House’s 2012 farm bill were “settled” last Thursday in the Agriculture Committee, ranking Democrat and Minnesota Rep. Collin Peterson said Saturday. But during a news conference at the Hjemkomst Center, Peterson said the bill will contain “significantly more” funding cuts than the $23 billion already cut in the Senate version that passed June 21. While he said there is enough support to pass the bill out of the Agriculture Committee, a vote now scheduled for July 11, Peterson said the next federal farm bill still faces its “own challenges” in getting through the House. Sen. Amy Klobuchar, D-Minn., praised the Senate version as a “good, strong bill” that eliminated direct payments, bolstered crop insurance and maintained the sugar program. She said the bill had strong support in the Senate – it passed 64-35 – because of its $23 billion in cuts, with $16 billion coming from farm programs despite 86 percent of the bill’s overall funding going to nutrition and conservation programs. “That was a very strong argument that had to be able to garner support from senators that were from states that didn’t have a lot of farming,” she said. But Peterson said the House version will increase those cuts, primarily to nutrition programs, as a way of gaining more support from Republicans. “It is going to make a lot of Democrats angry; it will make the Republicans a little more happy, but for some of them, it still won’t be enough for them,” he said. “But it’s something I think that is justified and we can live with.” Peterson said because of terms of the committee discussions, he could not disclose the full bill details. But he said the language of the bill should be made public Thursday or Friday, and he expects it to move ahead with the markup July 11 and pass the committee on a voice vote. After that, Peterson said he will give Republican leaders “a couple days” to schedule it for a full vote on the House floor because it needs to pass by Aug. 3, when Congress will break for the August recess, in order to be enacted before the current farm bill expires Sept. 30. “But if they don’t give us some indication of putting this on the floor, then I’m going to turn the heat up, and if I have to, I’m going to spend all day every day calling every farm radio station in the United States in every state and ratchet up the heat on them, and I encourage everybody else to do that as well,” he said. “I think that in the end, they’ll come around.” If the bill passes the full House, it would then go to a conference committee to work out the differences in the Senate version. Klobuchar said she will try to keep pressure on the House by arguing the farm bill is important for the entire country, not just states that rely heavily on agriculture like Minnesota. “The last thing we want to do is be dependent on foreign food like we’re dependent on foreign oil,” she said.

#### House won’t pass Farm Bill

Lutey 6/28 (2012, Tom, staff writer for Billings Gazette, Billings Gazette, “Farm bill skeptics turn to House” http://billingsgazette.com/news/state-and-regional/montana/farm-bill-skeptics-turn-to-house/article\_306d8f55-ced0-5ca0-994b-5b7984d667d6.html)

Days after watching the farm bill sail through the Senate, farm groups are doubtful the House can do the same. House lawmakers would have to get their version of the 2012 farm bill passed in July before leaving on August vacation. That’s a tall order considering the House Agriculture Committee has yet to mark up its bill, said John Youngberg of the Montana Farm Bureau Federation. The committee won’t meet to finish its work on the bill until July 11. A contentious House floor debate is expected to follow. “I would like to hope we could get something done, but I’m just thinking that time is running out,” Youngberg said. Much is at stake in the five-year, $500 billion farm bill, not only for farmers and ranchers, but also for the nation’s poor. Nutrition programs, like the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, account for 80 percent of farm bill spending. SNAP is better known by its old name, food stamps. If Congress reaches Sept. 30 without House action and a presidential signature, the current farm bill expires, setting up a scenario in which items in the farm bill either expire or revert to the way they were in the 1949 farm bill, a legislative backstop that’s rarely used. It’s likely Congress would craft some kind of extension of the current farm bill and take up a new version again after the November election, said Lola Raska, of the Montana Grain Growers Association. Kicking the farm bill down the road would be popular, however. The current farm bill is regarded by many lawmakers as too expensive. The Senate version of the 2012 bill promised to trim $23 billion in U.S. Department of Agriculture spending. The House version is expected to call for $30 billion or more in cuts. There’s a food stamp battle expected when the House takes up the farm bill next month. Youngberg expects House Republicans will try to squeeze more savings out of the farm bill by decoupling food programs from federal heating subsidies for the poor. So-called “heat and eat” programs were targeted by the Senate to cut down on the amount of government food aid being issued. “Heat and eat” refers to the way 14 states bundle food stamp and energy assistance programs together. The practice allows people receiving as little as $1 a year from the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program to qualify for food stamps, too. “Heat and eat” made it easy for elderly and disabled people on heat assistance to get food stamps. Some lawmakers argue that food stamp eligibility is now too easy, growing the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program by $1 billion a year. Senate changes to “heat and eat” cut $540 a year from federal food aid. Already, there’s talk in the House of trimming “heat and eat” even more to squeeze another $5 billion to $10 billion from the farm bill. “I don’t think the House is going to pass anything that isn’t at least $30 billion in cuts,” Youngberg said. Reconciling the $30 billion House trim of the farm bill with the $23 billion cut passed by the Senate could prove impossible, especially for urban lawmakers with constituents receiving food stamps. Raska doesn’t think urban lawmakers will allow the cuts. “I just don’t know if that’s going to be a priority once it gets to the floor with all those urban legislators who have to go back to their districts before the election and say that they cut food stamps,” Raska said. Last week, as the Senate finished its votes on the farm bill with Republicans and Democrats collaborating on its passage, Senate Agriculture Committee Chairwoman Debbie Stabenow, D-Mich, reminded lawmakers that in a year framed by arguments over deficit spending, the farm bill was the only major piece of Senate legislation to cut government spending. If the House met its tight deadlines, the farm bill could be the only cuts to government spending upon which Congress agreed.

#### Both the Infrastructure Bill and Farm Bill won’t pass in the House

Huff 6/29 (2012, Ron, staff writer for Inforum. Inforum “Cantor plays tune and Berg dances” http://www.inforum.com/event/article/id/365860/group/Opinion/)

Rep. Eric Cantor, R-Va., one of the top guys in all of Congress, just said that the U.S. House of Representatives is done legislating for the year. Apparently, if nothing passes, Republicans like Cantor think they can blame the president and get away with it. While the House refuses to work, there are important bills that must be passed this year. The Senate has passed the bipartisan Violence Against Women Act that the House has ignored. The Senate passed a farm bill that the House already says won’t go anywhere. And the Senate also passed a bipartisan transportation bill that is critical for this country, which won’t see the light of day thanks to Cantor and House Republicans. This should be the perfect time for Rep. Rick Berg, R-N.D., to show his boss, Cantor, that not working for the rest of the year isn’t the “North Dakota Way,” right? Wrong. Berg hasn’t done anything to get these bills passed. Instead, he’s been tied to the hip of Cantor, Rep. Paul Ryan, R-Wash., and Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, since he got elected. Apparently, when he has a choice between doing things the “North Dakota Way” and voting the way his party bosses tell him, doing things the bosses’ way wins out every time.

### AT: Farm Lobby

#### **The will to cut spending outweighs farm lobby persuasiveness—emprirics prove**

Rogers 11 [David Rogers, “Farm Lobby’s power withers as subsidies face cuts”, Politico, 9/20/11, http://dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=5FC66E6B-7297-407A-B3F4-993D9476F46B]

**Washington’s debt crisis brings American agriculture to a crossroads this fall and no other sector of the economy may have more to gain or lose from the debate in Congress over deficit reduction**. With record exports predicted for 2011, **farmers begin with a proven self-interest in stable world markets, but their very success makes them all the more vulnerable now to deep cuts from the federal subsidies so synonymous with agriculture for decades**. Corn and wheat prices are double what they were in the early 1990s, and for the first time in most growers’ lives, cotton futures are selling at more than $1 per pound. Forget the recession: Net farm income is predicted to jump 31 percent, or $24.5 billion in 2011. And from the opening bell of this **Congress, a bull’s-eye has been painted on the back of agriculture’s direct cash subsidies, still costing taxpayers almost $5 billion annually — much of it going to households earning more than $100,000**. Cotton interests got an early taste of this anger in a June floor fight in the House, and the August debt crisis greatly accelerated the process, making it impossible to wait for a new farm bill next year and throwing the agriculture debate into a more partisan, ideological arena. “**It’s settling in on people that this is different than in the past,”** said former Rep. Charles Stenholm of Texas, a veteran of many farm bill battles. **“This isn’t a discussion just in the hands of the Agriculture committees but** outside**.**” Beginning with the House Republican budget last April, deficit talks over the summer focused on 10-year cuts of about $30 billion. And the White House upped the ante further Monday by proposing what is actually a 22 percent cut in farm supports, including an end to all direct payments and a surprising 11 percent, $8 billion cut from crop insurance. **Change is certain then, and the real question for agriculture is how to manage this transition and still preserve some safety net**. New products in revenue insurance are being explored in what would be a historic shift from loan price supports or the current cash income supplements. The National Cotton Council broke ranks early last month, when it stunned its Southern rice and peanut allies by coming out with its own revenue insurance plan — dubbed STAX — that implicitly gives up on direct payments. Corn announced its own alternative last week, but each of these options relies on premium subsidies, and if Congress cuts too deep, too fast, it will undermine this change. **Rocked back on their heels, House and Senate agriculture committee leaders met privately last Thursday on how to respond**. But in truth, neither they nor their new rival — the 12-member joint deficit committee created in August — can succeed without the other. Indeed, **the joint committee may rue the day it was labeled “super” since it’s ill equipped to write agriculture policy and ultimately will need farm-state votes to pass its recommendations in November and December**. At the same time, if the Agriculture committees dig in too much, they risk undermining not just themselves but the whole effort to address the debt crisis — important to agriculture’s world markets. **It’s a political dance that will play out between the new select committee and other entrenched authorizing panels, who also will be asked to come forth with savings from defense, for example, or the federal retirement system.** But nothing matches the clash of cultures in farm policy — nor has the same political reach. Consider the fact that the Republican presidential field is being led by a former Texas agriculture commissioner, Rick Perry, whose state is the leading recipient of federal farm subsidies. Or the fact that Iowa, second only to Texas in subsidies, according to data collected by the Environmental Working Group, a Washington-based nonprofit, will host its caucuses within weeks of the year-end deficit debate. **“Moscow on the Mississippi” was how one member of the deficit panel, Sen. Pat Toomey (R-Pa.), famously described farm subsidies a few years back.** **And anxious commodity groups are now reduced to playing on the old loyalties of Ways and Means Committee Chairman Dave Camp, who long ago sat on the House Agriculture Committee alongside a future speaker, Rep. John Boehner.** Indeed, the cotton, rice, sugar subcommittee of the early 1990s is a trip down memory lane featuring Camp, now on the deficit committee; Boehner, who put him there; and Rep. Collin Peterson (D-Minn.), who shepherded through the last farm bill in 2008. Not missing a beat**, rice interests showed up at a Camp fundraiser last week, attempting to renew old ties even as Peterson took a hard line against any cuts of much more than $15.6 billion, about half of what’s been discussed thus far**. That $15.6 billion target is a rough approximation of the price agriculture would pay if the joint committee fails entirely and an automatic sequester to achieve $1.2 trillion is ordered under the Budget Control Act. “My position is we should not agree to anything bigger than the sequestration,” Peterson told POLITICO. **“…Why would we put our neck on the block? This is ideology. This is other agendas.”** Senate Budget Committee Chairman Kent Conrad (D-N.D.), a major power broker in agriculture circles now drafting his own revenue insurance alternative, agrees. “**Somewhere in the sequester range, we can make it all work,” Conrad said in an interview. “But you can’t make it work if you go this high.”** Others might accept a $20 billion target, but Senate Finance **Committee Chairman Max Baucus (D-Mont.), the deficit committee member with the strongest ties to agriculture, told POLITICO it is “self-defeating” to go much higher. “You’re not going to get that high number. It will not pass,”** he said flatly. “Because of the health of the farm economy, in a world of tough choices, we think these policies are justified,” answered White House Budget Director Jack Lew in an interview. But Kansas Sen. Pat Roberts, the ranking Republican on the Senate Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Committee brushed this aside, saying the administration’s proposals are **“dead on arrival.”** Roberts’s renewed prominence this fall is striking since it was he who first engineered direct payments as House Agriculture Committee chairman in 1996. Republicans boasted then that they were “transition payments” on the path to ending federal subsidies entirely. But when the Asian currency crisis hit in 1998, export demand fell, undercutting farm prices. And at a time of even budget surpluses, Congress began doubling up on the payments as a quick way to aid distressed farmers. Today’s circumstances are the opposite: high prices, high deficits. “The argument for direct payments is their economic neutrality. They are unrelated to plantings and price and thus do not distort markets,” said Keith Collins, a veteran economist for the Agriculture Department and now an adviser to the crop insurance industry. “But their downside is the same as their upside: They are unrelated to price and production, and thus income. They get made even in boom times. In this budget environment, they are going to be eliminated or cut.” The brave new world of revenue insurance is nonetheless a leap — and reflects shifts in agriculture itself. Cotton’s greater openness follows changes in its own ranks as West Texas growers have gained more clout in the Cotton Council and brought with them a history of promoting crop insurance. Briefings have been held to build support for the idea — dubbed the Stacked Income Protection Plan, or STAX. It would build on coverage today to allow farmers to buy a supplemental policy covering up to 95 percent against revenue losses — measured against the local county’s experience. But that would leave old Mid-South allies like rice standing alone, since rice growers — with built-in investments in irrigation — prefer direct payments to cover these capital costs and care less about crop insurance. For the insurance industry, that extra band of protection — from standard 85 percent coverage to 95 percent — is highly expensive, and the premiums will rise almost exponentially. This is where the cotton plan and others like it are very dependent on subsidies, but the administration is wary of the cost and whether the added protection will backfire, encouraging farmers to make foolish gambles, planting crops they shouldn’t plant. “**We have plans for a transition that are going to be very bold,” said Roberts. Then again bold was also what promoters called his “Freedom to Farm” bill in 1996 creating direct payments. “We’re under pressure to cut, cut, cut,” said Stenholm, now teaching in Texas. “We can’t turn the clock back. The direct subsidization of agriculture is a thing of the past.”**

### AT: Free Trade

#### Free trade doesn’t solve war – Empirically more wars have started when trade interdependence was high.

Friedman and Friedman 96, founder, chairman and Chief Intelligence Officer of STRATFOR (Dr.George and Meredith, The Future of War p7-9)

The argument that interdependence gives rise to peace is flawed in theory as well as in practice. Conflicts arise from friction, particularly friction involving the fundamental interests of different nations. The less interdependence there is, the fewer the areas of serious friction. The more interdependence there is the greater the areas of friction, and, therefore, the greater the potential for conflict. Two widely separated nations that trade little with each other are unlikely to go to war- Brazil is unlikely to fight Madagascar precisely because they have so little to do with each other. France and Germany, on the other hand, which have engaged in extensive trade and transnational finance, have fought three wars with each other over about seventy years. Interdependence was the root of the conflicts, not the deterrent There are of course, cases of interdependence in which one country effectively absorbs the other or in which their interests match so precisely that the two countries simply merge. In other cases, interdependence remains peaceful because the economic, military, and political power of one country is overwhelming and inevitable. In relations between advanced industrialized countries and third-world economies, for example, this sort of asymmetrical relationship can frequently be seen All such relationships have a quality of unease built into them, particularly when the level of interdependence is great. When one or both nations attempt intentionally or unintentionally, to shift the balance of power, the result is often tremendous anxiety and, sometimes, real pain. Each side sees the other’s action as an attempt to gain advantage and becomes frightened. In the end, precisely because the level of interdependence is so great, the relationship can and frequently does, spiral out of control. Consider the seemingly miraculous ability of the United States and Soviet Union to be rivals and yet avoid open warfare. These two powers could forgo extreme measures because they were not interdependent. Neither relied on the other for its economic well-being, and therefore, its social stability. This provided considerable room for maneuvering. Because there were few economic linkages, neither nations felt irresistible pressure to bring the relationship under control; neither felt any time constraint. Had one country been dependent on the other for something as important as oil or long-term investment, there would have been enormous fear of being held hostage economically. Each would have sought to dominate the relationship, and the result would have been catastrophic. In the years before World War I, as a result of European interdependence, control of key national issues fell into the hands of foreign governments. Thus, decisions made in Paris had tremendous impact on Austria, and decisions made in London determined growth rates in Ruhr. Each government sought to take charge of its own destiny by shifting the pattern of interdependence in its favor. Where economic means proved insufficient, political and military strategies were tried. The international system following the Cold War resembles the pre-World War I system in some fundamental ways. First, there is general prosperity. That is to say, the international economic system appears to be functioning extremely well, in spite of the normal cyclical downturns of the early 1990’s. Second, almost no fundamental ideological issues divide the major powers, one could say there is general agreement on matters of political principle. Third, there is a long-standing pattern of interdependence, measured in both trade and financial flows-capital has become transnational. Fourth, and perhaps most important, beneath the prosperity and stability there is a sense within each great power of a real and growing vulnerability to the actions of others. Some nations fear that growing protectionism will shift the balance of the system against them, while others are convinced that maintaining the current system will be devastating to their interests. Thus, the argument that war is obsolete because of growing interdependence is unsupportable. As we have seen, World War I broke out at a time when interdependence was substantially higher than it is today: indeed, in all likelihood war broke out because interdependence was so high. Today, war remains not only possible, but, as a simple statistical matter, highly likely.

#### Even without farmbill, U.S. will always act to bolster free trade.

AFP Google 10/21/08 [Bush: Crisis no reason to cut aid, trade, <http://afp.google.com/article/ALeqM5jRlyg2jHvo45-dC2dJAvGKASxSAQ>]

WASHINGTON (AFP) — President George W. Bush said Tuesday that the United States must stay committed to free trade and development aid policies despite difficulties spawned by the global financial crisis. "During times of economic crisis, some may be tempted to turn inward -- focusing on our problems here at home, while ignoring our interests around the world. This would be a serious mistake," Bush warned. The US president was speaking to an international development summit at the US State Department two weeks to the day before the November 4 elections and three months before he hands his successor the keys to the White House. "America is committed -- and America must stay committed -- to international development for reasons that remain true regardless of the ebb and flow of the markets," he said, citing extremists who use despair as a recruiting tool. Bush also highlighted his record on free trade, saying the United States had free trade pacts with three countries when he took office and now boasted 14, most with developing nations, and warned against protectionism. "During periods of crisis, protectionism may seem like the best way to safeguard wealth. But when major economies try to wall themselves in, they deny themselves the growth that comes from exports and deepen poverty by depriving poor nations of vital markets for their goods," said the president. "In the midst of this crisis, I believe the world should send a clear signal that we remain committed to open markets by reducing barriers to trade across the globe," he said, calling the recent impasse in the so-called "Doha Round" of World Trade Organization talks "disappointing." "But that does not have to be the final word. And so before I leave office, I'm going to press hard to make sure we have a successful Doha Round," he said. Bush also pressed Washington's partners in the Group of Eight rich countries, the United Nations, corporations, foundations, and other entities to continue to help the developing world battle poverty and disease. The summit brought together roughly 500 guests, including leaders from the international public and private sectors, non-governmental organizations, diplomats, multilateral organizations, and US government officials. Pop star turned international philanthropist Bob Geldof, a champion of aid to Africa, attended the gathering. Liberian President Ellen Johnson Sirleaf, due at the White House on Wednesday, introduced Bush. Earlier, US Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice called for a successful completion of the Doha Round, saying that would send a "powerful signal" that governments are not turning inward in response to the crisis. "We must seize this moment as an opportunity to revive and conclude the Doha round for the expansion of an open, global trading system," Rice said, warning against a repeat of the response to the Great Depression of the 1930s. During that period, "many countries, including the United States unfortunately, turned inward, adopted protectionist practices and deepened the crisis," Rice said in a keynote speech to the summit. There have also been calls in Europe to rescue the drawn-out negotiations for a new world trade pact that collapsed in Geneva in July amid bitter disagreement. The Doha Round was launched in the Qatari capital in 2001, with the aim of liberalizing trade rules for the benefit of developing countries. July's summit collapsed over a disagreement on tariffs between the United States and India.

#### Trade wars don’t cause shooting wars.

David H. Bearce 03 Grasping the Commercial Institutional Peace, University of Pittsburgh - International Studies Quarterly (2003) 47, 347–370

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) - and 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.

#### Free trade low and collapse inevitable – China proves.

Alibaba News 10/23/08 [China Worries Downturn May Spur Protectionism, <http://news.alibaba.com/article/detail/asia/100015827-1-wsja%252810%252F23%2529-china-worries-downturn-may.html>]

BEIJING -- With the world's major economies headed toward recession, China is starting to worry that its flashy trade surplus will elicit a protectionist backlash. The topic will be raised at the Asia-Europe Meeting opening Friday, an annual summit of top leaders from the two regions. According to diplomats preparing the two-day meeting, protectionism and ways of alleviating the current financial crisis will be two key topics discussed. European leaders have said they will use the meeting to promote a global system of financial regulation. French President Nicolas Sarkozy has expressed confidence he could win China's support for the effort, which could serve as a possible counterweight to U.S. resistance. A Chinese government spokesman said Wednesday the meeting will be a "perfect platform" to discuss the crisis. Chinese leaders have also taken a keen interest in U.S. efforts to manage the crisis. On Tuesday evening, Chinese President Hu Jintao told U.S. President George W. Bush he hoped U.S. moves to stabilize its financial markets will restore investor confidence and prevent the financial crisis from spreading to the wider economy, according to the government-run Xinhua news agency. China's financial institutions -- most of which are state-owned -- are relatively insulated from outside shocks, thanks to heavier regulation and government controls. That makes protectionism the greater worry for China. In recent talks with senior Chinese officials, World Trade Organization Director-General Pascal Lamy said Chinese officials raised concerns about protectionism. "In their view there's a risk of it reviving," Mr. Lamy said in an interview in Beijing. That has been reflected by pronouncements of senior officials and discussions in the state-run media. The Chinese official in charge of economic crisis management, Wang Qishan, said China wants a new round of trade talks to succeed and "firmly" opposes protectionism. Part of China's concerns lie in its trade imbalance. Growth in exports has remained stable, but growth in imports has been slowing. That has helped give China a record $29.4 billion trade surplus in September, helping to drive foreign-exchange reserves toward $2 trillion. The global slowdown could accelerate this pace. China's products are primarily low-cost, so tend to sell well during hard times. In past recessions, Chinese-made products have gained market share in the U.S. and could do so elsewhere as well, economists say. "Made in China is the favored brand of worried Western consumers," said Ben Simpfendorfer, an economist with Royal Bank of Scotland. "We think they will gain significant market share in the euro area. They gained significant market share in the U.S. during the last global slowdown." Although a pickup in demand would be good news for China's exporters, that dynamic helped to spur previous calls for protection against Chinese imports. This time, Chinese officials are worried that those calls could yield action damaging to China, particularly from the U.S. Mei Xinyu, a trade researcher at China's Ministry of Commerce, said protectionist calls are likely to come from the U.S. if manufacturing there continues to erode. "We need to sound the alarm bell" even before protectionist calls start, Mr. Mei said. Protectionist sentiment could also manifest itself in calls for China to stimulate domestic demand in order to boost imports. In Europe, with manufacturing already depleted, low-cost Chinese goods are seen to help retailers and consumers more than they trigger job losses. The EU recently extended antidumping tariffs on Chinese shoe imports but declined to set new tariffs on Chinese steel. China's concern about protectionism helps to explain its eagerness to complete the current round of global trade negotiations.

#### There’s a scholarly consensus that trade disputes don’t cause shooting wars.

Haftel 04 [From the Outside Looking In: The Effect of Trading Blocs on Trade Disputes in the GATT/WTO Yoram Z. Haftel, Ohio State University . [International Studies Quarterly](http://www3.interscience.wiley.com.ezp-prod1.hul.harvard.edu/journal/117984904/home) [Volume 48, Issue 1](http://www3.interscience.wiley.com.ezp-prod1.hul.harvard.edu/journal/118754265/issue), Pages 121-142 Published Online: 29 Jan 2004]

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 (Mansfield and Pollins, 2001:852).