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# Summary

This affirmative argues that the current focus on transportation infrastructure puts too much emphasis on highways and cars making it harder for poor people to get to work and have economic opportunities. Because it is expensive to buy and maintain a car, the focus on highways and roads at the expense of public transportation is discriminatory against poor and minority communities.

The affirmative plan is to increase investment in mass transit infrastructure. Mass transit includes things like buses and subways/light rail. This kind of infrastructure can transport many people at a lower cost and can increase economic opportunities for all.

Besides reinforcing segregation, a lack of mass transit also has other negative effects. The reliance of cars increases air pollution because driving a lot releases a significant amount of exhaust. Additionally, when people drive all the time, they walk less making them more likely to be overweight. The culture that surrounds cars also has the effect of disconnecting us from one another, unlike mass transit where people are more likely to talk and interact when put into close quarters. Finally, decreasing reliance on cars could help encourage people to stop living in environmentally destructive suburbs and instead move back into the city, decreasing urban sprawl.

# Glossary

Vocabulary

**Car culture**. America’s love of cars that is seen in music, movies, etc.

**Communities of color.**  Hispanic, black, Asian or other non-white group of people living together or connected in some way.

**Cycle of poverty.** This theory says that poor families do not have the necessary resources to escape poverty and stay in poverty for many generations. So if a grandparent is poor, their grand-child is likely to also live in poverty.

**Emissions.** Something emitted, such as the pollution from a car.

Gentrification. the process by which higher income households displace lower income residents of a neighborhood, changing the character of that neighborhood.

Mass transit. Transportation infrastructure that can move many people at once such as buses or subways/light rail.

Marginalized communities. Groups of people who have been discriminated against.

**Moral obligation.** Something you have to do because it is the right thing to do.

Segregation. The separation between people of different races. In this case, in terms, of where people live and work.

**Social inequality.** Differences between groups of people who do not have the same social status. In the US, this can mean differences in access to education, health care, housing, etc.

Subsidy. Government financial support of an industry or thing.

**Urban.** Relating to the city or town.

Urban Sprawl. The development of large suburbs outside of major cities.
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Contention One – The Status Quo

Current transportation infrastructure policy spends billions on highways while ignoring public transit. This situation is discriminatory against the poor and communities of color

Karyn Rotker, Attorney of Law, 2007 (Poverty & Race 16.5, " Transportation: Regional Equity & Environmental Justice", http://search.proquest.com/docview/210339531)

In August, 2007, a bridge on an interstate highway came crashing down during rush hour in Minneapolis. Commentators seized upon the disaster as a sign of the need for more government spending on infrastructure. But **conversations about "infrastructure" routinely focus on building**, **maintaining and expanding highways**, **treating public transit as an afterthought at best**. **For decades, the federal government** (and many state governments) **have lavished billions upon billions of dollars on highway construction**, **while funding for mass transit lags far behind**. **The neglect of transit is discriminatory**: The 2000 Census showed that nearly one in four African Americans, and large percentages of Latinos and Asians, live in households without vehicles available, compared to only 7% of non-Hispanic whites. **Communities of color are far more likely than whites to depend on public transportation to get to work**. **Governmental disregard of transit strands low-income persons and communities of color, often in inner cities though also in rural areas, while job growth, economic development and housing migrate to wealthier, whiter suburbs**. At the same time, federal mandates that require regional planning frequently limit the influence of central cities in transportation and regional development. The precise structures vary from community to community. In some cities, activists have challenged the disproportionate amount of money pumped into modes of transit used by better-off, whiter communities, while transit modes used by inner-city residents are starved. The most well-known example was the case in which Los Angeles bus riders challenged how much money was going to the rail system. In Milwaukee, a majority-minority city surrounded by a ring of overwhelmingly white suburbs, survival of the transit system is at issue. **There are clear disparities in auto ownership and drivers** **licenses** **between the predominantly low-income and minority residents** of Milwaukee's central city **and the predominantly white residents of suburban counties**. **Census data confirm** **that** Milwaukee residents, **especially those living in the central city**, **remain far more likely to rely on public transportation** than do suburban residents.
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Contention Two – The Harms of Transportation Inequality

Current lack of public transportation creates communities segregated along racial lines. Transportation directly influences the special layout of communities

Robert D. Bullard, Glenn S. Johnson, and Angel O. Torres, Ph.D. in Sociology at Iowa State University; Associate Professor at Clark Atlanta University; Geographic Information Systems Training Specialist, 2004 ("Highway Robbery Transportation Racism And New Routes to Equity", Page 3-5)

**Transportation systems** do not spring up out of thin air. They **are planned** and, in many cases, planned **poorly** **when it comes to people of color**. **Conscious decisions** **determine** the **location** **of freeways**, **bus stops**, **fueling stations**, **and train stations**. Decisions to build highways, expressways, and beltways have far-reaching effects on **land use**, energy policies, and the environment. Decisions by county commissioners to bar the extension of public transit to job-rich economic activity centers in suburban counties and instead spend their transportation dollars on repairing and expanding the nation's roads have serious mobility implications for central city residents. **Together, all these transportation decisions shape United States metropolitan areas**, growth patterns, physical mobility, and economic opportunities.' **These same transportation policies have also aided**, and in some cases subsidized, **racial**, economic, and environmental **inequities** **as evidenced** **by** the **segregated housing** **and spatial layout** of our central cities and suburbs. **It is not by chance that millions of Americans have been socially isolated** and relegated **to economically depressed** and deteriorating **central cities and that transportation apartheid has been created**. An Affair with the Automobile **Over the past 75 years,** **automobile production** and highway construction **have multiplied**, **while urban mass transit** **systems have been dismantled** or allowed to fall into disrepair. The American automobile culture was spurred by massive government investments in roads (3 million miles) and interstate highways (45,000 miles). Automobiles account for 28 percent of our nation's energy consumption. Transportation consumes 67 percent of the petroleum used in the United States.' And over 75 percent of transportation energy is used by highway vehicles. From 1998 to 1999, US gasoline consumption rose by 2.5 percent and vehicle miles traveled increased by 1.4 percent. More cars on the road has meant more pollution, traffic congestion, wasted energy, urban sprawl, residential segregation, and social disruption. Indeed, **not all Americans** **have received the same benefits from** the massive **road and highway spending** over the past several decades. Generally, the benefits of highways are widely dispersed among the many travelers who drive them, while the burdens of those roads are more localized. Having a seven-lane freeway next door, for instance, is not a benefit to someone who does not even own a car. **People of color are twice as likely to use nonautomotive modes of travel** public transit, walking, and biking to get to work, **as compared to their white counterparts**. **In urban areas**, **African Americans and Latinos** **comprise** **54 percent of transit users** (62 percent of bus riders, 35 percent of subway riders, and 29 percent of commuter riders).5
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This situation effects many groups and must be explicitly addressed

Eric Mann et al, members of the Labor/Community Strategy Center, 2006

(Eric Mann, Kikanza Ramsey, Barbara Lott-Holland, and Geoff Ray, “An Environmental Justice Strategy for Urban Transportation”. http://urbanhabitat.org/files/ 1%20Eric%20Mann.pdf)

Across the United States, **federal** and state **transportation funds favor suburban commuters and auto owners at the cost of the urban poor, the working class, the lowest income communities of color, the elderly, high school students, and the disabled.** People dependent on public transit for their transportation needs suffer dilapidated buses, long waits, longer rides, poor connections, service cuts, overcrowding, and daily exposure to some of the worst tail-pipe toxins. The movement for first-class, regional transportation systems that give priority to the transitdependent requires the mobilization of those excluded and marginalized from politics-as-usual, and will challenge the pro-corporate consensus. **Equity demands a mass movement of funds from the highway and rail interests to bus systems, from suburban commuters, corporate developers, and rail contractors to the urban working class of color**. Such a transformation will not happen—cannot happen— until a mass movement of the transit-dependent is built from the bottom up. A Transit Strategy for the Transit-Dependent In 1993, the Labor/Community Strategy Center (LCSC) in Los Angeles founded the Bus Riders Union (BRU)—now the largest multi-racial grassroots transportation group in the U.S.—with more than 3,000 members representing the roughly 400,000 daily bus riders. The BRU’s 12 years of organizing, significant policy and legal victories, and analytical and theoretical expertise can be used as a resource for the urgent work of mass transit reconstruction in U.S. urban communities. The needs and the leadership capacity of the urban working class of color must play a central role in developing sustainable communities**. We must aim to: reduce suburban sprawl; promote ecological and environmental public health; create non-racist public policy; and focus on the transportation needs of society’s most oppressed and exploited. The needs of the working class and communities of color are both an end in themselves and an essential building block of any effective organizing plan**.
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Failure to address transportation inequality guarantees cycles of poverty

Timo Ohnmacht et al,  University of Applied Science and Arts, Switzerland, 2009

(Timo Ohnmacht, Hanja Maksim, Manfred Max Bergman, Ashgate Publishing Company, *Mobilites and Inequatlities)*

**In Urban Areas social inequity is evident in terms of social deprivation that may occur both caused by lack of access to mobility** and as **a consequence of mobility-related degredation of living conditions** (e.g. caused by air pollution noise emissions etc.). Many cities in Europe still have **highly stressed neighbourhoods** and traffic corridors, which **also have** a high concentration of population groups with **a low rate of motorization or** who **are badly served by public transport**. In such areas, the two categories of problem overlap: **mobility** (especially motorized transport**) becomes a risk, contributing to the deterioration of living conditions**; **and the lack of mobility facilities prevents people from** participating in society, limits **access to education, the labour market** etc. **Poverty and deprivation structures are thus mutually reinforced**, also from a socio spatial point of view.

And reliance on cars locks in a system of dependence and directly causes many deaths every year

John Bly, Senior Project Manager at Honeywell, 2011

(May, http://aladinrc.wrlc.org/bitstream/handle/1961/9866/Bly,%20John%20-%20Spring%20'11.pdf?sequence=1)

Through ideological, social, political and physical means, the automobile has hijacked what it means to be mobile, as well as the very possibility of achieved mobility. This paper explores the various ways in which **cars have created and continue to reinforce a system** in America **that is almost completely reliant on them. This system externalizes its costs onto the environment and victims of ‘auto accidents,’ suppresses safer and more democratic means of mobility, demands continual supplies of foreign oil, claims valuable agricultural and urban land as well as time, and kills more non-participating bystanders every year than the number of people that died in the attack on the World Trade Center on September 11, 2001**. After exposing the costs of the system and the mechanisms of its reproduction, I conclude with a few ideas on how to move beyond the automobile.

In order to address these harms we offer the following plan:

**The United States federal government should substantially increase its investment in urban mass transit transportation infrastructure.**
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Contention 3 – Solvency

Increasing investment in mass transit is crucial to decrease social inequality and create movements for change

Eric Mann et al, members of the Labor/Community Strategy Center, 2006

(Eric Mann, Kikanza Ramsey, Barbara Lott-Holland, and Geoff Ray, “An Environmental Justice Strategy for Urban Transportation”. http://urbanhabitat.org/files/ 1%20Eric%20Mann.pdf)

**Mass Transit:** The Heart of the New Revolution Transportation **is a great multifaceted issue around which to build a movement, because it touches so many aspects of people’s lives.** **Transportation affects public health, access to jobs, childcare, housing, medical care, education, and more.** **It is inextricably tied to the history of the civil rights movement now and in the past**. **Now it has taken on a life and death urgency because of the public health crisis and global warming brought on by the automobile. Public transportation can be a great unifier—bringing together people of all races and classes who seek a saner, healthier world in which wars for oil and energy are exposed and opposed.**

And change in federal funding is the crucial issue

Robert D. Bullard, Glenn S. Johnson, and Angel O. Torres, Ph.D. in Sociology at Iowa State University; Associate Professor at Clark Atlanta University; Geographic Information Systems Training Specialist, 2004 ( "Highway Robbery Transportation Racism And New Routes to Equity", Page 3-5)

Many Americans have cars and the majority of American workers opt for private automobiles, which provide speed and convenience. Most drivers forego carpooling, with three-fourths of all commuting cars carrying only one person. Generally, people who commute using public transit spend twice as much time traveling as those who travel by car. Consider that the average commute takes about 20 minutes by car, 38 minutes by bus, and 45 minutes by train. For millions of inner-city residents, public transportation is the only means of getting around. For them, there is no question that energy-efficient public transportation is needed for easy access to child-care services shopping, job centers, and health care services. Routes of Transportation Apartheid The disparity of fruits borne by various transportation development projects is a grim story of a stolen harvest with disproportionate burdens and costs paid for in diminished health and life opportunities by poor people and people of color. Many **federally subsidized transportation** construction and **infrastructure** **projects cut wide paths** **through low-income** **and people of color** **neighborhoods**. **They physically isolate residents** **from their institutions** and businesses, disrupt once-stable communities, displace thriving businesses, contribute to urban sprawl, subsidize infrastructure decline, create traffic gridlock, and **subject residents to elevated risks from accidents**, spills, and explosions from vehicles carrying hazardous chemicals and other dangerous materials. Adding insult to injury, **cutbacks in mass transit subsidies have the potential to further isolate the poor in inner-city neighborhoods** **from areas experiencing job growth** compromising what little they already have.

# Urban Sprawl Add-on

[\_\_\_\_] Investing in mass transit could significantly reduce urban sprawl by reducing reliance on cars

Trip **Pollard,** Senior Attorney and Director, Land and Community Program at Southern Environmental Law Center, **2004**

(“Follow the money: transportation investments for smarter growth,” Temple Environmental Law & Technology Journal, Spring, 2004, 22 Temp. Envtl. L. & Tech. J. 155)

Greater analysis and scrutiny should be given to numerous aspects of transportation infrastructure decisions in order to better understand the likely impacts of these decisions on land development and transportation patterns and to identify opportunities to promote smarter growth. As noted above, **the** amount and comparative **level of investment in various transportation modes is an important influence on land development and transportation patterns**. **Heavy spending on highways and other roads has spurred sprawl and provided few meaningful alternatives to motor vehicle use**. **Investments in transit,** on the other hand, **tend to foster more compact development patterns and to reduce driving**. However, this is a very broad generalization and investments in road projects need not be antithetical to smarter growth and more sustainable transportation. The location, type, and scale of project selected for investment within a particular mode are additional factors influencing the impacts of transportation funding decisions. For example, **the impacts of funding a massive new highway through the countryside are very different than the impacts of extending and upgrading a network of smaller streets in an existing community.** Another significant feature of infrastructure funding decisions is the degree of connectivity a project provides to other transportation facilities. Funding a system of cul-de-sac streets that funnels all drivers in a suburban residential area onto a large collector road to go to work or to a store, for example, is likely to result in longer driving distances, more traffic congestion and less walking or bicycling than funding a connected grid of streets that provides alternative routes for drivers to reach any particular destination and more direct routes for pedestrians and cyclists.

# Urban Sprawl Add-on

[\_\_\_\_] Urban sprawl destroys the environment and causes a variety of social ills

Leonardo R. Grabkowski, reporter for the San Francisco Chronicle, 2012

(San Francisco Chronicle, “Negative Effects of Urban Sprawl”, http://homeguides.sfgate.com/negative-effects-urban-sprawl-1716.html)

**Spreading out development creates water distribution problems and can lead to water overconsumption. A typical low-density or suburban community uses more water than a high-density city community.** Landscaping is the primary culprit for this excessive use of water. According to the EPA, 30 percent of the water used daily in the United States is devoted to outdoor use. Loss of Wildlife Habitat The San Francisco Bay Area, with over 400,000 acres of natural landscape, is one of the nation’s six hotspots for biological diversity, according to the Center for Biological Diversity. The region has a wide variety of plant and animal species; unfortunately, 90 of them, including the California tiger salamander, are listed as endangered or threatened. **Rapid development can negatively affect wildlife by tearing down, clearing, or building over its habitat, potentially threatening survival**. This is not only a problem in the San Francisco Bay Area; **it’s a problem in all of America.** Increased Racial and Economic Disparity **When residents relocate** outside of a city’s core, they take their tax dollars with them. Often, it’s **the city’s poorest residents that are left behind. This creates economic disparity and stratification based upon location. It also creates funding problems for the core, which directly affects the money available for education, crime prevention, and maintenance and upkeep.** **Urban sprawl can also lead to economic “white flight.”** According to “Urban Sprawl: A Reference Guide,” urban sprawl leads to racial segregation as minorities are often left behind in the poorest parts of a region. This problem may not be as widespread as it has been in the past, but it's present nonetheless. Increased Risk of Obesity People living in suburban areas are more likely to be obese than people living in urban areas, according to the Ontario College of Family Physicians and the American Planning Association. Both studies show that people living in suburban areas tend to rely on their vehicles more often--even for short trips--instead of walking or cycling. This lower level of activity increases the risk of obesity, which can lead to other health problems such as heart disease, high-blood pressure and diabetes.

# Urban Sprawl Add-on- Link Extensions

### [\_\_\_\_] Road focus and car dependence promotes sprawl which harms the environment

Islam et.al. 2008 (Anna Brandon Lynn, and Bridget Maher, “Negative Environmental Impacts of American Suburban Sprawl and the Environmental Argument for New Urbanism”

<http://sitemaker.umich.edu/section007group5/home>)

The dependency on automobiles for transportation is one of the biggest factors in the environmental impacts of “suburban sprawl” and “urban growth.” Suburban growth as a result of highways being built after WWII made rural areas more accessible for development increasing the reliance on automobiles to get to and from the city for work (Southerland 164). This reliance has been furthermore encouraged through the relative decrease in gasoline prices since the 1970s (Southerland 165). City development in the past has been mainly focused on planning, “…towns and cities at a larger scale with a reliance primarily on automobile travel (Doi 485).” This type of urban growth results in a number of adverse effects on the environment. Growth of this nature requires people to travel larger distances for even basic needs, therefore making automobiles a necessary form of travel. One of the strategies for solving the overwhelming reliance on automobiles has been the construction of “compact cities.” The idea is that “compact cities” offer a closer community, a neighborhood, and a better quality of life that decreases the reliance on automobiles and therefore promotes a more environmentally friendly city. Mass transit and public transportation drastically decreases the amount of air pollution and reliance on oil.

### [\_\_\_\_] Mass transit allows for more efficient land use

Arizona PIRG Education Fund, 2009 “a federation of independent, state-based, citizen-funded organizations that advocate for the public interest.”(“Why and How to Fund Public Transportation”, march 2009, <http://www.uspirg.org/sites/pirg/files/reports/Why-and-How-to-Fund-Public-Transportation.pdf)//DD>

Transportation and land-use problems are tightly connected. On the one side, light rail, commuter rail and rapid bus systems allow development of more walkable communities where using a car is an option rather than a requirement. For example, communities that are more compact save money because smaller networks can be constructed for driving, sewage, electricity and parking. Many central cities thrive as physical “hubs” for business activity, many doubling their population during the work day. Such massive influxes of people would be impossible if everyone drove long distances and required parking.

# Air Pollution Add-on

### [\_\_\_\_] Road focused transportation leads to air pollution and health problems

Trip Pollard, Senior Attorney and Director, Land and Community Program at Southern Environmental Law Center, 2004

(“Article: Follow the money: transportation investments for smarter growth,” Temple Environmental Law & Technology Journal, Spring, 2004, 22 Temp. Envtl. L. & Tech. J. 155)

**Extensive road building and motor vehicle use, as well as the sprawl spurred by current transportation approaches, are linked to virtually every pressing environmental problem and to serious public health concerns.** One of the most dramatic impacts of current development and transportation patterns is the rapid loss of open space. Over 25 million acres were developed nationwide between 1982 and 1997, and the rate of land consumption is accelerating. n16 This phenomenal growth has caused a massive loss of productive farmland and forests, wetlands, wildlife habitat, and other precious resources. Rapid growth spurred by transportation investments also impacts both water quality and quantity. Roads, parking lots, and buildings are replacing millions of acres of forests, farms, and wetlands that would otherwise filter water. The rise in the amount of impervious surfaces increases the volume of pollutant runoff, increases erosion, and slows groundwater replenishment, thus depleting water supplies. n17 In addition, land bulldozed for roads and development is a major source of silt in rivers and streams, and road use and maintenance introduces herbicides, pesticides, antifreeze, and other pollutants into the water. n18 **Road-centered transportation investment policies have had severe air pollution impacts as well. Motor vehicles are a major source of pollutants such as carbon monoxide and smog-causing nitrogen oxides and volatile organic compounds;** trucks, diesel buses, and road building equipment also emit soot, particulate matter, and other pollutants. Among other things, **these emissions can cause premature death, lung tissue damage, asthma attacks, visibility impairment, and forest damage.** The American Lung Association estimates that 137 million Americans live in areas violating ozone health standards. n19 The Clean Air Act and technological advances have sharply curtailed the amount of pollution released per mile from driving; however, this progress has been offset by the dramatic increase in the amount of miles driven. n20 [\*162] Vehicle emissions also are a major source of greenhouse gases, which could have catastrophic environmental, health, and economic impacts by causing global climate change. The average vehicle emits more than one pound of carbon dioxide per mile, n21 and transportation is the largest source of carbon dioxide emissions in the United States. n22 There is growing evidence linking automobile dependence and sprawling settlement patterns to a number of other serious public health problems. n23 The federal Centers for Disease Control (CDC) found that by increasing the distances between activities, and thereby discouraging walking, sprawl increases obesity. n24 Physical inactivity also contributes significantly to health problems such as diabetes, cardiovascular disease, and certain forms of cancer. Moreover, traffic crashes claimed the lives of almost 43,000 people annually in recent years, and more sprawling metropolitan areas tend to have higher rates of traffic fatalities. n25

# Air Pollution Add-on

#### [\_\_\_\_] Air pollution is a serious threat – it kills 70,000 people in the U.S. every year

Bernie Fischlowitz-Roberts, Analyst at the Earth Policy Institute, 2002

(“Air Pollution Fatalities Now Exceed Traffic Fatalities by 3 to 1,” Earth Policy Institute, September 17th, http://www.earth-policy.org/plan\_b\_updates/2002/update17)

The World Health Organization reports that 3 million people now die each year from the effects of air pollution. This is three times the 1 million who die each year in automobile accidents. A study published in The Lancet in 2000 concluded that air pollution in France, Austria, and Switzerland is responsible for more than 40,000 deaths annually in those three countries. About half of these deaths can be traced to air pollution from vehicle emissions. In the United States, traffic fatalities total just over 40,000 per year, while air pollution claims 70,000 lives annually. U.S. air pollution deaths are equal to deaths from breast cancer and prostate cancer combined. This scourge of cities in industrial and developing countries alike threatens the health of billions of people. Governments go to great lengths to reduce traffic accidents by fining those who drive at dangerous speeds, arresting those who drive under the influence of alcohol, and even sometimes revoking drivers' licenses. But they pay much less attention to the deaths people cause by simply driving the cars. While deaths from heart disease and respiratory illness from breathing polluted air may lack the drama of deaths from an automobile crash, with flashing lights and sirens, they are no less real. Air pollutants include carbon monoxide, ozone, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, and particulates. These pollutants come primarily from the combustion of fossil fuels, principally coal-fired power plants and gasoline-powered automobiles. Nitrogen oxides can lead to the formation of ground-level ozone. Particulates are emitted from a variety of sources, primarily diesel engines. "Smog"-a hybrid word used to describe the mixture of smoke and fog that blankets some cities-is primarily composed of ozone and particulates.

# Obesity Add-on

### [\_\_\_\_] Expanding mass transit substantially decreases obesity and health care costs

**Treasury Department 2012**

(“A NEW ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT”, MARCH 23, 2012, <http://www.treasury.gov/resource-center/economic-policy/Documents/20120323InfrastructureReport.pdf>)

**If improved infrastructure changed the way Americans live and work, there would be significant benefits to health and wellness.** For example, **MacDonald et al. find that** improving neighborhood environments and **increasing the public’s use of light rail transit would benefit health to the extent it causes increased physical activity, a reduction in the incidence of obesity** (body mass index greater than 30), **and a reduction in the odds of becoming obese**.44 Using data on individuals before (July 2006 to February 2007) and after (March 2008 to July 2008) the completion of a light rail system in Charlotte, North Carolina, **they find that the use of light rail to commute to work is associated with a nearly 1.2 point reduction in body mass index as well as an 81 percent reduction** **in the odds of becoming obese**. Moreover, improved perceptions of neighborhoods as a result of the availability of light rail were associated with 15 percent lower odds of obesity as well as higher odds of meeting weekly recommended physical activity levels for walking and vigorous exercise (9 percent and 11 percent, respectively). In addition to all of the personal benefits associated with a healthier life style, **overall costs on our health care system are substantially reduced when obesity rates are lowered, given that health care costs for the obese are almost twice the rate for normal weight individuals**. Finkelstein et al. find that between 1998 and 2006, the prevalence of obesity in the United States increased by 37 percent, adding $40 billion dollars to health care costs. 45

[\_\_\_\_] Obesity causes 300,000 deaths a year

Douglas Besharov, American Enterprises Institute, 2003

(Testimony before Committee on Agriculture, April 3, <http://www.aei.org/publications/pubID.16861,filter.all/pub_detail.asp>)

Being overweight is not simply a matter of aesthetics. **The growing girth of Americans is a major health catastrophe.** Overweight people are three times more likely to have coronary artery disease.[5] two to six times more likely to develop high blood pressure, [6] more than three times as likely to develop type 2 diabetes, [7] and twice as likely to develop gallstones than normal weight people.[8] **Obesity**, of course, **is more serious, causing an estimated 50 to 100 percent increase in premature deaths (estimated to be 300,000 deaths per year).**[9]

# Car Accidents Add-on

### [\_\_\_\_] Mass transit reduces the number of auto accidents significantly

Arizona PIRG Education Fund, a federation of independent, state-based, citizen-funded organizations that advocate for the public interest, 2009

(“Why and How to Fund Public Transportation”, march 2009, http://www.uspirg.org/sites/pirg/files/reports/Why-and-How-to-Fund-Public-Transportation.pdf)

**The Bureau of Transportation Statistics estimates that motor vehicles cause over 40,000 accidental deaths and almost 3 million injuries each year**.11 **By contrast, less than 300 deaths annually take place on public transit**.12 Using conservative estimates to quantify these costs in financial terms, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration in 2002 estimated an average social cost from accidents totally 15.8 cents per vehicle mile or 4.3 percent of GDP.13 Substituting driving with public transit tends to reduce death and injuries because **transit is safer**.14 Rail and buses have lower crash risk per-passenger-trip because professional drivers tend to have lower crash rates and total vehicle traffic is reduced. Bus passengers have about one-tenth the per-mile crash fatality rate as automobile passengers. **Rail passengers have a rate of risk about one-quarter that of drivers** — higher than bus because of generally higher speeds. **More compact communities have far lower crash and fatality rates than less compact communities.**

[\_\_\_\_] Auto accidents are a significant cause of death- kill more per year than war

Taras Grescoe, frequent contributor to the New York Times, 2012

(Straphanger: Saving our Cities and Ourselves from the Automobile, http://www.utne.com/environment/straphanger-public-transport-ze0z1206zsie.aspx?page=5)

You would be hard pressed to track down the name of the latest victim**: in the last minute alone, two humans somewhere on the planet have had their lives cut short by cars.** **Year in, year out, automobiles kill 1.2 million people around the world, and injure 20 million. It is a hecatomb equivalent to a dozen fully loaded jumbo jets crashing every day, with no survivors, yet one so routine the majority of fatalities go unreported**—as though being crushed by glass and metal had become just another of death’s “natural causes”. **War, in comparison, is an inefficient scourge of the human race: among people aged ten to twenty four, the automobile long ago beat out armed conflict as the leading cause of death.**

# Lack of Mass Transit Leads to Poverty/ Segregation

[\_\_\_\_] Lack of public mass transit aggravates inequalities

Moulding, J.D. candidate, Georgetown University Law Center, 2005

(Georgetown journal on Poverty Law & Policy, "Fare or Unfair? The Importance of Mass Transit for America's Poor", Hein Online)

The **underdevelopment of public transportation** in America **has exacerbated our nation's** economic and **social inequalities**. A decades-long trend of **prioritizing automobile** use at the expense of public transportation **has undercut an important means of improving the lives of low-income Americans**, especially in urban areas. **While the consequences of high-way transit network** for the environment and energy consumption have **received attention, the economic impact on the poor is relatively overlooked.**

# Lack of Mass Transit Leads to Poverty/ Segregation

[\_\_\_\_] Current transportation policies exclude marginalized communities from jobs and opportunities

Center for Social Inclusion 2006

(“Racism and Racial Discrimination in the U.S.: Federal Disinvestment in Opportunity for Marginalized Communities”. The Center for Social Inclusion is a national policy strategy organization that works to dismantle structural racial inequity and increase well-being for all. http://www.assetfunders.org/library/documents/CSIonUSandCERD.pdf)

In all of the public spheres listed in Article 1, **U.S. policies** create conditions that disproportionately **exclude marginalized communities** and groups **from enjoying fundamental freedoms and opportunities**, such as good jobs and good schools. Some policies may be facially race-neutral but perpetuate the historic racial exclusion that is embedded in our institutions. **Present-day federal transportation,** housing, education and fiscal policies **perpetuate the racial exclusion** that was built into federal policies from the 1930s through 50s – policies that created middle-class White suburbs and poor, non-White inner-city neighborhoods. While the incomes and racial identities of cities and suburbs have been changing, **people of color continue to be deeply isolated from opportunities**. **Poor people of color** **are** much more **likely** than poor Whites **to live in concentrated** poverty **neighborhoods that lack opportunities**, like good jobs, good schools, and quality services. Concentrated poverty neighborhoods are neighborhoods where at least 20% (rural) or 40% (urban) of the population lives at or below the federal poverty level.3More than two-thirds of people living in concentrated urban poverty are Black or Latino, even though they are one-fourth of the US population.4 In rural America, half of poor rural Blacks and Native Americans live in concentrated poverty and 27% of all poor rural Latinos live in areas of high poverty.5 Gulf Coast states have high rates of concentrated poverty compared to the rest of the country (26% in Alabama, 41% in Louisiana, and 41% in Mississippi).6 More than 1 out of every 10 neighborhoods in New York City is a concentrated poverty neighborhood (248 total, or 11.2% of all neighborhoods) and these neighborhoods are predominately people of color (87.5% of these neighborhoods are over 80% non-White). Of the 923,113 people living in concentrated poverty in New York, 37.1% are Black and 49.7% Latino, compared to 8.4% White.7 (See Appendix A for a map of concentrated poverty in neighborhoods of color in New York City). o **Very poor neighborhoods** of color **have far less to no jobs in their neighborhoods** compared to other areas of the City. (See Appendix B for a map showing the relationship between concentrated poverty, neighborhoods of color, and location of jobs).

# Car Culture Leads to Systemic Violence

[\_\_\_\_] Owning a car is not a choice – it is forced on us by the infrastructure we choose to support. Mass transit is critical to break the cycles of discrimination and violence

Zack Furness, Columbia College Chicago Department of Humanities, 2010

(One Less Car, pg. 8)

**The** historical **transformation of the United States into a full-blown car culture is** commonly, though somewhat **erroneously, attributed to choice or desire**, **as if the aggregation of individual consumer choices and yearnings necessarily built the roads, lobbied the government, zoned the real estate, silenced the critics, subsidized auto makers, underfunded public transit, and passed the necessary laws to oversee all facets of these projects since the 1890s.** One of the primary stories used to bolster this broad-based claim is that of america’s love affair with the automobile—a common trope in U.S. popular culture that colors our understanding of transportation history and also buttresses some of the most partisan arguments posed by the car’s vigorous defenders. 27 it is unquestionable that many americans do, in fact, love their cars and cling to the myth of “The road” with the zeal of Madison avenue and Jack Kerouac combined. However, the fidelity of the narrative is almost irrelevant when considering how it is put to use and for whom it is made to work. That is to say, while the love affair serves a variety of social and cultural functions in the **United States, it is particularly compelling to a relatively small group of freemarket ideologues and multinational corporations** (particularly oil conglomerates) who largely govern and/or profit from the production, marketing, sales, and regulation of the automobile. indeed, **the love story satisfies two of the most cherished myths of free-market capitalism concurrently: it corroborates the idea that consumer choices equal authentic power** (i.e., people vote with their wallets), **and it normalizes the false notion that consumer desires ultimately determine the so-called evolution of technologies**—**a position that ignores the profound roles that material and cultural infrastructures play in the success of any technology,** much less the development of technological norms. Such explanations not only are misleading; they also effectively downplay some of the most undemocratic and thoroughly racist decision-making processes at the heart of postwar urban development and transportation policy implementation in the United States, as well as the political influence historically wielded by what could easily be termed an automobile-industrial complex. 28 This is not to suggest that power is always exerted from the top down, nor to imply that the average person plays no role in the production or contestation of technological and cultural norms. rather, it is simply a way of acknowledging **that technological desires and choices**, particularly **those concerning transportation and mobility, are necessarily constrained by the profit imperatives of very specific and very powerful institutions and organizations.**

# Inequality Should Come First

[\_\_\_\_] The government has a moral obligation to address economic inequality

Congressional Black Caucus 2009

(Opportunities for All -Pathways Out of Poverty, Bi-Annual Report, January—June 2009, thecongressionalblackcaucus.lee.house.gov/reports/Bi\_Annual\_Report\_June\_2009.pdf)

As our nation’s economic uncertainty continues, **millions of Americans already struggling to overcome systemic poverty are encountering greater hardships**. **Millions more are grasping to maintain their quality of life during this turmoil**. This crisis is particularly acute among African Americans. More than 24% of African Americans live below the poverty line and African Americans are 55% more likely to be unemployed than other Americans. The Congressional Black Caucus (CBC), in its continued role as the Conscience of **Congress, has a moral obligation to address inequality and injustice as never before in history.** We are aggressively advancing the role of government to empower and protect American families by collectively pursuing a legislative agenda that addresses the priori- ties of our constituents**. We believe that we have a responsibility and obligation to eradicate poverty by utilizing the full constitutional power, statutory authority, and resources of our government to provide opportunities for all and to develop pathways out of poverty**. Some of these opportunities and pathways include economic opportunities, job training, livable wages, education, mental health services, affordable housing, health care, child nutrition and a responsible foreign policy.

# Answers to: No Impact to Poverty

#### [\_\_\_\_]

#### [\_\_\_\_] Poverty is a hidden evil that systematically targets the weak and poor, constantly causing harm

James Gilligan, professor of Psychiatry at the Harvard Medical School, Director of the Center for the Study of Violence, 1996

(Violence: Our Deadly Epidemic and its Causes, p 191-196)

**The deadliest form of violence is poverty**. You cannot work for one day with the violent people who fill our prisons and mental hospitals for the criminally insane without being forcible and constantly reminded of the extreme poverty and discrimination that characterizes their lives. Hearing about their lives, and about their families and friends, you are forced to recognize the truth in Gandhi’s observation that the deadliest form of violence is poverty. Not a day goes by without realizing that trying to understand them and their violent behavior in purely individual terms is impossible and wrong-headed. Any theory of violence, especially a psychological theory, that evolves from the experience of men in maximum security prisons and hospitals for the criminally insane must begin with the recognition that these institutions are only microcosms. They are not where the major violence in our society takes place, and the perpetrators who fill them are far from being the main causes of most violent deaths. **Any approach to a theory of violence needs to begin with a look at the structural violence in this country.** Focusing merely on those relatively few men who commit what we define as murder could distract us from examining and learning from those structural causes of violent death that are far more significant from a numerical or public health, or human, standpoint. **By “structural violence” I mean the increased rates of death, and disability suffered by those who occupy the bottom rungs of society, as contrasted with the relatively lower death rates experienced by those who are above them. Those excess deaths** (or at least a demonstrably large proportion of them) **are a function of class structure**; **and that structure is itself a product of society’s collective human choices**, concerning how to distribute the collective wealth of the society. These are not acts of God. I am contrasting “structural” with “behavioral violence,” by which I mean the non-natural deaths and injuries that are caused by specific behavioral actions of individuals against individuals, such as the deaths we attribute to homicide, suicide, soldiers in warfare, capital punishment, and so on. Structural violence differs from behavioral violence in at least three major respects. \***The lethal effects of structural violence operate continuously, rather than sporadically**, whereas murders, suicides, executions, wars, and other forms of behavioral violence occur one at a time. \*Structural violence operates more or less independently of individual acts; independent of individuals and groups (politicians, political parties, voters) whose decisions may nevertheless have lethal consequences for others.

### 

# Answers to: Segregation Declining

**[\_\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_\_] Segregation is increasing not decreasing

Daniel Lichter, Cornell University, 2011

(http://npc.umich.edu/publications/u/2011-16%20NPC%20Working%20Paper.pdf, May 3, National Poverty Center Working Paper Series #11 – 16)

Third, our analyses showed that **patterns of racial and class segregation were distinct but overlapping phenomena. Poor minorities—both in metro and nonmetro areas—are highly ghettoized spatially at the macro-scale leve**l (across communities and counties). Significantly, **the poor and nonpoor—regardless of race—became more segregated from each other during the 2000s**. Concentrated poverty was much higher among America’s minority rather than among white populations. Rural blacks, in particular, were especially likely to be concentrated in poor places and counties. Moreover, our multivariate models indicated that counties—even less populated nonmetro counties—with heavy concentrations of racial minorities (especially blacks) are most likely to have spatially segregated poor populations. **The policy implications are clear: because spatial and social mobility often go hand-in-hand, the segregation of the minority poor from the nonpoor connotes persistent racial injustice, limited opportunities for upward social mobility, and the reproduction of poverty and inequality from one generation to the next**.

# Solvency Extension

[\_\_\_\_] Central federal planning is crucial to alter patterns of urban segregation

Robert D. Bullard, Glenn S. Johnson, and Angel O. Torres, Ph.D. in Sociology at Iowa State University; Associate Professor at Clark Atlanta University; Geographic Information Systems Training Specialist, 2004 ( "Highway Robbery Transportation Racism And New Routes to Equity", Page 3-5)

People of color communities are not waiting for government, business or mainstream environmental groups to come up with a "silver-bullet solution to address the transportation racism that fuels suburban sprawl and uneven development. **Some communities and groups are taking action**. Whether central city, suburb, or rural, **it will take a coordinated effort among the divergent interests to fix the nation's transportation problems**. **Transportation racism and suburban sprawl act in concert to suck the life out of central cities**. Employing smart growth strategies to address both problems would go a long way towards bringing economic vitality back to many declining urban communities. **It will also take time and resources to arrest suburban sprawl and the negative impacts it has had on central cities**. **Clearly, people of color organizations that have long track records in civil rights** have a ready-made issue in transportation equity and smart growth. They need only seize the issue as their own. Without transportation equity, many of our nation's neighborhood revitalization efforts, brownfields redevelopment, location-efficient mortgages, transit-oriented development, and related smart growth initiatives will be difficult, if not impossible, to implement. Building a Transportation Equity-Smart Growth Movement Race still matters in the United States, and running from it solves "hing. **Addressing social equity and improving race relations needs** **to be explicit priorities in transportation equity** and smart growth initiatives. **Racial polarization is impeding community and economic develop in almost every metropolitan region that has large Concentrations of people of color**. **Dismantling** **racial barriers** and institutional racism **would go a long way** towards boosting financial incentives and reinvestment in central-city neighborhoods. ft makes little sense to have only white men and women in suits talking to each Other about solving regional air pollution, transportation, sprawl, and overall quality of life problems. **Transportation planning is too important to be left solely in the hands of urban planners**, many of whom drive cars, seldom use public transit, and have few real world experiences with poor people and 194 HIGHWAY ROBBERY people of color. Having transit riders on the local or regional transit provider's board and metropolitan planning organizations is a good first step in broadening stakeholder input into decision-making. However, serving on boards or sitting at the table is not sufficient. **There must be some real power-sharing with poor people and people of color and other underrepresented groups before real change and real solutions are possible**. **There must be a national strategy to develop and disseminate transportation equity** and smart growth messages to everybody involved in the equitable transportation movement to make sure our voices are heard loud and clear.

# Answers to: No Riders

### [\_\_\_\_]

### [\_\_\_\_] Increased government support of mass transit resolves the main reasons people don’t use mass transit

Prum and Catz, 2011- \* Assistant Professor, The Florida State University AND \*\* Director, Center for Urban Infrastructure; Research Associate, Institute of Transportation Studies, University of California, Irvine (Darren and Sarah, “GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSION TARGETS AND MASS TRANSIT: CAN THE GOVERNMENT SUCCESSFULLY ACCOMPLISH BOTH WITHOUT A CONFLICT?” 51 Santa Clara L. Rev. 935, 971-972)//AWV

Within the context of transit (and depending on the consumer’s location), the ability to select between viable substitutes becomes an issue where policy makers wish to use transit options as part of an overall greenhouse gas reduction program. Personal freedom and cost play a large role in guiding the consumer’s preferences, but those preferences begin to change when certain population densities and price points make mass transit more competitive with other readily available alternatives.204 In achieving the proper price point for mass transit, the expense of constructing the project and the on-going operational costs can overburden these options, making them unaffordable choices in the consumer’s eyes when other important factors, such as population density, weigh against them.205 However, in these situations, the government can strategically provide financial incentives that can level the opportunity costs and give consumers viable alternatives, despite the drawbacks from other important aspects.206 Thus, a variety of market factors like personal freedom, population density, and cost must reach critical levels whereby consumers are willing to consider meaningful substitute modes; but the financial model for the entity providing the service needs to be viable, with adequate funding from all of its sources.

### [\_\_\_\_] Reason that people don’t use public transportation is because it is not available – plan could resolve this

Weyrich and Lind **200**3 (Paul M. and William S., “How Transit Benefits People Who Do Not Ride It: A Conservative Inquiry”, October,

http://www.apta.com/gap/policyresearch/Documents/how\_transit\_benefits.pdf)

A major reason why Americans do not use public transportation at the same rate as Europeansis that good public transportation is not available. As we noted in an earlier study, only about one-half of all Americans have any public transit service, and only about one-quarter have

service they call “satisfactory.”34 In most cases, high quality transit – transit good enough to draw riders from choice – means rail transit. That, in turn, usually means electrified railways,

if the rail transit system is carrying lots of passengers.

# Answers to: No Riders

### [\_\_\_\_]

### [\_\_\_\_] People will ride mass transit – becoming increasingly popular, especially with new generations

Grescoe **20**12 - writer, frequent contributor to the NYT, the Independent, and National Geographic, (Taras, Straphanger: Saving our Cities and Ourselves from the Automobile)

If you credit the demographers, this transit trend has legs. The “Millenials”, who reached adulthood around the turn of the century and now outnumber baby boomers, tend to favor cities over suburbs, and are far more willing than their parents to ride buses and subways. Part of the reason is their ease with iPads, MP3 players, Kindles, and smartphones: you can get some serious texting done when you are not driving, and earbuds offer effective insulation from all but the most extreme commuting annoyances. Even though there are more teenagers in the country than ever, only ten million have a driver’s license (versus twelve million a generation ago). Baby boomers may have been raised in Leave it to Beaver suburbs, but as they retire, a significant contingent is favoring older cities and compact towns where they have the option of walking and riding bikes. Seniors, too are more likely to use transit, and by 2025 there will be 64 million Americans over the age of 65. Already, dwellings in older neighborhoods in Washington, D.C., Atlanta, and Denver, especially those near light rail or subway stations, are commanding enormous price premiums over suburban homes. The experience of European and Asian cities shows that if you make buses, subways, and trains convenient, comfortable, fast, and safe, a surprisingly large percentage of citizens will opt to ride rather than drive.

### [\_\_\_\_] Mass transit use rises as gas prices soar

Hargreaves 2012 -CNNMoney (Steve, http://money.cnn.com/2012/03/12/news/economy/mass-transit/index.htm, 3-12-12)

Ridership on the nation's trains and buses hit one of the highest levels in decades, with officials crediting high gas prices, a stronger economy and new technology that makes riding public transit easier. In 2011, Americans took 10.4 billion trips on mass transit, which includes buses, trains, street cars and ferries, according to the American Public Transportation Association. That's a 2.3% increase over 2010 and just shy of the number of trips in 2008, when gasoline spiked to a record national average of $4.11 a gallon. "As people get jobs and go back to work, they get on mass transit more," said Michael Melaniphy, president of APTA. "And then when people look at gas prices, they really get on transit more."Melaniphy said gas prices near $4 a gallon tends to be the tipping point that pushes more people onto mass transit.

# Answers to: No Riders

### [\_\_\_\_]

### [\_\_\_\_] 2/3 of people are in metropolitan areas and can’t ride Mass transit because it isn’t there

BAF, 2011 Transportation Infrastructure Report 2011 Building America’s Future Falling Apart and Falling Behind Building America’s Future Educational Fund Building America’s Future Educational Fund (BAF Ed Fund) is a bipartisan coalition of elected officials dedicated to bringing about a new era of U.S. investment in infrastructure [www.bafuture.com](http://www.bafuture.com)

The 100 largest U.S. metropolitan regions house almost two-thirds of the population and generate nearly three-quarters of our GDP. In 47 states—even those traditionally considered ‘rural,’ like Nebraska, Kansas, and Iowa—the majority of GDP is generated in metropolitan areas.13 And over the next 20 years, 94% of the nation’s economic growth will occur in metropolitan areas.14 Metropolitan areas are already home to the most congested highways, the oldest roads and bridges, and the most overburdened transit systems—and the strains on the transportation system are only bound to get worse. By 2035, an estimated 70 million more people will live in U.S. metropolitan regions. More people bring more commerce and greater transportation demands. Every American accounts for about 40 tons of freight to be hauled each year—so an additional 2.8 billion tons of freight will be moved to and from major metropolitan regions in 2035.15 Our transportation system is simply not up to the task. Our transportation system has also not adapted to the energy realities of the 21st century. Air pollution and carbon emissions—the majority of which in the United States are generated by transportation—threaten the environment. Reliance on foreign oil has imperiled our national security. And fluctuating gas prices are making Americans’ car-dependent lifestyles simply unaffordable. We are increasingly aware that for all these reasons a trans-portation system largely run on gasoline is environmentally and economically unsustainable. In a global economy, businesses need access to manufacturing plants and distribution centers, to international gateways like ports and airports, and to consumers in both metropolitan and rural regions. People need reliable and efficient ways to commute to work and go about their daily lives. We need a modern infrastructure system if we are to meet both needs. And if we don’t create a transportation system that functions reliably and cost-effectively in the 21st century, companies operating in this globalized world can simply choose to do their business elsewhere—taking U.S. jobs and revenues with them.

# Answers to: No Riders

### [\_\_\_\_]

### [\_\_\_\_] Empirically, new and upgraded mass transit increases ridership

### 

Bailey, 2007- Federal Programs Advisor at the New York City Department of Transportation.(transportation policy analyst <http://www.apta.com/resources/reportsandpublications/Documents/apta_public_transportation_fuel_savings_final_010807.pdf>)

A final analysis was completed to estimate the effect of an expansion of public transportation service and use. Total ridership, as measured in unlinked trips, was doubled. Growth in public transportation use was assigned to two major sources: improvements to an existing route or system, and extensions and new routes. By conducting an analysis of growth on public transportation systems from 1999 to 2004, the research team found that approximately one-third of ridership growth is associated with improvements to existing routes, while two-thirds has resulted from new routes and modal extensions. The necessary growth in route miles and modal extensions was estimated using recent improvements to public transportation systems in the U.S., using the average increase in ridership relative to the route miles built. Figures from several recent rail and high-quality bus projects were collected directly from public transportation agencies. Most major improvements and extensions to public transportation systems currently operate either light rail, commuter rail, or high-quality bus systems. For households, an increase in the number of route miles served by high-quality public transportation service would increase the total number of households with the option to use public transportation, as well as the total number of employment sites served by public transportation networks. The number of households that would have improved or new public transportation service is estimated using some basic assumptions about the distribution of residences:

• Residential density is assumed to be the average for urbanized areas across the U.S. Current urbanized areas were defined by the 2000 Census, and generally represent cities and suburbs that have a combined population of over 50,000 people. This is a conservative estimate because public transportation alignments are generally targeted to areas that have been zoned and built up at a higher density than other areas in the city.

• The area served by new routes are assumed to overlap with areas served by parallel or nearby routes by 25 percent. Existing public transportation availability was estimated using the NHTS 2001 data. NHTS 2001 staff provided a special data set to the research team that uses the geographic location of each respondent and a 1994 database of bus lines and rail stops to calculate the distance between each respondent and public transportation services. Relative increases in total public transportation route mileage is based on existing services from 2004.

# Answers to: Road Focus Good for Economy

[\_\_\_\_]

[\_\_\_\_] Highways infrastructure is failing now even with lots of government investment

Jack Schenendorf et al., of Counsel Covington and Burling LLP, 2011

(For nearly 25 years, Mr. Schenendorf served on the staff of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the U.S. House of Representatives. He was Chief of Staff from 1995 to 2001. “Modernizing U.S. Surface Transportation System: Inaction Must Not Be an Option”, 7-22, <http://www.aem.org/PDF/2011-07-27_SchenendorfModernizingSystem.pdf>, DOA: 4-10-12)

In the past three decades or so, however, the total number of highway lane miles grew only 4.4 percent. As a result, hours of delay per traveler almost tripled from 1982-2005, and total hours of delay increased fivefold. **In urban areas alone, congestion resulted in 4.8 billion hours of traveler delays and consumption of an additional 3.9 billion gallons of fuel in 2009**. **Freight movements have been similarly affected: th**e top 25 truck bottlenecks in the U.S. (primarily at interstate inter- changes) account for about 37 million truck hours of delay each year. **These problems aren’t only the result of a steadily growing usage, but also of deteriorating conditions.** As of 2006, **more than half of total** vehicle **miles traveled** **on the** federal highway **system occurred on roads that were not in good condition**. More than one-quarter of the nation’s bridges are structurally deficient or functionally obsolete.

# [\_\_\_\_]

# Answers to: Road Focus Good for Economy

### [\_\_\_\_] Public transit is key to local and national economies – greater mobility and increased productivity

Weisbroad and Reno 2009 (Glen, researcher at the Economic Development Research Group, Inc. and Arlee, of Cambridge Systematics, Inc. “Economic Impact of Public Transportation Investment,” <http://www.apta.com/resources/reportsandpublications/Documents/economic_impact_of_public_transportation_investment.pdf>)

In addition to the cost savings described above, a shift from auto to public transportation would facilitate increased productivity and competitiveness within cities (as discussed in Section 4.3). This benefit stems from two factors: (1) reduction in wage premiums paid to attract workers to more-congested areas with higher travel times and costs, and (2) enhancement of access to labor and customer markets, which bring scale and “agglomeration” economies.

[\_\_\_\_] **Mass transit investment provides thousands of jobs and boosts urban economies**

APTA 2012, (American Public Transportation Association, March “Economic Recovery: Promoting Growth”, <http://www.apta.com/resources/reportsandpublications/Documents/Economic-Recovery-APTA-White-Paper.pdf>)]

Throughout the country, public transportation systems provide jobs with good wages that stay in local communities. When those employees make purchases, they help boost their local economies, providing benefits beyond the value of their wages—they buy goods and services that fund more jobs. Noted economists have calculated that for every $1 billion invested in public transportation, more than 36,000 jobs are supported. Investment in public transportation also flows to private-sector transit industry manufacturers and their suppliers. These firms employ many people, which further multiplies the effects of public transportation dollars when these individuals spend their wages in their communities. Approximately 74 percent of government funding for public transportation goes toward supporting hundreds of thousands of private sector jobs. It is estimated that every $1billion of public transportation capital investment creates 24,000 jobs. Every$1 billion spent on public transportation operations supports or creates more than 41,000 jobs. In 2010, the industry spent $37.2 billion on operating costs and $17.9 billion on capital costs, which created and supported nearly 2million jobs.1Estimates of the number of jobs created by public transportation include three levels supported by public transportation spending. The highest level is jobs created directly at public transit systems or by operators and manufacturers of transit equipment, followed by indirect jobs supported by the purchase of products and services by public transportation businesses. The third level takes in other indirect jobs created when public transportation workers spend their earnings in the greater economy. In this way, dollars from public transportation spending effectively travel to many different industries across the country.

# Answers to: Road Focus Good for Economy

### [\_\_\_\_] Investment in mass transit provides the most jobs per dollar spent.

Phillips 2009 -transportation policy expert for the Environmental Defense Fund (“A stimulating investment - mass transit”, San Francisco Chronicle, November 22, 2009 <http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2009/11/21/IN2H1ALLFM.DTL#ixzz1ySjUopPk>)

Whether such a bill can be put to the best use for jobs depends on whether Congress and the Obama administration invest in the right type of transportation infrastructure. One good approach would be to focus on repairing existing infrastructure: fill the potholes and refurbish old bridges that cost Americans time, money and wear and tear on vehicles. However, the best approach would be to direct new investment in public mass transit because it creates the most jobs per dollar spent, according to the Surface Transportation Policy Project. It also responds to the growing demand for good transit that began with rising gasoline prices in 2008. In addition, mass transit investment also cuts air and global warming pollution. In fact, a report by the Duke University Center on Globalization, Governance & Competitiveness shows that increasing investment in conventional and green transit bus systems would cut greenhouse gas pollution around the country. It would also create high-quality, long-term manufacturing jobs in nearly every state in the eastern United States as well as Northern California.

### [\_\_\_\_] Government support of mass transit is key to save American manufacturing

Fitzgerald et.al. 2010- professor and director of the graduate program in Law, Policy and Society and a Senior Research Fellow at the Kitty and Michael Kukakis Center for Urban and Regional Policy at Northeastern University (Joan, Granquist, Khatiwada, McLaughlin, Renner, “Reviving the U.S. Rail and Transit Industry: Investments and Job Creation”, WorldWatch Institute)//AWV

The bottom line is that the United States needs to focus on high-end manufacturing. A strategy for doing so is to link manufacturing to other policy goals. Countries in both Europe and Asia have successfully linked the development of state-of-the-art public transit systems to manufacturing. These countries are now exporting or producing technologically sophisticated transit vehicles around the world. It is time for the United States to become a producer, rather than a consumer, of transit vehicles. But no single industry will save U.S. manufacturing—the country needs a coherent industrial policy. In reports such as this one, the authors are con- strained by the boundaries of current policy debate if they expect to be taken seriously. As a result, even though the above analysis indicates that the level of funding proposed under the International Competitiveness scenario would most forcefully accelerate the development of a strong U.S. transit industry, the less-ambitious Increased Domestic Investment level is recommended here—and even this is an aggressive funding scenario given the current political climate. Nevertheless, the analysis in this report plainly suggests that if U.S. manufacturing is to experience a serious revival that produces more than fragmented show- case projects and scattered jobs, public policy needs to think much bigger and more boldly than it currently does.

# Answers to: Road Focus Good for Economy

### [\_\_\_\_] Mass transit helps the US economy by providing jobs, generating tax revenue, expanding exports, reducing trade deficits, and increasing manufacturing

Feldman 2009 (Jonathan Michael, “From Mass Transit to New Manufacturing”, American Prospect; April 2009, Vol. 20 Issue 3, pA12-A16, 5p)

A new industrial-policy initiative for domestic production of masstransit products could help the United States overcome multiple economic challenges. It could provide highwage jobs, generate tax revenue, expand exports, and reduce trade deficits. This mass-transit-production strategy requires a new kind of industrial and planning policy to overcome the limits of traditional public works. It’s not enough to lay more tracks and upgrade rail facilities. The government has to support domestic production of trains, signals, and related transit hardware and software. According to the Institute for Supply Management, U.S. manufacturing activity recently fell to its lowest level in 28 years. Manufacturing has also suffered across the globe. But overseas the downturn reflects mainly the recession, while in the U.S. there is a long-term manufacturing decline. Traditional public-works outlays alone won’t restore American manufacturing—but they could supply new demand if we had industrial policies in place. Mass transit could be the incubator for an industrial renaissance, based on new kinds of producers and processes. If public investment is connected to developing new industries, then government spending will not “crowd out” private investment. On the contrary, the public outlay could provide demand for new private investments. But when the market and existing firms fail to make the necessary investments, the government must fill the void.

# Answers to: Gentrification Turn

**[\_\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_\_] The answer to gentrification is more, not less mass transit

[Lloyd Alter](http://www.treehugger.com/author/lloyd-alter/), fmr. President of the [Architectural Conservancy of Ontario](http://arconserv.ca/), 2010  
(Does New Public Transit Increase Gentrification and Lower Ridership?, October 22, http://www.treehugger.com/cars/does-new-public-transit-increase-gentrification-and-lower-ridership.html)

It seems counter-intuitive that people would move to an area because of an investment in transit and then drive, but hey, it's America. **It** also **is counter-intuitive to think that the investment and upgrading that comes from gentrification is not a good thing**, but the report points out that poor people, who benefit most from transit, can be displaced and have to move further from the transit that is their only option. In the end, **the report** makes some solid recommendations to get the best of both worlds. They **advocate incentives to build affordable housing, reduced parking requirements** (so people who move there have fewer cars) **and other incentives to get people out of their cars and onto transit**. But ultimately **the answer is to make the United States like almost every other civilized country: install good clean transit that is affordable and comfortable, and stop subsidizing the car**, the roads and the parking. In most of the world there is no stigma to transit and the ethnicity of the riders pretty much mirrors the ethnic mix of the cities it runs through. Transit is for everyone.

# Answers to: Gentrification Turn

**[\_\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_\_] Cities can take many steps to avoid gentrification

Lesley Williams Reid and Robert M. Adelman, Georgia State University, 2003

(The Double-edged Sword of Gentrification in Atlanta, http://www.asanet.org/footnotes/apr03/indexthree.html)

In response to events in recent years, **the Atlanta city government created a task force to deal with the negative aspects of gentrification.** **The task force suggested that the city institute aggressive affordable housing policies, especially for low-income residents; provide incentives for builders to include affordable housing in new developments; use land seized by the city through tax foreclosures for affordable housing; prevent property tax liens from being sold to private collection agencies; and educate longtime residents on predatory lending and below-market price sales scams**. But, as sprawl and long commutes continue to plague Atlanta, the demand for in-town housing will increase. Developers and renovators will be more than happy to meet that demand. Indeed the biggest challenge facing Atlanta is to prevent those who control the market from defining the terms of gentrification. This is a task few cities have done well, and in a city built on a mantra of pro-growth, pro-development, no-holds-barred boosterism, it is a particularly daunting task.

# 

# Answers to: Crime Turn

**[\_\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_\_] Mass transit decreases crime in bad neighborhoods because of police presence

House Logic, 2010 (April 23, 2010, <http://www.houselogic.com/home-advice/green-living/public-transportation-adds-value-home/>)

Another stereotype about public transportation is that it brings criminals into the neighborhood. **Research shows**, however, **that the existing socio-demographic makeup of the neighborhood is what drives crime, not its proximity to public transportation**.  As **the Department of Urban Planning** **at** the **U**niversity of **C**alifornia, **L**os **A**ngeles, School of Public Policy and Social Research **found** when it studied [the issue](http://www.uctc.net/papers/550.pdf), **transit stations and surrounding neighborhoods in L.A. “are no more unsafe than other city streets. In fact, if we consider only serious crime, rail stations are safer than many city streets because of the higher rate of police deployment.”** The study did find that the type of crime committed was influenced by the environment. Pick-pockets work in crowds, while car theives work park-and-ride lots.

[\_\_\_\_] Crime is at an all time low

New York Times, 2011 (May 23, <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/05/24/us/24crime.html>)

**The number of violent crimes in the United States dropped significantly** last year, to what appeared **to** be **the lowest rate in nearly 40 years,** a development that was considered puzzling partly because it ran counter to the prevailing expectation that crime would increase during a [recession](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/r/recession_and_depression/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier). **In all regions, the country appears to be safer. The odds of being murdered or robbed are now less than half of what they were in the early 1990s**, when violent crime peaked in the United States. Small towns, especially, are seeing far fewer murders: **In cities with populations under 10,000, the number plunged by more than 25 percent last year.**

# Answers to: Federalism

### [\_\_\_\_] Non unique link – federal government dominates transportation policy

Dilger 2011, -Senior Specialist in American National Government (Robert Jay, “Federalism Issues in Surface Transportation Policy: Past and Present”, 1-5-11, Congressional Research Service)

American federalism, which shapes the roles, responsibilities, and interactions among and between the federal government, the states, and local governments, is continuously evolving, adapting to changes in American society and American political institutions. The nature of federalism relationships in surface transportation policy has also evolved over time, with the federal government’s role becoming increasingly influential, especially since the Federal-Aid to Highway Act of 1956 which authorized the interstate highway system. In recent years, state and local government officials, through their public interest groups (especially the National Governors Association, National Conference of State Legislatures, National Association of Counties, National League of Cities, U.S. Conference of Mayors, and American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials) have lobbied for increased federal assistance for surface transportation grants and increased flexibility in the use of those funds. They contend that they are better able to identify surface transportation needs in their states than federal officials and are capable of administering federal grant funds with relatively minimal federal oversight. They also argue that states have a long history of learning from one another. In their view, providing states flexibility in the use of federal funds results in better surface transportation policy because it enables states to experiment with innovative solutions to surface transportation problems and then share their experiences with other states. Others argue that the federal government has a responsibility to ensure that federal funds are used in the most efficient and effective manner possible to promote the national interest in expanding national economic growth and protecting the environment. In their view, providing states increased flexibility in the use of federal funds diminishes the federal government’s ability to ensure that national needs are met. Still others have argued for a fundamental restructuring of federal and state government responsibilities in surface transportation policy, with some responsibilities devolved to states and others remaining with the federal government.

# Answers to: States CP

**[\_\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_\_] Transportation equity is a moral obligation that the federal government is responsible for

Thomas W Sanchez, chair of the Department of City and Metropolitan Planning at the University of Utah, 2010 (Poverty & Race 19.4, "Transportation and Civil Rights", http://search.proquest.com/docview/744192726)

**Transportation infrastructure can displace residents and permanently damage community structure** and integrity. **Both the construction and operation of infrastructure can impair (or benefit**) **walkability and livability**. Use of motor vehicles and rail cause air pollution, noise and pedestrian hazards, disproportionately affecting people living near them. **Preferential investments in auto-centered transport have generated a transit-dependent subclass that has substantial barriers to access**. **Transportation systems facilitate race-, ethnic- and class-based segregation, contributing to environmental injustice**. On-road mobile sources contribute to the highest health risks near major roadways. **Land use decisions should be made with an attempt to protect sensitive individuals where air pollution is expected**. There are lessons to be learned from environmental law and process. At the scoping stage in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, there should be adequate consideration of Title VI and environmental justice. **Minority and low-income populations should be identified early and their concerns examined and addressed, at the planning stage**. **Cumulative impacts need to be considered**. **The precautionary principle should be invoked**. As the recent massive and catastrophic oil leaks in the Gulf of Mexico have shown, categorical exclusions to the need for a proper environmental impact statement (EIS) cannot be lightly granted by federal agencies. But even an EIS is not a solution if social needs and cultural history are not properly considered, as was shown in the Port Angeles case. **The responsibilities of planners are more than legal**, **because a conservative federal judiciary has undercut legal requirements. Planners' responsibilities are also moral and ethical**. **Just as a number of faithbased organizations have undertaken environmental concerns due to a sense of responsibility for stewardship of God's creation**, **planners need to get back to their roots of responsibility**. **Solutions need to be sought, not just by advocates and not just in faith**, **but also in legislatures and Congress**. Fixing the Sandoval decision, returning the "private attorney general" provision for private right of suit under Title VI, and incorporating environmental justice concepts into statute would be important steps. Also important is avoiding panic-driven decisions to cut public transportation services to those who most need them. The ARRA "shovel-ready project" concept has led to funding too many pothole-filling efforts. **The larger American polity needs to be considered, with a return to the American creed of social mobility and opportunity**.

# Answers to: States CP

### [\_\_\_\_]

### [\_\_\_\_] Federal action is key to investor predictability – the private sector won’t lend for transit infrastructure without consistent federal support

**Melaniphy, 12** - President & CEO American Public Transportation Association (Michael, Testimony efore The Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, 3/21,

Federal Transit Administration Programs

Capital Investment Grants (New Starts) – APTA was pleased to see the Senate continue to support the New Starts program in MAP-21.  The New Starts program is the primary source of federal investment in the construction or expansion of heavy rail, light rail, commuter rail, and bus rapid transit projects.  The success of these major, multi-year capital projects requires predictable support by Congress and the FTA.  Congress established Full Funding Grant Agreements (FFGAs) to provide this predictability.  A continued commitment to federal investment will also influence the willingness of private financial markets to finance public transportation projects and it will help ensure that the bond ratings will remain high and interest rates will remain low. We urge the Congress to recognize the importance of long-term, predictable funding for all highway and transit programs, including New Starts.  APTA believes that the New Starts program should grow at the same rate as the rest of the transit program, as it is essential to enhancing our nation’s mobility, accessibility and economic prosperity, while promoting energy conservation and environmental quality.
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# Glossary

Vocabulary

**Car culture**. America’s love of cars that is seen in music, movies, etc.

**Communities of color.**  Hispanic, black, Asian or other non-white group of people living together or connected in some way.

**Cycle of poverty.** This theory says that poor families do not have the necessary resources to escape poverty and stay in poverty for many generations. So if a grandparent is poor, their grand-child is likely to also live in poverty.

**Emissions.** Something emitted, such as the pollution from a car.

Gentrification. the process by which higher income households displace lower income residents of a neighborhood, changing the character of that neighborhood.

Mass transit. Transportation infrastructure that can move many people at once such as buses or subways/light rail.

Marginalized communities. Groups of people who have been discriminated against.

**Moral obligation.** Something you have to do because it is the right thing to do.

Segregation. The separation between people of different races. In this case, in terms, of where people live and work.

**Social inequality.** Differences between groups of people who do not have the same social status. In the US, this can mean differences in access to education, health care, housing, etc.

Subsidy. Government financial support of an industry or thing.

**Urban.** Relating to the city or town.

Urban Sprawl. The development of large suburbs outside of major cities.

# Answers to: Urban Sprawl Add-on

**[\_\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_\_] There are many other causes besides transportation infrastructure

Dee Striker, writer for the San Francisco Chronicle, 2007

(“What are the Causes of Urban Sprawl”, http://homeguides.sfgate.com/causes-urban-sprawl-2577.html)

Urban sprawl is loosely defined as low-density residential, and sometimes commercial, development that is outside the borders of higher density urban centers. Urban sprawl communities are typically automobile-oriented as opposed to pedestrian-friendly. **Planners, scholars, community activists and public officials all offer numerous possibilities as to the causes of urban sprawl.** Lack of Comprehensive Planning The Planners Web Sprawl Guide suggests that **little to no regional planning is one of the major causes of urban sprawl.** If officials in densely populated urban centers plan in isolation without consulting nearby communities, the result is sometimes poorly planned developments on the outskirts of urban centers. Instead of bridging the existing infrastructure and amenities of surrounding communities, these less densely populated areas often incur new public expenses for infrastructure improvements without regard to a regional plan or pooled resources. A regional plan would anticipate the growth of new areas and gradually execute the necessary planning initiatives to create a cohesive community. Rapid Population Growth The Sierra Club notes that **although population growth is not the only cause of urban sprawl, it is a major factor.** Rapid population growth is a particularly large contributor to urban sprawl in the Western and Southern regions of the United States. A sharp increase in residents beyond the capacity of nearby urban centers necessitates the creation of new communities. As the regional population continues to increase, communities begin to spread farther and farther away from city centers. Subsidized Infrastructure Improvements One condition that encourages urban sprawl, according to Towson University Center for Geographic Information Sciences, occurs when municipalities subsidize the cost of infrastructure such as roads and sewers to un- or under-developed areas. Such an action incentivizes the creation of communities outside of city centers without requiring comprehensive plans or suggesting alternative development options. Consumer Preferences One cause of urban sprawl that is difficult to quantify is preference. Useful Community Development, a site dedicated to progressive urban planning, cites the desire for larger homes, more bedrooms and bigger yards as one of the causes of urban sprawl. **Some people simply prefer more space or more home square footage than what is affordable or available in more crowded city centers.**

# Answers to: Urban Sprawl Add-on

**[\_\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_\_] Mass transit programs increase urban sprawl by allowing people to easily commute into the city

Edward L. Glaeser, economics professor at Harvard, 2009

(“What Would High-Speed Rail Do to Suburban Sprawl?”, http://www.lawrence.edu/fast/finklerm/Glaeser%20on%20High%20Speed%20Rail.doc)

**But there is little evidence documenting that rail has strong positive effects on land use.** Unfortunately, **all of the evidence on this question comes from intraurban, not interurban rail lines.** Atlanta’s rail line had little impact on population or employment within the metropolitan area. BART, the Bay Area Rapid Transit system serving the San Francisco region, seems to have done more, but the **effects are** still **modest.** Nathaniel **Baum-Snow and** Matthew **Kahn** **have done the most comprehensive look at new intraurban rail** systems in 16 cities. I asked **them to examine whether population levels rose close to new rail stations, and they found no evidence** for that. Moreover, the story of Ciudad Real should make us question the presumption that rail will centralize. **If a** Dallas-Houston **line stops** somewhere **between** the **two cities**, and fosters the growth of a new exurb, **the result will be more, not less, sprawl**.

# Answers to: Urban Sprawl Add-on

**[\_\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_\_] Instead of increasing centralization, mass transit increase emigration out of the city by allowing for short commutes

Jason Kambitsis, city planner and contributing editor for Wired.com, 2010

(Wired, “High-Speed Rail as a Conduit of Sprawl”, http://www.wired.com/autopia/2010/03/high-speed-rail-and-sprawl/)

It’s fast, it’s efficient and it is the future of transportation, but will high-speed rail cause sprawl? Yes, it could, warn some urban planners. **Despite the promise of creating more densely populated urban centers,** high-speed **rail could do quite the opposite by making it easier for people to live far from urban centers.** Let’s use California as an example, since high-speed rail has made the most progress there. The Golden State, long known as a trendsetter for transportation and environmental policy, has received more than [$2.3 billion in stimulus funds](http://gov.ca.gov/press-release/14304/) toward a proposed line [linking San Francisco and Los Angeles](http://www.cahighspeedrail.ca.gov/map.htm) by way of the Central Valley. The money is earmarked for construction, land acquisition and engineering and it follows the $9.95 billion allocated by a state ballot initiative. If and when the line is completed by 2030, riders will zip between the two cities in 2 hours and 38 minutes and pay less than half what it would cost to fly. **But that** convenience **could increase emigration from California’s urban centers to the exurbs and beyond. In other words, it could lead to more sprawl. An example of this can be seen in cities like Palmdale, which is** 58 miles **north of Los Angeles.** By **cutting the commute time** between those two cities from [1 hour and 25 minutes](http://maps.google.com/maps?client=firefox-a&rls=org.mozilla:en-US:official&channel=s&hl=en&source=hp&q=palmdale%20to%20los%20angeles&um=1&ie=UTF-8&sa=N&tab=wl), to 27 minutes**, outward growth** of the Los Angeles area **will undoubtedly continue.** It’s easy to see why — **home prices** **in Palmdale are more than** [half of those in L.A.](http://www.zillow.com/local-info/CA-Palmdale-home-value/r_40227/), and high-speed **rail could make getting downtown as quick and easy as living downtown.** **Pushing people further into the exurbs runs counter to a major goal of** high-speed **rail**, namely cutting our carbon output while creating denser, more sustainable communities.

# Answers to: Air Pollution Add-on

**[\_\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_\_] Mass transit results in more, not less emissions

Randal O’Toole, senior fellow at the Cato Institute, 2009

(Congressional Testimony, “On Transit and Climate”, <http://www.cato.org/testimony/ct-ro-20090707.html>)

Transit Is Not Significantly Cleaner than Driving Even if more subsidies to transit could attract significant numbers of people out of their cars, it would not save energy or reduce greenhouse gas emissions because transit uses as much energy and generates nearly as much greenhouse gas per passenger mile as urban driving. As described in my Cato Institute Policy Analysis no. 615 (http://www.cato.org/pubs/pas/pa-615.pdf), the following data are based on the Department of Energy's Transportation Energy Data Book, the Federal Transit Administration's National Transit Database, and the Federal Highway Administration's Highway Statistics. In 2006, the nation's transit systems used an average of 3,444 BTUs and emitted 213 grams of CO2 per passenger mile. The average passenger car used 3,445 BTUs—just 1 BTU more—and emitted 245 grams of COsup>2 per passenger mile, just 15 percent more. While transit appears slightly cleaner than autos, as shown in figure three, auto and light truck energy efficiencies have rapidly improved, while transit energy efficiencies have declined. Since CO2 emissions are proportional to energy consumption, these trends hold for greenhouse gas production as well. We can expect these trends to continue. If auto manufacturers meet the Obama administration's new fuel-economy standards for 2016—even if they fail to improve energy efficiencies beyond that—by 2025 the average car on the road will consume only 2,600 BTUs and emit only about 186 grams of CO2 per passenger mile—considerably less than most transit systems (figure four). This rapid improvement is possible because America's auto fleet almost completely turns over every 18 years. By comparison, cities that invest in rail transit are stuck with the technology they choose for at least 30 years. This means potential investments in transit must be compared, not with today's cars, but with cars 15 to 20 years from now. In much of the country, the fossil-fuel-burning plants used to generate electricity for rail transit emit enormous amounts of greenhouse gases. Washington's Metrorail system, for example, generates more than 280 grams of CO2 per passenger mile— considerably more than the average passenger car. Light-rail systems in Baltimore, Cleveland, Denver, Philadelphia, and Pittsburgh all emit more greenhouse gases per passenger mile than the average SUV. In places, such as the West Coast, that get much of their electricity from renewable sources, it would be wiser and more cost-effective to apply that electricity to plug-in hybrids or other electric cars that can recharge their batteries at night when renewable power plants generate surplus energy. As Professor Lave said, the "law of large proportions" dictates that "the biggest components matter most." In other words, since more than 90 percent of urban travel is by auto and only 1.6 percent is by transit, small improvements in autos can be far more significant than large investments in transit.

# Answers to: Obesity Add-on

**[\_\_\_\_]**

### [\_\_\_\_] The harms of obesity are massively overblown – there’s no scientific basis for their claims

Patrick Basham and John Luik,Director – Democracy Institute, Health Policy Writer, 2006

(“Four Big, Fat Myths”, The Telegraph, 11-26, http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/1535176/Four-big,-fat-myths.html)

Yet **the obesity epidemic is a myth manufactured by public health officials in concert with assorted academics and special-interest lobbyists**. These crusaders preach a sermon consisting of four obesity myths: that we and our children are fat; that being fat is a certain recipe for early death; that our fatness stems from the manufacturing and marketing practices of the food industry (hence Ofcom's recently announced ban on junk food advertising to children); and that we will lengthen our lives if only we eat less and lose weight. The trouble is, **there is no scientific evidence to support these myths**. Let's start with the myth of an epidemic of childhood obesity. The just-published Health Survey for England, 2004 does not show a significant increase in the weight of children in recent years. The Department of Health report found that from 1995 to 2003 there was only a one-pound increase in children's average weight. Nor is there any evidence in claims that overweight and obese children are destined to become overweight and obese adults. The Thousand Families Study has researched 1,000 Newcastle families since 1954. Researchers have found little connection between overweight children and adult obesity. In the study, four out of five obese people became obese as adults, not as children. There is not even any compelling scientific evidence to support the Government's claim that childhood obesity results in long-term health problems and lowers one's life expectancy. In fact, the opposite may be true: **we could be in danger of creating a generation of children obsessed with their weight with the consequent risk of eating disorders that really do threaten their health**. Statistics on the numbers of children with eating disorders are hard to come by, but in the US it is estimated that 10 per cent of high school pupils suffer from them. Recent studies show adults' attempts to control children's eating habits result in children eating more rather than less. Parental finger wagging increases the likelihood that children develop body-image problems as well as eating disorders.

# Answers to: Obesity Add-on

### [\_\_\_\_] Obesity is a tiny health risk – their evidence is biased exaggeration

**Center for Consumer Freedom 2008**

(“CDC Must Retract Obesity Deaths Study”, http://www.consumerfreedom.com/article\_detail.cfm/article/161?nd=1)

In the past few years, **the federal government has waged an all out war to scare Americans about our so-called "obesity epidemic**." The Surgeon General says it's [just as dangerous as the threat of terrorism](http://www.time.com/time/2004/obesity/index.html). A leading Harvard expert compares obesity to a [massive tsunami heading toward American shores](http://au.health.yahoo.com/050316/3/3r3b.html). The director of the CDC called it [worse than the Black Death](http://www.theledger.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20041108/NEWS/411080310/1036). Unfortunately, [trial lawyers who see dollar signs where the rest of us see dinner](http://www.consumerfreedom.com/issuepage.cfm/topic/32) have seized on the CDC's 400,000 deaths number to justify their frivolous crusades. **Now word comes from experts within the CDC that excess weight is about one-fifteenth as dangerous as previously thought**, and has a lower death toll than diseases like septicemia and nephritis. Each death is of course tragic. But has anyone heard of the septicemia "epidemic" or the nephritis "tsunami**"? It turns out that the 70 million Americans who are technically “overweight” have no increased mortality risk**. The real problems occur only among the small percentage of Americans with a [Body Mass Index of 35 or more](http://www.bmiscale.com/). To put that in perspective, ["fat actress" Kirstie Alley](http://www.sho.com/site/fatactress/people.do) and ["fat adult actress" Anna Nicole Smith](http://www.sky.com/showbiz/article/0,,50002-1174850,00.html) both had a BMI of 31 -- before they lost weight. Shortly after the 400,000 study was published, Science magazine [reported on a storm within CDC's headquarters](http://www.consumerfreedom.com/article_detail.cfm?article=162). Many top researchers warned a political agenda to exaggerate the risk of obesity had trumped scientific concerns. Debate was suppressed, and at least [one agency expert said he feared speaking out would cost him his job.](http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/full/304/5672/804) An internal investigation was launched soon thereafter. The CDC buried a [summary](http://www.cdc.gov/nccdphp/publications/actual_causes.htm) of its findings on their website, and requests for the full report have gone unfulfilled. But the overview does acknowledge, "the fundamental scientific problem centers around the limitations in both the data and the methodology." In January the CDC disclosed that a small mathematical error had artificially raised their 400,000 estimate by 35,000 deaths. Some admission. If NASA operated this way, Neal Armstrong would be landing on Pluto about now. What's the difference between the original 400,000 statistic and the updated 26,000 figure? Primarily, it's that the new study uses more recent data. The 400,000 number took data from as long ago as 1948 and didn't adjust for improved medical care. Those who were able to complete high-school math and [noted this problem months ago](http://www.consumerfreedom.com/news_detail.cfm?headline=2535) can claim some measure of vindication. Unbelievably, the CDC had the more recent data readily available on its own computers. [The CDC collects that data](http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nhanes.htm). Why didn't they use it? No one is saying. Now a CDC scientist who co-authored the original 400,000 deaths estimate admits the new number is "[a step forward](http://www.iht.com/articles/2005/04/20/news/fat.php)." Yet the agency's official position is that it will take no position. The [CDC proclaims the science is too new](http://www.theledger.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20050420/ZNYT02/504200403), debates about methodology "[detract from the real issue," and we shouldn't focus so much on obesity deaths anyway](http://www.ajc.com/opinion/content/opinion/0205/25cdc.html). Funny. It didn't have any of these quibbles when it announced the 400,000 number and said obesity would soon become the number one cause of preventable death. **It's said that a lie can travel halfway round the world while the truth is putting on its shoes. Well, the truth about obesity is finally lacing up.** And that's bad news for trial lawyers pursuing obesity lawsuits against food and beverage companies as well as the self-appointed diet dictators seeking extra taxes on foods they don't like.

# Answers to: Car Accidents Add-On

**[\_\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_\_] New car technology proves trend towards safety measures to prevent car accidents

Washington Times, 2012

(June 10, <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2012/jun/10/safety-measure-lets-cars-talk-to-each-other-to-avo/>)

It’s also possible for connected cars to exchange information with traffic lights, signs and roadways if states and communities decide to equip their transportation infrastructure with similar technology. The information would be relayed to traffic management centers, tipping them off to congestion, accidents or obstructions. If cars are reported to be swerving in one spot on a roadway, for example, that could indicate a large pothole or obstruction. The constant stream of vehicle-to-infrastructure, or V2I, information could give traffic managers a better picture of traffic flows than they have today, enabling better timing of traffic signals to keep cars moving, for example. Correspondingly, cars could receive warnings on traffic tie-ups ahead and rerouting directions. In a line of heavy traffic, the systems issue an alert if a car several vehicles ahead brakes hard even before the vehicle directly in front brakes. And the systems alert drivers when they’re at risk of rear-ending a slower-moving car. [NHTSA](http://www.washingtontimes.com/topics/national-highway-traffic-safety-administration/) has been working on the technology for the past decade along with eight automakers: [Ford](http://www.washingtontimes.com/topics/ford/), General Motors, Honda, Hyundai-Kia, Mercedes-Benz, Nissan, Toyota and Volkswagen. “We think this is really the future of transportation safety, and it’s going to make a huge difference in the way we live our lives,” said Scott Belcher, president of the Intelligent Transportation Society of America, which promotes technology solutions to transportation problems.

[\_\_\_\_] 2010 was an all-time low for car fatalities

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 2012

(Februrary 9, www.nhtsa.gov/staticfiles/administration/pdf/Budgets/FY-2013\_Budget\_Highlights.pdf)

In 2010, the number of overall traffic fatalities reached the lowest level in recorded history (since 1949). In 2010, 32,885 people lost their lives on US roadways, a 2.9 percent decrease from 2009 (33,883). NHTSA’s success is attributed to the combined efforts of the various offices of the Agency. Below are highlights of NHTSA’s FY 2013 budget proposal, which is based on the Administrations Reauthorization Policy Proposal for Surface Transportation.

# No Harms – Segregation Declining

**[\_\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_\_] Racial segregation has been reduced

Lingqian Hu, assistant professor at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, 2010

(May 2010, “Urban Spatial Transformation and Job Accessibility: Spatial Mismatch Hypothesis Revisited,” Google Scholar. http://digitallibrary.usc.edu/assetserver/controller/item/etd-Hu-3392.pdf).

**During the last several decades**, many metropolitan areas have experienced notable shifts in demographics. **Racial segregation between African Americans and Whites** has been one of the central issues in the U.S. Although African Americans as a whole still face great constraints in the housing and labor market, racial segregation **has been reduced** (Wilson, 1980; Massey 2001). Moreover, with the increasing size of the African American middle class, differences within African Americans have enlarged in terms of their residential locations and socioeconomic status (Wilson, 1987; Fischer, 2003). Furthermore, African Americans gradually have become a relatively smaller minority group as Hispanics and Asians immigrate to major cities. **The original dichotomy of African Americans and Whites is no longer as crucial**; rather, segmentations of other racial/ethnic groups are also relevant. At the same time, poor people become more segregated from the affluent majority over time (Massey and Eggers, 1993; Abramson, Tobin, and VanderGoot, 1995). Economic segregation becomes increasingly evident in the urban spatial transformation. Therefore, instead of examining racial/ethnic minorities, this research focuses on low-income job seekers. Results of this research depict low-income job seekers’ different labor market conditions with respect to the spatial arrangements of low-income jobs and job seekers, and provide direct input to the planning and policy efforts which aim to reduce poverty.

[\_\_\_\_] The most recent studies indicate that segregation is declining in the US

David Ariosto, staff writer at CNN, 2012

(Study: Segregation in U.S. on decline, but disparities persist, http://articles.cnn.com/2012-01-31/us/us\_segregation-decline-study\_1\_segregation-jacob-vigdor-neighborhoods?\_s=PM:US)

**Segregation of African-Americans in cities and towns across the United States has dropped to its lowest level in more than a century, according to a recent study**. The Manhattan Institute report, released two days before the start of Black History month, points to **federal housing policies, changes in public perception and demographic shifts since the 1960s that have helped integrate the nation**. Still, the study adds, America's social and income disparities continue. "We thought about racial inequality and thought that neighborhoods had something to do with it," said **economist Jacob Vigdor** of Duke University, who **co-wrote the study with Edward Glaeser** of Harvard University **at the New York-based conservative think tank.**

# No Harms – Car Focus is Declining

**[\_\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_\_] People are moving back into the cities now due to high transport costs

Judson Kidd, real estate advisor at Caldwell Banker, 2012

(“The Re-Urbanization of Atlanta” May 6th 2012 Coldwell Banker NRT Development Advisors)

The Unites States Census Bureau recently released updated population estimates for the first time since 2010, and the results were quite surprising.  Despite signs of economic recovery and nearly two years after the technical end of the recession, a reverse trend has developed.  **The exodus of buyers to the outlying suburbs** where homes are larger **is over**.  In fact, **the annual rate of growth in American cities and surrounding urban areas has now surpassed that of the suburbs for the first time in over 20 years.**This decrease in population in outlying areas or “Exurbs” is due to various factors.  For one, the substantial loss in home values in these areas has buyers looking for property with increased price stabilization and higher short-term ROI potential.  With foreclosure inventory nearing the bottom within the I-285 corridor, market sales are on the rise and taking prices along for the ride.  **Energy costs have a direct impact on this new trend** as well.  **The high cost of gasoline discourages long commutes**, and larger suburban homes generally come with higher heating and cooling costs. Finally, young buyers prefer an urban location, and with the emergence of the “Echo Boomers” as the next wave of new home purchasers, **this trend is likely to continue.**

# No Harms – Poverty

**[\_\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_\_] Lack of education is the main cause of poverty, not transportation

Blake Bailey, National Center for Policy Analysis, 2003

(“How to Not Be Poor,” Jan 15, http://www.ncpa.org/pub/ba428/)

Furthermore, these lower propensities for poverty last throughout a person's life. **In every adult age group, people who fail to obtain a high school degree are more than twice as likely to fall into poverty.** People ages 25 to 54 are nearly three times as likely. The numbers are worse for long-term poverty - poverty that lasts for years. An Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) report found that in the United States: **High school dropouts suffer a long-term poverty rate of 14.2 percent, while high school grads have only a 3.8 percent long-term poverty rate**. Only 1.2 percent of adults receiving some education beyond high school are poor long-term.

# 

# No Solvency – Social Inequality

**[\_\_\_\_] Turn- Mass Transit fees reduce social welfare- empirically proven**

Winston, Maheshri, 2006 – Brookings Institution, U.C. Berkeley (Clifford, Vikram, “On the Social Desirability of Urban Rail Transits,” Brookings Institution, 08/23/06, http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/papers/2006/8/rail%20systems%20winston/08\_rail\_systems\_winston.pdf)//AX

The evolution of urban rail transit in the United States over the past twenty years has been marked by three inescapable facts that signal an inefficient allocation of transit resources. Rail’s share of urban travelers is declining during a period when there has been little investment in new roads; its deficits are rising sharply; and yet investment to build new systems and extend old ones continues. In 1980, two million Americans got to work by rail transit. Today, in spite of an increase in urban jobs and transit coverage, fewer than one million U.S. workers commute by rail, causing its share of work trips to drop from 5 percent to 1 percent.1 Although rail transit’s farebox revenues have consistently failed to cover its operating and capital costs since World War II, governmental aid to cover transit deficits has been increasingly available. Since 1980, annual operating subsidies have climbed from $6 billion to more than $15 billion today (APTA Transit Fact Books, figures in 2001 dollars). Capital subsidies have also increased as transit agencies struggle to maintain and provide new facilities, track, and rolling stock. These worrisome trends, however, have not curbed U.S. cities’ appetite for rail transit service. During the 1990s, Cleveland, Washington, Santa Clara, Sacramento and other cities expanded their systems, while Los Angeles, Denver, Dallas, and St. Louis built new ones. Recently, Houston and Minneapolis opened new light rail lines while small, sparsely populated cities such as Sioux City, Harrisburg, and Staunton, Virginia suggested that they want federal funds to help build their systems. And although county residents repeatedly nixed a referendum to build a $4 billion extension of Washington’s Metro out to Dulles airport, planners nevertheless circumvented popular will and diverted increased toll revenue from the Dulles toll road to finance a portion of the ultimate extension. Any private firm that was losing market share and reporting increasing losses would be hard pressed to attract funds to expand. Almost certainly, it would try to determine the most efficient way to contract. Of course, a transit agency does not seek to maximize profits, but its public financing is justified only if it is raising social welfare, where social welfare can be measured as the difference between net benefits to consumers and the agency’s budget deficit, also taking into account relevant externalities (for instance, the reduction in roadway congestion attributable to rail). Although the costs and benefits of public rail transit operations have been debated in the policy community (see, for example, Litman [1]), we are not aware of a recent comprehensive empirical assessment of rail’s social desirability.2 The purpose of this paper is to estimate the contribution of each U.S. urban rail operation to social welfare based on the demand for and cost of its service. We find that with the single exception of BART in the San Francisco Bay area, every U.S. transit system actually reduces social welfare. Worse, we cannot identify an optimal pricing policy or physical restructuring of the rail network that would enhance any system’s social desirability without effectively eliminating its service. Rail transit’s fundamental problem is its failure to attract sufficient patronage to reduce its high (and increasing) average costs. This problem has been complicated enormously by new patterns of urban development. Rail operations, unfortunately, are best suited for yesterday’s concentrated central city residential developments and employment opportunities; they are decidedly not suited for today’s geographically dispersed residences and jobs. At best, urban rail service may be socially desirable in a few large U.S. cities if its operations can be adjusted to mirror successful privatization experiments conducted abroad. Ironically, however, rail transit enjoys powerful political support from planners, civic boosters, and policymakers, making it highly unlikely that rail’s social cost will abate.

# No Solvency – Social Inequality

**[\_\_\_\_] Turn- promoting Mass Transit as the answer to Social Inequality only hurts social welfare- it empirically won’t help but will prevent real solutions**

Winston, Maheshri, 2006 – Brookings Institution, U.C. Berkeley (Clifford, Vikram, “On the Social Desirability of Urban Rail Transits,” Brookings Institution, 08/23/06,

http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/papers/2006/8/rail%20systems%20winston/08\_rail\_systems\_winston.pdf)//AX

Could any system be transformed to have a positive effect on social welfare? We are unable to find ways to significantly raise the net benefits of the nation’s transit systems given their current operations. However, recently privatized rail transit systems in foreign cities, notably Tokyo and Hong Kong, have been able to eliminate deficits by reducing labor and capital costs and by introducing more comfortable cars and remote payment mechanisms, among other innovations, that have reduced operating costs and expanded ridership. We therefore investigated which, if any, U.S. rail transit systems would become socially desirable assuming privatization reduced short-run total costs 20 percent—a plausible estimate based on U.S. and foreign experience with bus transit privatization (Winston and Shirley [3]). With the exception of BART, which already generates small net benefits, we found that such a cost reduction would result in only the New York City and Chicago systems producing positive net benefits. We are not aware of any public officials who have endorsed complete privatization of rail transit. On the other hand, a few have encouraged bus transit agencies to contract with private companies in an effort to reduce costs. Private contracting would be a politically more feasible alternative to privatization, but it appears that at best it would enable only a few rail systems to be socially justified. Because no policy option exists that would enhance the social desirability of most urban rail transit systems, policymakers only can be advised to limit the social costs of rail systems by curtailing their expansion. Unfortunately, transit systems have been able to evolve because their supporters have sold them as an antidote to the social costs associated with automobile travel, in spite of strong evidence to the contrary.40 As long as rail transit continues to be erroneously viewed in this way by the public, it will continue to be an increasing drain on social welfare.

# No Solvency – Social Inequality

[\_\_\_\_] The problem with racism and poverty is not mobility rather its residential segregation.

Turner at al 2009 (Margery Austin Turner, Vice President for Research at the Urban Institute, where she leads efforts to frame and conduct a forward-looking agenda of policy research and Karina Fortuny. Researcher at the Urban Institute, “Residential Segregation and Low-Income Working Families”, February 2009, DM)

**Segregated housing patterns not only separate white and minority neighborhoods, but also help create and perpetuate the stubborn disparities in employment, education, income, and wealth. More specifically, res- idential segregation distances minority jobseekers (particularly blacks) from areas of employment growthand opportunity**. Beginning in the late 1960s, John Kain argued that **the concentration of blacks in segre- gated central-city neighborhoods limited their access to employment, as growing numbers of jobs moved to predominantly white suburban locations (**Kain 1968). **As demand for labor shifted away from the neighborhoods where blacks were concentrated, discrimination in housing and mortgage markets prevented blacks from moving to communities where job growth was occurring, and information and transportation barriers made it difficult to find and retain jobs in these distant locations.** William Julius Wilson (1987) expanded on this basic “spatial mismatch” story, arguing that **the exodus of jobs from central-city locations, combined with the persistence of residential segregation, contributed to rising unemployment among black men during the 1980s, as well as to worsening poverty and distress in black neighborhoods.2 More recent evidence confirms that residential segregation continues to separate minorities from centers of employment opportunity, and that this separation contributes to unequal employment outcomes** (Raphael and Stoll 2002). But **the traditional image of minorities trapped in central-city neighborhoods while jobs disperse to more and more distant suburban locations is probably too simplistic. Today, minority workers** (and especially low-skilled black workers) **are still overrepresented in central cities, while jobs** (especially low-skill jobs) **are widely dispersed throughout the suburbs**. However, in the decades since Kain first articulated the spa- tial mismatch hypothesis, many minorities have gained access to housing in the suburbs. The barriers of segregation and discrimination are falling (slowly perhaps, but perceptibly), and nonblack minorities (whose numbers are growing) appear to face substantially lower levels of segregation than blacks. Nonetheless, **the suburban residential communities where minorities live are generally not the suburban jurisdictions that offer the most promising job opportunities**. In many metropolitan regions, **job growth has been the most robust in predominantly white suburbs and weakest in predominantly black suburbs** (Turner 2008). Recent research indicates that nearly half of all low-skill jobs in the white suburbs are inaccessible by public transportation, making it particularly difficult for minority residents of other sub- areas to reach them (Stoll, Holzer, and Ihlanfeldt 2000). **And the race or ethnicity of new hires into low- skill jobs generally matches the racial composition of the area where jobs are located** (Stoll et al. 2000). **Black workers in particular are underrepresented in jobs located in predominantly white suburban com- munities. And although jobs in the central business district may be accessible for workers of all races and ethnicities, these jobs tend to be highly competitive and may require higher skills** (Holzer 2001). Thus, **residential segregation continues to put considerable distance between minority workers—especially African Americans—and areas of greatest employment opportunity. Residential segregation also contributes to minorities’ unequal educational attainment, which reinforces their disadvantage in today’s labor market**.

# No Solvency – Car Culture

**[\_\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_\_] Car culture is too essential to our society – alternatives won’t be taken seriously

Philip J Vergragt, Visiting Scholar at MIT, 2004

(Management for Sustainable Personal Mobility: The Case of Hydrogen Fuel Cells” Autumn 2004)

So far, each of these **solutions** has **captured only a** very **small fraction of the market, with the car** (including SUVs and vans) **continuing to be** the **preferred** solution **for personal mobility**. **This is no surprise if we take into account the entrenchment of the car system**, and with it the petrol system, in Western industrialised societies (Knot et al. 2001). **The inertia in such a system is enormous**, not just for economic, scientific and technological infrastructure reasons, but also **because of the vested interests of powerful key actors such as** vehicle **manufacturers and oil companies**, mining companies, petrol stations, dealers and repair shops. **Moreover, many authors have noted the powerful position of the car as a modern cultural icon** (Grin et al. 2003). Governments do not escape societal preferences; on the contrary, **government policies are expressions of** such **preferences**. Furthermore, governments can do what societal interest groups cannot: for instance, regulate emissions to air. However, **governments in democratic industrialised societies do not regulate** personal **car use** or choice of car. Hence, government regulation has, until recently, concentrated on controlling the negative impacts of car use (such as exhaust emissions), through technologies such as the catalytic converter, and by providing fiscal incentives to change consumers' behaviour: for example, by reducing fuel duty on unleaded petrol. Further, governments can increase tax on unleaded petrol (as has been done in Europe but much less so in the US) and they can regulate access to inner cities by permits, parking fees and congestion charges.

# No Solvency – Car Culture

**[\_\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_\_] There won’t be a transition away from cars—The love of the car prevents people from seeing any problems

Robert Creighton, MA student at The New School for Public Engagement, 2005

(“Absence of Motion: Stillness in Cars” Project Thesis for the Master of Arts in Media Studies New School University)

**Automobiles have played an essential role in** the development of **U.S. culture** throughout the last century. They represent better than any other consumer product the overwhelming power of the industrialization processes that were refined at the turn of the nineteenth century – **so much so that the last** one **hundred years could be** rightly **called the century of the car**. The impact of their production techniques and the business models of those that made them cannot be overstated. **The car reached into all aspects of our lives.** However it is **the cultural impact of the car** that **has the greatest role in society**. " The space that they occupy in the American psyche leads to **the love affair with cars** that we have maintained over the last 70 years. It **acts as a mask when we want to ask difficult questions** about the role of automobility in the future. Our emotional attachment to the car hides the inherent problems that they bring to the table. Car trouble has serious implications beyond the everyday frustrations one experiences in traffic. Yet the methodology of the car remains the same. Commercials espouse freedom, openness, and motion. These past ideals dominate the discussion of cars in the public sphere of the United States and throughout the rest of the world. The following examples will suggest how we’ve arrived at this point where the emotional attachment to the automobile is still so strong.

# No Solvency – No Riders

[\_\_\_\_] No one will use mass transit – Europe Proves

RobertUtt, Ph.D., is Herbert and Joyce Morgan Senior Research Fellow in the Thomas A. Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies at The Heritage Foundation, 2011

(“Time to End Obama’s Costly High-Speed Rail Program,” 2/11, <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/02/time-to-end-obamas-costly-high-speed-rail-program>)

If one’s knowledge of European travel preferences comes from Time, The New York Review of Books, and Pink Panther movies, then the President’s statement would seem to ring true. Sadly, the reality is quite different. European and Asian governments have paid staggering sums to subsidize a mode of travel that only a small and shrinking share of their populations uses.[[18]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/02/time-to-end-obamas-costly-high-speed-rail-program" \l "_ftn18) In its most recent report on European travel patterns, the European Commission noted that passenger rail’s share of the European market (EU-27) declined from 6.6 percent in 1995 to 6.3 percent in 2008, reaching a low of 5.9 percent in 2004. Market shares for autos and buses also fell over the period, while the airlines’ market share jumped. In effect, Europeans are adopting more American modes of travel, despite massive taxpayer subsidies for rail. They are shifting their travel to unsubsidized, taxpaying airlines, which expanded their market share from 6.5 percent in 1995 to 8.6 percent in 2008. Indeed, by 2008, passenger rail’s share of the transportation market was the lowest of all modes, except travel by sea and motorcycles.[[19]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/02/time-to-end-obamas-costly-high-speed-rail-program" \l "_ftn19) Although the total size and scope of European subsidies for passenger rail are not known, a recent report by Amtrak’s Inspector General indicated that they are sizable and likely exceed what the U.S. government pays for highways. One purpose of the review was to address the contention that passenger rail in other countries, especially HSR, operates at a profit (that is, without subsidies). For 1995–2006, the study found that the governments of Germany, France, the United Kingdom, Spain, Denmark, and Austria spent “a combined total of $42 billion annually on their national passenger railroads.”[[20]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/02/time-to-end-obamas-costly-high-speed-rail-program" \l "_ftn20) These six countries have a combined population of 269 million, and their expenditure of $42 billion on passenger rail in 2006[[21]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/02/time-to-end-obamas-costly-high-speed-rail-program" \l "_ftn21) is roughly proportional to the $54.8 billion that the government of the United States (population of 309 million) spent on all forms of transportation, including highways, rail, aviation, water transport, and mass transit.[[22]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/02/time-to-end-obamas-costly-high-speed-rail-program" \l "_ftn22) Data from individual countries reveal the financial catastrophes that the U.S. could confront if it embraces Euro-style passenger rail programs. According to the left-leaning The Economist, passenger rail subsidies reached $8.9 billion in 2008– 2009, and the magazine wondered: It is not clear why the public should be heavily subsidizing a mode of transport that accounts for a tiny minority of all travel: 8% of the total distance travelled in Britain during 2009, compared with 85% by cars and vans. The relatively few who use railways often are disproportionately well-off: three-fifths of the traffic is concentrated in the wealthy commuting counties of the south-east.[[23]](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2011/02/time-to-end-obamas-costly-high-speed-rail-program" \l "_ftn23) Despite these massive subsidies, rail ticket prices are still comparatively high. At present, two people traveling from Heathrow airport to downtown London can hire a limousine that meets them at the baggage claim and takes them directly to their destination for less than the cost of taking the Heathrow Express to Paddington Station and then taking the Tube or a taxi to their final destination.

# No Solvency – No Riders

### [\_\_\_\_] Only works in urban areas with lots of jobs- most of the country won’t use it

**O’Toole, 2010** - senior fellow at the Cato Institute (Randal, “Fixing Transit The Case for Privatization”, 11/10, <http://www.cato.org/pubs/pas/PA670.pdf>)

At best, all this money has done is arrest the decline in transit ridership. In 1944, about 84 million Americans lived in urban areas, and they rode transit an average of 275 times a year. Since that year, per capita urban ridership declined steadily to 60 trips per year in 1965 and less than 50 trips per year in 1970. Since then, it has fluctuated—mainly in response to gasoline prices—between about 40 and 50 trips a year, settling at 45 trips per year in 2008. 30 Although the national average is 44 trips per urban resident, fewer than two dozen urban areas out of the more than 320 that provide transit service exceed this average. Transit systems in nearly half of all urban areas with transit service attract fewer than 10 rides per resident per year. As Table 1 suggests, urban areas with high rates of transit ridership tend to have large concentrations of jobs at the urban core (such as New York City; San Francisco; and Washington, DC) or are college towns (as in State College, Pennsylvania; Ames, Iowa; and Champaign–Urbana, Illinois). The presence or absence of expensive rail transit does not seem to be an important factor in the overall use of transit. While per capita ridership may have remained steady at about 40 to 50 trips per year, transit’s share of travel has declined as per capita urban driving has grown. From 1970 through 2008, per capita transit ridership stagnated, but per capita driving of personal vehicles grew by 120 percent. 31 As a result, transit’s share of motorized urban travel fell from 4.2 percent in 1970 to 1.8 percent in 2008. 32

### [\_\_\_\_] Mass transit fails – people empirically won’t use it even if it is funded

**Wall Street Journal, 2012** – editorial (“Why Your Highway Has Potholes,” 4/15,

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702303815404577333631864470566.html?mod=WSJ_Opinion_LEADTop>

Since 1982 government mass-transit subsidies have totaled $750 billion (in today's dollars), yet the share of travelers using transit has fallen by nearly one-third, according to Heritage Foundation transportation expert Wendell Cox. Federal data indicate that in 2010 in most major cities more people walked to work or telecommuted than used public transit.

Brookings Institution economist Cliff Winston finds that "the cost of building rail systems is notorious for exceeding expectations, while ridership levels tend to be much lower than anticipated." He calculates that the only major U.S. rail system in which the benefits outweigh the government subsidies is San Francisco's BART, and no others are close to break-even.

# No Solvency – No Riders

#### [\_\_\_\_] Infrastructure alone does not solve

Miles Tight and Moshe Giovoni 2010

(The Role of Walking and Cycling in Advancing Healthy and Sustainable Urban Areas” BUILT ENVIRONMENT VOL 36 NO 4)

Sustainable mobility is the new paradigm in transport planning and policy (Banister, 2008) and ‘Planning and health is big news’ (Boarnet, 2006, p. 5) according to a special issue of the Journal of the American Planning Association on ‘Planning’s role in building healthy cities’. At the heart of the new planning and policy model are two modes of transport which until recently did not seem to register as being important, at least in the eyes of many researchers, planners and policy-makers. These modes are walking and cycling, commonly referred to as ‘active travel’. Now the number of research papers related to walking and cycling is growing rapidly. A recent review of evidence on cycling as a commuting mode (Heinen et al., 2010) found more than 100 relevant studies, the majority of them including empirical evidence. The interest is not only within academia, it is also evident in the fi eld. Some of the largest and most prosperous cities in the world, New York, London and Paris, amongst others, are adopting pro-walking and cycling policies, investing in appropriate supporting infrastructure, and have recently (Paris and London) rolled out large cycle-hire schemes. Transport strategies for most cities include an element (at least offi cially) that promotes the use of these modes. Despite this, transport, even for short distances, is still heavily dominated by the use of the private car. Perhaps one of the first realizations emerging from the latest research on walking and cycling is that promoting walking and cycling **use is not just a simple question of infrastructure provision.**

### [\_\_\_\_] No one will use it- only 10% of jobs are near mass transit

**O’Toole, 2011** - senior fellow at the Cato Institute  (Randal, “Transportation: From the Top Down or Bottom Up?,” 5/25, <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/transportation-top-down-or-bottom>)

Central planners' fascination with trains is a wonder to behold. A group called Reconnecting America laments that only 14 million American jobs — about 10 percent — are located within a quarter mile of transit, by which they mean rail transit. The group advocates spending a quarter of a trillion dollars to increase this to 17.5 million jobs, or 12.5 percent.

Simply putting transit close to jobs, however, doesn't mean people will ride it. The Brookings Institution recently ranked San Jose as the second-most transit-accessible urban area in America, while Chicago was ranked 46th. Yet the Census Bureau says only 3.4 percent of San Jose commuters use transit, compared with 13.2 percent in Chicago.

# No Solvency – Not Sustainable

### [\_\_\_\_]

### [\_\_\_\_] Mass transit isn’t economically sustainable and will collapse

**O’Toole, 2008** - senior fellow at the Cato Institute  (Randal, “Light-Rail Systems Are a False Promise,” 9/16, <http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/lightrail-systems-are-false-promise>

Rail transit has become such an albatross around the necks of the American cities that have it that it is hard to imagine that anyone of good will would wish it upon Kansas City. Rail transit is expensive to build, to operate and maintain. One of rail transit’s dirty secrets is that the entire system - rails, cars, electrical facilities, stations - must be replaced, rebuilt or rehabilitated roughly every 30 years. This costs almost as much as the original construction, which means for taxpayers that rails are a "pay now, pay more later" proposition. The Chicago Transit Authority is on the verge of financial collapse. The agency estimates it needs $16 billion it doesn’t have to rehabilitate tracks and trains. To keep the trains running, the agency siphoned money away from the city’s bus system and lost a third of its bus riders between 1986 and 1996. Newer systems face other financial challenges. San Jose’s light-rail system put the city’s transit agency so far in debt that when sales tax revenues fell short early in this decade, it was forced to cut bus and rail service by 20 percent. Rail construction almost always costs more than the original estimates. Denver voters approved a 119-mile rail system in 2004 on the promise that it would cost $4.7 billion to build it by 2017. The current estimate is up to $7.9 billion, and the regional transit agency says the system might not be complete until 2034.

# Road Focus Better – Automobile Industry

[\_\_\_\_] Automobile dependency is key for boosting the economy

Todd Litman and Felix Laube, founder and executive director of the Victoria Transport Police, 2012

(“Automobile Dependency and Economic Development”, www.vtpi.org/ecodev.pdf)

Automobile dependency has various impacts that affect economic development.6 These are summarized below and some are discussed in detail later in this paper. *1. Increased Mobility And Convenience For Motorists* **Automobile dependency directly benefits vehicle users: favorable pricing, investment, facility design, parking and land use practices make driving relatively fast, convenient and affordable**. **It also allows businesses to use more centralized distribution systems** and Just-In-Time production, **and to access a wider range of possible employees and customers, which can cause certain types of agglomeration efficiencies, such as large retail centers. These savings and efficiencies can increase economic development if they increase the productivity of local industries**. These productivity benefits are separate and in addition to consumer benefits from increased mobility. However, not all increased vehicle use by producers represents increased productivity. As discussed later in this paper, **automobile dependent transportation systems and land use patterns require more travel to provide a given level of services.**

# Road Focus Better – Jobs

[\_\_\_\_] The automobile industry is key to providing jobs, nearly 10% of recent jobs were directly created through the automobile industry

Adam Hershand *Jane* Farrell, *an economist at the Center for American Progress Action Fund,Special Assistant for Economic Policy at CAPAF,* 2012

(A[uto Industry Provides Bright Spot In Jobs Report, Proving Again That Letting It Fail Would Have Been The Wrong Course](http://thinkprogress.org/economy/2012/04/06/459857/auto-industry-bright-spot/), <http://thinkprogress.org/economy/2012/04/06/459857/auto-industry-bright-spot/> April 6th 2012)

Today’s jobs report from the Department of Labor shows that **the private sector** [has added jobs](http://www.marketwatch.com/story/economy-fights-headwinds-politics-for-jobs-gain-2012-04-06?link=MW_latest_news) **for the past 25 months consecutively. One particular bright spot: auto industry employment continued its winning streak**. **Nearly ten percent of the 120,000 U.S. jobs added in March were a result of strong growth in the motor vehicles and parts manufacturing sector, serving as yet another wake-up call regarding whose ideas are working for the economy**. Many Republicans — including the GOP’s presidential front-runner, Mitt Romney, said we should “let Detroit go bankrupt“. Auto industry jobs suffered a steady decline in the 2000s even before the Great Recession hit. From March 2001 — the previous cycle peak — to December 2007, auto jobs fell from 1.24 million to 956,000. As the housing bubble economy deflated and the financial crisis on Wall Street threw us further into a tailspin, auto industry employment fell by another one-third. **Fortunately, the Obama administration had the** [vision and perseverance](http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/fact-sheet-obama-administration-auto-restructuring-initiative-general-motors) **to come to the aid of the auto industry in early 2009. By organizing a restructuring of the industry instead of letting it go bankrupt, the Administration saved hundreds of thousands of American jobs and a vital sector of the U.S. economy**. The graph here shows the cumulative net change in motor vehicles and parts industries jobs since June 2009–the month that General Motors filed for Chapter 11 bankruptcy and the Obama administration’s strategy for restructuring the American auto industry really kicked into high gear. **From June 2009 to March 2012, the industry increased employment by more than 22 percent, or 139,000 new jobs created. And last week, U.S. automakers registered their** [strongest sales growth since early 2008](http://www.calculatedriskblog.com/2012/03/us-light-vehicle-sales-at-151-million.html)**, even stronger than during the** [successful “Cash for Clunkers” program](http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2010/10/cash_over_clunkers.html) **in summer 2009. Industry output growth recovered, too. After falling 60 percent in 2008 and 25 percent in 2009, U.S. motor vehicle output grew by 27 percent in 2010 and 12 percent in 2011, adjusting for inflation**. Growth in 2011 was held back by the March 2011 Japanese earthquake, which disrupted global automotive supply chains. **Without the Obama administration’s bold efforts to restructure the American auto industry, not only would these auto industry jobs not exist, but hundreds of thousands of other jobs upstream and downstream from the auto industry would have disappeared as well.**

# Road Focus Better- Economy Impact

[\_\_\_\_] Economic collapse leads to poverty and unemployment

Sharing for Success 2012

(Sharing For Success, “Lack of Jobs in Georgia Leads to Increase in Poverty”, <http://job-library.classifieds1000.com/poverty/20111104-154315-Lack-of-Jobs-in-Georgia-Leads-to-Increase-in-Poverty>)

I know, the title seems to say it all, but it wouldn't be much of an article without a few facts to back it up.   Recent census data indicates the poverty level in Georgia is one of the highest in the U.S. **More than 1.8 million residents fall into the category of financially impoverished**. This puts Georgia in the number three spot behind Louisiana and Mississippi. Joblessness impacts a number of other key factors in the state. Georgia also ranked high among the uninsured. Approximately 19 percent of the state's population is uninsured. Georgia has joined other states to challenge the President's healthcare plan. **The rising number of uninsured, stems from increases in insurance premiums and the growing number of residents who, for one reason or another, find themselves without gainful employment**. These issues need to be addressed, and Obama's healthcare "solution" is not a "one size fits all" plan. Georgia's uninsured numbers beat out Louisiana, Mississippi, Nevada, New Mexico, South Carolina and Texas.That's not much consolation for a state desperately trying to remedy the situation with little success. To make matters worse, Georgia's population is growing. Census figures from 2010 rank it ninth most populous, with a growth rate of 18.3 percent. This is far beyond the national growth rate of 9.7 percent. **State budget cuts have worsened the effects of the declining economy**. State representatives stress a need for jobs and economic investment. Democrats say revenue from state and federal levels is needed to balance out state cuts that seem to be driving the poverty levels. Whatever side of the political fence you reside on, one thing is certain: **those living at or below the poverty level** in Georgia **do not have a chance to improve their quality of life until additional jobs are created.** It really doesn't matter where they come from-jobs created by small business owners, large companies moving to the state or the government. At this point, Georgia needs jobs, and needs them now.

# Roads Focus Better- Answer to: No Trade-off

[\_\_\_\_]

[\_\_\_\_] Increasing funding for mass transit directly trades off with funding for highways

Gerald E Frug, Samuel R. Rosenthal Professor of Law at Harvard University, 1998

(“CITY SERVICES”, LexisNexis, 4/98)

Highway maintenance also raises broader issues than the need to fill potholes. Fixing the streets is simply one of the many direct costs imposed on cities by America's automobile-based society: cities spend money policing the streets, sweeping them, installing traffic signals, and sending the fire department and paramedic services when accidents occur. n223 And **highways are only one ingredient in a transportation system** that can either link metropolitan residents together or divide them from each other. **Decisions about the allocation of funds for highways, mass transit, and bicycle paths have had a major impact** on the design of the area's streets, housing, and commercial life and, with it, the accessibility of jobs for the poor. Indeed, some cities and neighborhoods have excluded the region's mass transit system to prevent "undesirables" from having easy access to them, and highways have been located to separate the region into racially identifiable spaces. n224 This history of isolating the poor makes it clear that **a decision to shift resources from highways to a fully accessible mass transit system would affect the lives of everyone** in the region, not just those who ride the trains. n225 So does a recognition of the effect that such a shift would have on the extent of car generated pollution throughout the metropolitan area.

# Road Focus Better – Answers to: Highways Declining Now

[\_\_\_\_] US infrastructure is strong now

Charles Lane, Washington Post editor, 2011

(Charles, “The U.S. infrastructure argument that crumbles upon examination”, 10-31, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/the-us-infrastructure-argument-that-crumbles-upon-examination/2011/10/31/gIQAnILRaM_story.html>)

So how come my family and I traveled thousands of miles on both the east and west coasts last summer without actually seeing any crumbling roads or airports? On the whole, the highways and byways were clean, safe and did not remind me of the Third World countries in which I have lived or worked. Should I believe the pundits or my own eyes? For all its shortcomings, U.S. infrastructure is still among the most advanced in the world — if not the most advanced**.** I base this not on selective personal experience but on the same data alarmists cite. The contiguous United States(that is, excluding Alaska and Hawaii) cover 3.1 million square miles, including deserts, mountain ranges, rivers and two oceanic coastlines. In a world of vast dictatorships (China), tiny democracies (Switzerland) and everything in between, from Malta to Mexico, the challenge of building and maintaining first-rate roads, bridges, railroads, airports and seaports in a country like the United States is extraordinary — and so is the degree to which the United States succeeds. When you compare America’s WEF rankings with those of the 19 other largest countries, it stands second only to Canada, which is lightly populated — and whose infrastructure is linked with ours. Among the 20 most populous countries, the United States ranks behind France, Germany and Japan, in that order. This would seem to confirm the case for U.S. inferiority in the developed world. But France and Germany, in addition to being substantially smaller than the United States, are part of the European Union, a borderless single market from the Baltic Sea to the Black Sea. Sure enough, when you average out the scores of all 27 E.U. nations, the United States beats them by a clear margin. The WEF produced its rankings based on a survey in which business executives were asked to rate their respective countries’ infrastructure on an ascending scale of 1 to 7. Barbados’s 5.8 average score means that paradise’s execs are a smidgen happier with their infrastructure than are their American counterparts, who gave the United States an average score of 5.7. This is a “national disgrace”? Barbados has one commercial airport. The United States has more than 500. The WEF asked executives to rate “railroad infrastructure,” without distinguishing between freight (which excels in the United States) and passenger (which does not). Perhaps the survey’s subjectivity accounts for odd results such as Guatemala outranking Italy. Or that the U.S. score plunged below 6.0 for the first time in 2008 — proof of a sudden drop in the actual quality of our roads and bridges, or merely an indicator of the general despondency that hit U.S. businesses along with the Great Recession? **And while that D from the American Society of Civil Engineers is undoubtedly sincere, the organization has a vested interest in greater infrastructure spending, which means more work for engineers**. The engineers’ lobby has given America’s infrastructure a D in every one of its report cards going back to 1998, except for 2001, when the mark was D-plus.

Crime Turn

### [\_\_\_\_] Mass transit attracts increased crime

Gary Stoller, reporter for USA Today, 2011

(“US: Crime Lurks Outside Airports, Rail Stations”, Mass Transit Magazine, 7/12/11, http://www.masstransitmag.com/news/10295844/us-crime-lurks-outside-airports-rail-stations)//LP

The CAP Index study finds that the likelihood of crime is nearly eight times higher than the national average outside Philadelphia airport and nearly five times higher outside Newark airport. The likelihood of crime exceeds the national average outside 28 of 29 big-city airports in the study and outside all 26 central train stations, says CAP Index, which uses statistics, demographics and computer modeling to determine the likelihood of crime. Of the 29 airports, about half have surrounding neighborhoods where the likelihood of crime is more than four times higher than the national average. Of 26 central train stations, 21 have surrounding neighborhoods where the likelihood is more than four times higher. CAP Index President Jon Groussman says his company's analysis of law enforcement and clients' loss data shows a large number of crimes are committed in such neighborhoods. "You are clearly getting into a more elevated risk potential" when you enter a neighborhood with a crime likelihood at least four times the national average, he says. CAP Index says its crime-risk determinations are 70% to 90% accurate. Like other probability formulas, CAP Index's methodology has its limitations, company officials acknowledge, because it does not take into account various variables, including police force size, amount of security equipment being used and current events. Rosemary Erickson, a criminologist and security expert, says CAP Index is "extremely useful for predicting crime," and travelers should heed its findings for neighborhoods outside airports and central train stations. The areas outside airports and central train stations have a higher likelihood of crime because they're often poor neighborhoods and are probably not as effectively policed as some downtown areas, says Lewis Yablonsky, emeritus professor of criminology at California State University-Northridge.

[\_\_\_\_] Crime causes long term psychological impacts to the victims, causing more poverty.

Scott Erickson, MS in Criminal Justice Studies, 2012

( February 12, <http://dailycaller.com/2010/02/19/the-financial-impact-of-crime/#ixzz22ADB7rw1> )

Intangible costs associated to crime are often difficult to quantify; however **it is not difficult to imagine the long term effect that psychological trauma or a reduced quality of life have on victims of crime**. **Upwards of** [**5 million Americans**](http://www.house.leg.state.mn.us/hrd/pubs/costcrime.pdf) **are estimated to receive mental health therapy directly related to their victimization**. This represents a significant financial cost in both real terms as well as in estimates of reduced individual productivity. **The trauma associated to criminal victimization often leads to troubled** personal and professional **relationships and can limit the anticipated earnings an individual might expect to produce** throughout their lifetime. Recognizing the reduction in **lost opportunity costs significantly increases the financial impact that crime places upon society**.

# Crime Turn – Impact Extension

[\_\_\_\_] Crime costs society over $130 billion each year.

Scott Erickson, MS in Criminal Justice Studies, 2012

(February 12, <http://dailycaller.com/2010/02/19/the-financial-impact-of-crime/#ixzz22ADB7rw1> )

Seeking to more accurately account for these hidden cost estimates, **economist David Anderson provided a disquieting account of the financial impact of crime** in his 1999 study [The Aggregate Burden of Crime](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=147911)**. Anderson estimated** t**he cost of crime within the United States to be upwards of $1.7 trillion annually**. His estimates far exceeded those of previous studies; however a closer examination of his methodology provides a useful insight into his conclusions.Anderson’s study included a comprehensive analysis of previously overlooked variables such as the aforementioned reduction in opportunity costs emanating from both the commission of crime as well as the victimization of crime. Often unrecognized are the potential earnings forecasts attributable to those serving time for criminal activity. **Anderson estimated that each incarcerated inmate represented an annual productivity loss of over $23,000**. **Calculating lost opportunity costs coupled with the time and effort that individuals expend on securing their assets from crime, Anderson placed the annual loss from these variables alone at over $130 billion**.

# Gentrification Turn

[\_\_\_\_] An investment in mass transit will contribute to a greater gentrification as it causes people to move from the suburbs to the cities inevitably rising house prices

Gerg St. Martin, Writer for Coalition on Sustainable Transportation, 2010

(New Transit May Cause Unintended Gentrification, <http://www.costaustin.org/jskaggs/?p=1333>)

A Northeastern report warns of the unintended consequences of first-time expansion of transit into some metropolitan neighborhoods. **Extending public transportation to a metropolitan neighborhood** for the first time can, in some cases**, raise rents, bringing in a population of wealthier residents who would rather drive than take public transportation**. That’s the conclusion of a report by the Kitty and Michael Dukakis Center for Urban and Regional Policy, which found that **new public transit investments can sometimes lead to gentrification that prices out renters and low-income households**—people considered core public-transportation users—**working against the public goal of boosting transit ridership**. The study, released today, urged planners and policymakers to consider the unintended consequences of neighborhood gentrification when expanding or improving public tr ansit, given the risk that transit investment can cause undesirable neighborhood change. “Transit planners frequently speak of the need for transit-oriented development to support ridership, but what transit stations need is transit-oriented neighbors who will regularly use the system,” said Stephanie Pollack, the report’s lead author and associate director of the Dukakis Center. “**In the neighborhoods (around the country) where new light rail stations were built**, almost every aspect of neighborhood change was magnified,” added Barry Bluestone, director of the Dukakis Center and the report’s coauthor. “**Rents rose faster**; owner-occupied units became more prevalent**. Before transit was built, these neighborhoods had been dominated by low-income, renter households**.” The report, “Maintaining Diversity In America’s Transit-Rich Neighborhoods: Tools for Equitable Neighborhood Change,” was funded by the Rockefeller Foundation. It includes new research analyzing socioeconomic changes in 42 neighborhoods in 12 metropolitan areas across the United States first served by rail transit between 1990 and 2000. The report’s findings, researchers said, also raise concerns about equity. Core transit riders are predominantly people of color and/or low-income who disproportionately live in transit-rich neighborhoods. Researchers calculated that transit-served metropolitan regions are currently home to over half of all African Americans, 60 percent of all Hispanics and 70 percent of all immigrants in the United States. The report’s recommendations include advising policymakers to get ahead of the issues using coordinated and community-responsive planning tools, and designing policies that attract core and potential transit users to these now transit-rich neighborhoods. To moderate increases in rents, future housing policies should include funding for land and property acquisition, preservation of existing affordable housing, and creation of new affordable housing, researchers said.

# Gentrification Turn

[\_\_\_\_] An increase in house prices will cause reinforce segregation and force people who can’t afford to pay increased rents out of their own neighborhoods

Thomas W. Sanchez et al, an associate professor of Urban Affairs and Planning and research fellow in the Metropolitan Institute at Virginia Tech, 2003

(Rich Stolz is Senior Policy Analyst at Center for Community Change. Jacinta S. Ma is a Legal and Policy Advocacy Associate at The Civil Rights Project at Harvard, “Moving to Equity: Addressing Inequitable Effects of Transportation Policies on Minorities”)

Another housing-related impact of transportation policies is gentrification. **Gentrification is** commonly characterized as a transformation of neighborhood conditions that encompass physical, economic, and demographic dimensions and can be defined as “**the process by which higher income households displace lower income residents of a neighborhood, changing the essential character and flavor of that neighborhood**.”122 It occurs for a number of reasons, including increased desirability of an area due to a transportation investment such as extension of a commuter rail line, new or improved train service or station, or addition of a highway ramp or exit. Most commonly, gentrification has been portrayed in terms of residential location patterns, such as “back to the city” flows of middle-income households from the urban fringe or suburbs or elsewhere within a metropolitan area. Gentrification, however, manifests itself through reinvestment and rehabilitation of previously degraded neighborhoods, improving the physical condition and appearance of both residential and commercial properties. Due to the perception that increased property values, increased safety, and improved neighborhood amenities signal neighborhood revival, middle- income households upgrade housing conditions for their personal consumption. While owner- occupied single-family residences replace renter occupancy, businesses that target the demographic group of middle-income homeowners transform older, traditional commercial locations through reinvestment and rehabilitation of structures. Thus, the gentrification process entails physical property improvements, a demographic change to higher income levels, more “yuppie” (young, urban professionals) households, and property value increases. Some neighborhood gentrifications absorb vacant properties, while others involve replacement (or displacement) of households no longer able to afford housing due to housing cost (price/rent) appreciation. While some consider property value increases resulting from gentrification to be positive, **such changes have also been criticized for worsening the well-being of low-income persons, especially in neighborhoods of color**. Some have argued that **increases in property values** are capitalized in rent increases, which then **push households that are less able to pay to other neighborhoods or to undesirable housing arrangements**.123 In particular, some argue that certain antisprawl land use policies that direct housing development away from the urban fringe reduce housing affordability and limit housing choice, especially for low-income households. Others have argued, in addition to causing displacement, that **gentrification is undesirable because it leads to homogenous neighborhoods that are not socioeconomically or culturally diverse**.124 However, there is insufficient data to draw specific conclusions about the net social and economic impacts of transportation investments on gentrification and displacement.

# Gentrification Turn – Link Extension

**[\_\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_\_] New public transit projects increase gentrification, pricing people out of their own neighborhoods

[Andrew Nusca](http://www.smartplanet.com/search?q=andrew+nusca), editor of SmartPlanet, 2010

(New public transit encourages gentrification, lowers ridership, study says, October 22, http://www.smartplanet.com/blog/smart-takes/new-public-transit-encourages-gentrification-lowers-ridership-study-says/11832)

**If you were to extend the reach of public transportation to an underserved neighborhood**, **you would expect ridership to increase and rents to drop, right?** Wrong, according to a new study. [A new report from the](http://www.northeastern.edu/news/stories/2010/10/transitreport.html) Dukakis Center for Urban and Regional Policy at Northeastern University says that **the result may be the complete opposite — that is, attract a population of wealthier residents who prefer private cars to public buses and trains**. The report, [which can be found here (.pdf)](http://www.northeastern.edu/dukakiscenter/documents/TRN_Equity_final.pdf), found that **new public transit investments can**, in some cases, **lead to gentrification. That means renters and low-income resident**s — you know, the folks you think would ride public transportation — **get priced out of the neighborhood and, once again, away from easy access to the very system that’s thought to serve them the most.**

# Spending Link

[\_\_\_\_] Urban transit funds are wasteful and cost billions- the economic payoff is marginal because the benefits are so localized

Randal O’Toole, Cato Analyst, 2012

(CATO INSTITUTE, “Urban Transit”, June 2010, http://www.downsizinggovernment.org/transportation/urban-transit)

The Department of Transportation's Federal Transit Administration has an annual budget of more than $10 billion, nearly all of which is spent on subsidies to state and local governments.2 In addition, the economic stimulus bill of 2009 added a further $8 billion in subsidies over a period of years.3 Through these subsidies and related regulations, federal policymakers play a major role in shaping urban transportation choices. **Transit funding is costly to taxpayers, and it is not a proper function of the federal government. It encourages state and local governments to pursue high-cost and less-efficient transportation solutions**—in particular, rail transit. Outside of a few hyper-dense cities in the world, rail transit is a luxury for the few paid for by everyone. **Commuter trains and subways may be necessary to keep Manhattan going, but that doesn't mean that everyone else in the nation should subsidize them**. Outside of New York City, rail transit makes little economic sense.

### [\_\_\_\_] Plan would cost a LOT of money

Fitzgerald et.al. 2010- professor and director of the graduate program in Law, Policy and Society and a Senior Research Fellow at the Kitty and Michael Kukakis Center for Urban and Regional Policy at Northeastern University (Joan, Granquist, Khatiwada, McLaughlin, Renner, “Reviving the U.S. Rail and Transit Industry: Investments and Job Creation”, WorldWatch Institute)//AWV

The Federal Transportation Administration’s 2010 National State of Good Repair Assessment estimates that $13.5 billion is needed to replace U.S. buses and $16.2 billion to replace U.S. railcars that have exceeded their useful life or whose conditions fall below the acceptable minimum threshold.23 To remedy the bus backlog and maintain the existing fleet, annual investments of $6.8 billion over six years would be needed, or a total of almost $41 billion. For rail, remedying the backlog and maintaining the existing fleet would require $5.8 billion annually over six years, or almost $35 billion. This combined investment of $76 billion would do nothing to actually expand bus and rail and meet the pent up demand for additional transit services. Addressing the needs for both maintenance and expanded service would require even further investments.

# Spending Link

[\_\_\_\_] ****Mass Transit is expensive, it costs over $125,000 per passenger!****

Financial God 2012

(Financial God “Cars Are the Mass-Transit Solution of the Future”, <http://www.financialgod.com/cars-are-the-mass-transit-solution-of-the-future/> DM)

**Public agency corruption** **Mass transit is becoming more and more expensive,** and cities everywhere are decrying a lack of funding. **It costs hundreds of millions to billions of dollars to build new lines, and because mass transit corporations are usually taxpayer-funded public organizations, they not only hold a local market monopoly due to government privilege, but they also hold a gun to the local citizen’s head**. If they don’t get the exorbitant compensation increases they feel they deserve, they can bring the city to a grinding halt**. The city I live in recently extended a subway line and constructed a few new stations at a total cost of nearly $1 billion, and even the transit agency itself estimates that only around 8,000 people use this new line. Most of those were also existing bus riders. Therefore, the government spent around $125,000 per passenger so that they could sit in a train in a dark tunnel for a few kilometers, instead of a bus**. Talk about a massive waste of resources! **That money could have been spent elsewhere for a better return, or, better yet, could have been returned to the taxpayers. Keep in mind that maintenance costs for the tunnel, workers and trains also amount to another tens of millions per year.** I wonder how many people pocketed out of that deal. **Mass transit is expensive Building** [**elevated rail**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Elevated_railway) **or subterranean tunnels is very expensive and prone to significant cost overruns and corruption, as the government overpays and construction companies profit from mismanagement of public funds**. Elevated rail also has the extra cost of “not in my backyard” protests and compensation. At-grade rail is less expensive, but imposes significant penalties in the form of eminent domain evictions, grade-crossings, and slower transportation speeds. It is one of the worst ways of building a mass-transportation network, except where it is historical and a tourist attraction in places like San Francisco and Toronto. **Mass-transportation lines are also rigid. They cannot easily accommodate shifting patterns of demand**. A grid network would be more flexible, but costs are usually so prohibitive that these are only built in places where they really make sense, like Manhattan.

# Federalism Link

[\_\_\_\_] Federal involvement in mass transit would be a deep blow to federalism

Samuel Staley, senior research fellow with the Reason Foundation, associate director of the DeVoe L Moore Center at Florida State University, 2009

(11-16-09, “Federal Takeover of Subways: Another Blow to Federalism,” http://reason.org/blog/show/federal-takeover-of-subways-an)

**The Federal government's approach to its proposed takeover of subway and light rail safety regulation is an all too common way it approaches problem solving: Identify a problem, identify a political solution, but the federal government in charge**. Secretary Ron LaHood says as much based on statements reported in the *Washington Post*: "Administration officials said they are responding to a growing number of collisions, derailments and worker fatalities on subways -- and in particular to the fatal June 22 crash on Metro's Red Line and failures in oversight that have surfaced in its wake. Those failures have been the subject of an ongoing investigative series in The Washington Post. "After the [Metro] train crash, we were all sitting around here scratching our heads, saying, 'Hey, we've got to do something about this,' " Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood said in an interview. "And we discovered that there's not much we could do, because the law wouldn't allow us to do it." "Metro spokeswoman Lisa Farbstein said the agency had not seen details of the proposal. "The bottom line is we welcome additional safety oversight with open arms," she said. This Administration has shown little tolerance for boundaries established by tradition or Constitutional principle. Perhaps this is because the President is a former law professor who taught Constitutional law; he knows how to get around the law to make the system work for him. **Subways are particularly noteworthy, as both a test case for the breakdown of federalism as well as setting the tone for how local governance will be handled by the Federal Government in the future. Most transit agencies, unlike Amtrak and airlines, are well within state jurisdictional boundaries** (Washington, D.C. Metro being a notable exception). The **Obama** Administration **will use its funding precedent--most capital costs for transit agencies are funded by the Federal Government--as the mechanism for taking over rail transit agencies**. The trick will be trying to accomplish this, like highway funding, through incentives instead of direct mandates. Interesting, virtually no one in the media seems to even understand the Constitutional principles involved. Intercity rail and airlines can be regulated by the federal government because they plausibly fall under the interstate commerce regulatory authority of the federal government. That doesn't apply to the vast majority of rail transit systems, including those in Los Angeles, Denver, San Francisco, Dallas and even Chicago. Yet, this shouldn't be a surprise. **Progressive political philosophies show little respect for governing principles that divide or limit the power of government**. President Obama is not just a progressive politician, he's also a populist. So, **using the Federal government to address an identified political problems is consistent with an overall political philosophy, even if it isn't consistent with principles of federal-state governance embedded in the U.S. Constitution.**

# Federalism Link

[\_\_\_\_] States are much more important to mass transit funding now

Gordon, 2011 – Economic Analyst at Charles River Associates (Michael, “Funding Urban Mass Transit in the United States”, Boston College Economics Honor’s Thesis, http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=2007981, p. 23-24, 3-23-11)//AWV

Hess and Lombardi first provide a history of urban mass transit, noting important developments throughout the years and how they affected funding. They note that state approaches to funding urban mass transit often influence local government funding.77 Furthermore they find that “federal support has become proportionately less significant while local and state governments have grown increasingly responsible for transit’s operating and capital expenses.”78 They also discuss the importance of dedicated state and local taxes, in particular, local option transportation taxes (LOTTs). These LOTTs “include levies on sales, property, and income that often require voter approval but provide reliable and ongoing sources of revenue.”79 These dedicated funds provide a stable source of revenues for urban mass transit systems. Furthermore, Hess and Lombardi note the prevalent impact of politics on the funding and spending process. They write that politicians often prefer to contribute towards the more visible capital expenses instead of the more necessary operating expenses. Ideally, capital funding would improve efficiency so that operating funding becomes less necessary, but this is often not the case.80 Instead, funding capital expenses encourages overcapitalization and does not necessarily improve efficiency.81 Despite this overcapitalization, Hess and Lombardi then transition to note that some transit agencies have started using local funding to bypass the federal and state new starts criteria, which require years of planning.82 Overall, they find that local and state funding has and will become more relevant.83

# States CP Solvency

### [\_\_\_\_] State funding is more efficient

Gordon, 2011 – Economic Analyst at Charles River Associates (Michael, “Funding Urban Mass Transit in the United States”, Boston College Economics Honor’s Thesis,

http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=2007981, p. 42-43, 3-23-11)//AWV

In spite of the large amount of federal funding, this finding implies that state and local funds are more efficient than federal funds, which could happen for a number of reasons. First, the idea of fiscal federalism states that a centralist federal government should have less control and influence than more localized sources because it is further removed from the system needs.140 The federal government may not know as well as more localized governments how to best use the funds, but it may attach restrictions to them anyways. Additionally, urban mass transit agencies often apply for federal funds for projects that they may not need. For example, the federal ARRA program funds capital improvements, while state and local sources may instead fund more necessary operating measures. Agencies may choose to apply for federal funds (e.g. ARRA) for projects simply because the funds are available, even if the agency would not undertake these projects otherwise.

### [\_\_\_\_] Federal funding is inefficient

Gordon, 2011 – Economic Analyst at Charles River Associates (Michael, “Funding Urban Mass Transit in the United States”, Boston College Economics Honor’s Thesis, http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=2007981, p. 45-46, 3-23-11)//AWV

Including only total capital funding with a breakdown of operating funding levels produces similar results regarding levels of funding.144 Again, the federal operating funding term has a very large coefficient (2.146). This implies that the total federal funding term coefficient of the earlier regression is not greater than one solely due to capital funding considerations. This exemplifies that federal funding is also less effective than other levels of government at providing operating funding. An increase in one dollar of federal funding for operating expenses increases total expenses by over two dollars according to this regression, demonstrating that increasing federal funding would not help decrease urban mass transit agency deficits.

# States CP Solvency

### [\_\_\_\_] States comparatively better for mass transit funding

Gordon, 2011 – Economic Analyst at Charles River Associates (Michael, “Funding Urban Mass Transit in the United States”, Boston College Economics Honor’s Thesis,

http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=2007981, p. 53, 3-23-11)//AWV

However, the federal government should continue to stay away from funding operating expenses unless it gives funds through the state and local governments in a similar proportional process. The state and local governments appear best equipped to handle operating funding. Local governments should continue to heavily fund operating expenses to ensure that the systems continue to operate, as urban mass transit systems provide an important service. State governments, however, must further consider equity concerns when funding the urban mass transit systems since often many of the state residents do not live near the systems and do not necessarily benefit from its operation. For example, citizens of western Massachusetts do not benefit greatly from continued MBTA operations in Boston. Yet, state dollars are extremely important to keep these systems running, and state funding reduces the deficit effectively.

# Capitalism Link

**[\_\_\_\_] Public Transportation will be implemented to serve capitalist interests and widen inequality**

**Farmer 2011** Farmer Sociology Dep’t Roosevelt University 2011 Stephanie Uneven public transportation development in neoliberalizing Chicago, USA Environment and Planning http://envplan.com/epa/fulltext/a43/a43409.pdf,KB

**Public transportation policy is one dimension of spatial restructuring deployed by entrepreneurial governments** to create place-based competitive advantages for global capital. **Transportation represents a fixed, place-based geographic element where the local and the global interact; where global processes shape local geographies and where local politics shape global networks**. As Keil and Young (2008) suggest, transportation should now be considered in relation to globalized trade and economic networks and consumption-oriented patterns of everyday life. Growth demands in cities experiencing gentrification, the development of luxury consumption spaces, and a surge of tourism have placed pressure on local agencies to expand airports, roads, 1156 S Farmerand rail and public transit capacities. Large-scale urban redevelopment plans have made a comeback as city planners conceive of megaprojects that concentrate new public transit investment in the revalorized core (Fainstein, 2008; Keil and Young, 2008; Swyngedouw et al, 2002). Air transportation has become the leading form of global connectivity, influencing the decisions of global, national, and regional elites to create air-transportation infra-structure (Cidell, 2006; Erie, 2004; Keil and Young, 2008; Phang, 2007). For instance, there is a growing network of world-class cities (Shanghai, London, and Tokyo) that enables air travelers to connect seamlessly from one global city core to the next, with direct express train service from the downtown business core to the city's international airports (Graham and Marvin, 2001). These specialized **public transit systems more closely integrate a city into global markets, thereby making the city more attractive for business activities** (Brenner and Theodore, 2002; Graham, 2000). The resulting ``premium network spaces'' are ``geared to the logistical and exchange demands of foreign direct investors, tourist spaces or socioeconomically affluent groups'' (Graham and Marvin, 2001, page 100). Interactions with the surrounding residential districts are carefully managed by filtering `proper' users through nonstop services or prohibitively expensive fares. In addition, premium transport services tend to be bundled with upscale shopping centers, entertainment spectacles, hotels, or office spaces to form a giant, integrated bubble of luxury. Subsequently, sociospatial relations are reconfigured as premium infrastructure bypasses devalorized places and exclude economically disadvantaged users from accessing the transit service.

## Russian Oil Links

### [\_\_\_\_] The current roads focus in transportation policy exacerbates oil dependence

**Sandalow, 2007 -** David Sandalow is Energy and Environment Scholar at The Brookings Institution (“Ending Oil Dependence”, 1/22,<http://www.brookings.edu/views/papers/fellows/sandalow20070122.pdf>)

Americans are driving more and enjoying it less. Between 1993 and 2003, vehicle miles traveled in the U.S. increased 26%. Drivers report spending more time in their cars each day – up from 49 minute average in 1990 to 62 minutes today. Traffic congestion is a growing frustration for millions. 32 More sensible growth patterns could help improve quality of life while reducing oil dependence. “Transit-oriented development” – building mixed-use communities around transit stations – is one increasingly popular approach. A recent study found that doubling ridership on mass transit nationally could save 1.4 billion gallons of gasoline per year. 33 Longstanding federal subsidies for urban highway construction have contributed to the current mix of traffic congestion, driver unhappiness and oil consumption. Ironically, repeated experiences in major U.S. cities demonstrate that building more roads fails to solve traffic congestion. One expert summed it up by saying: “Trying to cure traffic congestion by building more roads is like trying to cure obesity by loosening your belt.” 34 The most recent federal highway bill, passed in August 2005, provides four times more funding for highways than mass transit. 35

**Russian Oil Links**

### [\_\_\_\_] **Federal support for mass transit is vital to shifting away from new road construction – it’s vital to substantially decreasing oil dependence**

**Nelder, 2009** - Chris Nelder is an energy analyst and consultant who has written about energy and investing for more than a decade (“Is Obama's Infrastructure Plan Built to Last?,” Energy & Capital, 1/14, [http://www.energyandcapital.com/articles/obama-infrastructure-energy/813)//DH](http://www.energyandcapital.com/articles/obama-infrastructure-energy/813)/DH)

It is abundantly clear to me, as it is to any student of peak oil or anybody who has read my column or my books, that rail is the obvious priority for the future of transportation. Rail is by far the cheapest and most fuel-efficient form of transport, requiring about a third less fuel than air for personal travel, and as little as 3% of the energy for freight. Yet, our current rail system is a joke compared to the rest of the developed world. As James Howard Kunstler has remarked, even Bulgaria would be ashamed of our rail system. Destinations are limited, especially in the West, and most of the trains run on diesel. Our fastest train, Amtrak's Acela, only does about 100 mph on its short run from Boston to D.C., less than half the speed of modern high-speed trains elsewhere. If we really intend to have an infrastructure that survives peak oil, we have to transform it to run on renewably generated electricity. We also have to expand it massively and take millions of cars and transport trucks off the road. Doing so would probably cost trillions of dollars and would be worth every penny. For example, a high-speed rail corridor for the Northeast would run about $32 billion. Laying high-speed rail between the major cities of California would cost north of $40 billion. So far, however, I have seen little suggestion of such an ambitious transformation. The funding package approved in October by Congress would grant a paltry $13 billion to passenger rail over five years, of which three-fourths would go to Amtrak. Another $5 billion is currently proposed by the House transportation and infrastructure committee for intercity rail. That's not transformation spending; that's barely better than maintenance spending. In fact, despite Obama's pledge to devote funds to projects beyond "roads and bridges," it's now looking like the states might hijack those funds and try to pour much of the Obama stimulus package money into roads and cars. According to a report by Bloomberg, Missouri plans to spend $750 million of it on highways and nothing on mass transit. Utah would devote 87% of its share to new roads, and Arizona would spend $869 million on highways. Presumably, other states have similar priorities. I'm not unsympathetic to the plight of the states. Saddled with declining revenues due to the recession and a crumbling road, bridge and airport infrastructure badly in need of repair, they have to do something. In the absence of strong federal leadership into mass transit, they have little choice but to try to maintain what they have. A spokesman for House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Chairman James Oberstar quoted in the Bloomberg article was blunt: "We like the environmentally friendly way of doing things but the charge we were given was to come up with something that can happen quickly," he said. "We can't lose sight of what the primary goal here is, and that is to put people to work." Not Just Jobs, but the Right Jobs Which brings us to the key point: Instead of seeking "shovel ready" projects that can be started within 180 days to create new jobs ASAP, the Obama team should be looking at the long view on energy and ensuring what we build now is truly built to last. Roads—especially new roads—are definitely not that. According to the director of Washington-based Building America's Future, some $16.5 billion in mass transit projects can be started within a year. (By comparison, tens of billions of dollars have already been committed to high-speed electric rail in Europe and Asia.) Those projects should be our immediate national priority, followed by some deep and serious planning for a long-term transportation infrastructure that will survive $150 oil and declining supply. President Roosevelt created just such a planning board as part of the New Deal, which eventually resulted in the interstate highway system. By planning for it now, we could achieve a somewhat orderly transition away from liquid fuels and toward efficient electric transport. We'll still create millions of new jobs, only they'll be theright jobs. Jobs that won't disappear the next time oil spikes.
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Summary

This Affirmative case argues that the United States should invest in measures to improve security in US ports in order to prevent terrorists from smuggling deadly material, particularly nuclear weapons material through a US port that receives goods for import.

There is substantial concern that deadly materials could arrive in the United States due to weak port security because the United States imports hundreds of millions of goods every year and those goods arrive on containers from abroad aboard large ocean vessels. Nuclear materials, or other forms of deadly materials, could arrive in these boxes and then be detonated in the United States or immediately in a port.

If terrorists were able to assemble a nuclear weapon, they could detonate the nuclear weapon as a regular bomb. But even if they were not able to detonate an actual weapon, they could simply explode the nuclear material, spewing radiation for miles. A simple blast of the nuclear material is known as a “dirty bomb.”

Glossary

**Vocabulary**

Al-Qaeda. The terrorist organization that is responsible for the 9-11 attacks.

Containers. Large boxes of goods that arrive in the United States from abroad. They are off-loaded from large ships and then distributed via truck and train throughout the United States.

Dirty bomb. The explosion of nuclear material as a way to spread the nuclear material around. It is not a direct explosion.

Fissile material. Nuclear material that can be detonated.

Imports. Goods that enter the US and are then sold in the US.

Port. A place where goods arrive via a container ship and are imported into a country.

Weapon of Mass Destruction (WMD). Nuclear, Chemical, and Biological weapons are considered to be WMDs.

Glossary

**Acronyms**

**CBP.** Customs & Border Patrol

**CBPO.** Customs & Border Patrol Officer

**CBW.** Chemical and Biological Weapons

**DOD.** Department of Defense

**DHS.** Department of Homeland Security

**IED.** Improvised Explosive Device

**GAO.** General Accounting Office.

**HEU.** Highly Enriched Uranium

**NPT.** Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty

**RDD.** Radiological Dispersion Device

**RPG.** Rocket Propelled Grenade

**URC.** United States Regulatory Commission

**WMD.** Weapons of Mass Destruction
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#### Contention 1 – The Current Situation

#### Congress will not act to improve port security now

Stamford Advocate, 2012

(May 9, “Maritime Industry Awaits Action in Congress”, http://www.stamfordadvocate.com/news/article/Martime-industry-awaits-action-in-Congress-3544112.php)

**The maritime businesses should not expect any industry-related legislation soon from Congress** as the Republican-controlled House and Democratic-controlled Senate continue to do battle. Joan M. Bondareff, an attorney with the Washington, D.C., office of [Blank Rome LLP,](http://w3.nexis.com/new/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T14683658970&returnToId=20_T14683687707&csi=169235&A=0.4689847744014277&sourceCSI=162599&indexTerm=%23CC0007H79%23&searchTerm=Blank%20Rome%20LLP,%20&indexType=C) told more than 150 participants at the Tugs & Barges Marine Log Conference & Expo on Tuesday at the Stamford Marriott that **the impasse will continue** until after the presidential and congressional elections in November.

"This Congress is in considerable gridlock, and nothing much will happen until after election," said Bondareff, who focuses on marine transportation and environmental issues. **Much of proposed transportation funding that is tied up in the 2013 federal budget pertains to maritime programs, including port security and improvements**, said Bondareff, who encouraged the audience to contact their senators and representatives to urge action on maritime-related legislation.
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#### Contention 2 – Harms

#### The risk of a terror attack involving weapons of mass destruction is increasing

Robert Galluci, President, John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, 2012

(April 5, Huffington Post, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/robert-gallucci/nuclear-terrorism\_b\_1406712.html

We should all be concerned that **perhaps during one morning rush hour in a major American city, a nuclear weapon of crude and improvised design will be detonated**. Such a device's yield will be far smaller than that of the bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, but still tens of thousands will die instantly from the blast, burns and radiation. Over the following month, thousands more will succumb to burns, injuries, or the effects of radiation. The blast area will be uninhabitable for months or longer. **This is not the stuff of pulp fiction or sensational television; it is a credible scenario.** **There is clear** [evidence](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/01/25/AR2010012502598.html) **that terrorist organizations, such as al-Qaeda, are interested in acquiring and using nuclear weapons. They seek to inflict maximum damage with an economy of means; nothing can accomplish this end more effectively and with more certainty than a nuclear weapon.**

#### Lack of security means terrorists could detonate a weapon of mass destruction – WMD – in a US port

Lt. Morgan James et al, Naval Postgraduate School, 2007

(Port Security Strategy 2012, edocs.nps.edu/npspubs/scholarly/TR/2007/NPS-97-07-003.pdf)

The disruption of port operations may come in three forms: Injuring and/or evacuation of port workers Damaging infrastructure of the port Contaminating port facilities with a chemical weapon or a dirty bomb Vehicle-borne IEDs and **pier-side release or detonation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) have been identified to be the prominent land threats to port operation**s. Vehicle borne IEDs are improvised explosive devices carried either in a vehicle or inside a shipping container. IEDs can be made easily from readily available materials. The delivery of such devices is noted to be either by personnel (suicide bombers) or vehicles. From the various IED bombing incidents on 1 October 2005 in Bali, Indonesia, on 9 September 2004 at the Australia Embassy in Indonesia, on 5 August 2003 at the Marriott Hotel in Indonesia, and on 19 April 1995 in Oklahoma City in the United States, it was noted that vehicle borne IEDs are preferred mode of terrorist operation as it has enough explosive power to cause significant damage to infrastructure which, in the case of a port, may severely impact port operation. **WMDs are weapons that possess the capacity to inflict extensive damage to infrastructure or the populace, or deny the use of critical geography through contamination. The successful deployment of a weapon of mass destruction would result in large economic loss and/or loss of life.**
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#### Entry through US ports is easy now – screening is inadequate

Jim Kouri, Vice President of the National Association of Chiefs of Police, 2012

(CPP, February 22, U.S. bound cargo remains vulnerable to terrorists, WMD <http://www.examiner.com/law-enforcement-in-national/u-s-bound-cargo-remains-vulnerable-to-terrorists-wmd>)

It may seem unbelievable to most Americans that the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) that more than ten years after the worst terrorist attack in U.S. history**, the vast majority of cargo containers entering the U.S. go unchecked**. Incredibly, it’s true and the alarming details are outlined in the GAO report published this week by the Government Accountability Office (GAO), the investigative arm of the U.S. Congress. The Maritime Transportation Security Act (MTSA) of 2002 and the Security and Accountability For Every (SAFE) Port Act of 2006 required the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to take actions to improve maritime transportation security. Also, the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007 (9/11 Act) required, among other things, that by July 2012, 100 percent of all U.S.-bound cargo containers be scanned. Within DHS, U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) is responsible for container security programs to address these requirements. Sadly, the GAO report reveals that **the DHS agency responsible for screening cargo, Customs and Border Protection (CBP), still lacks the ability to check 100% of the containers that enter the U.S. through seaports each day**. Under the 9/11 Commission Act, all U.S-bound cargo containers must be scanned because they are vulnerable to threats from terrorists and could be used to smuggle nuclear and radiological materials. To meet the goal, DHS has spent hundreds of millions of dollars on faulty systems that didn’t get the job done. In fact, the agency dropped more than $200 million on 1,400 radiation portal monitors that weren’t up to the task, according to a blog published by a public-interest group that investigates and exposes government corruption and ineptitude -- Judicial Watch. “Uncertainty persists over how DHS and CBP will fulfill the mandate for 100 percent scanning given that the feasibility remains unproven in light of the challenges CBP has faced implementing a pilot program for 100 percent scanning,” state the GAO investigators. In addition, the GAO reveals that several years ago it asked Homeland Security officials to perform an analysis to determine whether 100% scanning is even feasible, but the agency hasn’t bothered doing it. Congressional investigators have logically concluded that CBP is “no longer pursuing efforts to implement 100 percent scanning” by the mandatory July 2012 deadline. The GAO reveals that several years ago it asked Homeland Security officials to perform an analysis to determine whether 100% scanning is even feasible, but the agency never did it. Congressional investigators have logically concluded that CBP is “no longer pursuing efforts to implement 100 percent scanning” by the mandatory July 2012 deadline. **The GAO’s findings could not have come at a worst time, on the heels of an international study on maritime trafficking that reveals weapons, drugs and banned missile are regularly smuggled aboard reputable ships owned by major companies in the U.S. and Europe.**
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#### Use of WMD in a port will destroy nearby population centers

Jon D. Haveman and Howard J. Shatz, Public Policy Institute of California, 2006

(Protecting the Nation’s Seaports: Balancing Security and Costs, www.ppic.org/content/pubs/repo-rt/r\_606jhr.pdf)

Beyond their economic role, **the largest seaports are also near major population centers, so the use of a weapon of mass destruction at a port could injure or kill thousands of people. In addition, a weapon such as a nuclear device could cause vast environmental and social disruption** and destroy important non-port infrastructure in these urban areas such as airports and highway networks.

#### A successful nuclear terrorist attack would cause a police state

Mohamed Sid-Ahmed, Al-Ahram Weekly political analyst, 2004

(Al-Ahram Weekly, "Extinction!" 8/26, no. 705, http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/2004/705/op5.htm)

**What would be the consequences of a nuclear attack by terrorists? Even if it fails,** it would further exacerbate the negative features of the new and frightening world in which we are now living. **Societies would close in on themselves, police measures would be stepped up at the expense of human rights**, tensions between civilizations and religions would rise **and ethnic conflicts would proliferate. It would also speed up the arms race and develop the awareness that a different type of world order is imperative if humankind is to survive**.

Therefore we propose the following

**Plan: The United States federal government should increase investment in its transportation infrastructure by investing in enhanced detection for chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons at US ports.**
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#### Contention 3 – Solvency

#### US needs to increase funding and support for port security

Jon D. Haveman and Howard J. Shatz, Public Policy Institute of California, 2006

(Protecting the Nation’s Seaports: Balancing Security and Costs, www.ppic.org/content/pubs/repo-rt/r\_606jhr.pdf)

Finally**, the U.S. government should reconsider the level of staffing and funding devoted to port security efforts. Under current programs, 12,000 facility and vessel security plans and more than 5,600 C-TPAT plans will need monitoring** (with the number of C-TPAT plans steadily rising). The U.S. Coast Guard has gained a large set of new duties that need staffing. **New technologies need developing.** Customs officials must review large amounts of new information to target high-risk containers. Personnel from the Coast Guard and other parts of the government need training in tasks previously unknown to them. Finally, **new security equipment will need maintenance, repair, and upgrading.**

#### Increasing investment will protect ports

Wendy Keefer, Lawyer at Keefer and Keefer, 2008

(Container Port Security: A Layered Defense Strategy to Protect The Homeland and The International Supply Chain; CAMPBELL LAW REVIEW Vol. 30:139; <http://law.campbell.edu/lawreview/articles/30-1-139.pdf>)

#### **Priority should be given to effective security solutions that complement and improve the business processes already in place, and which build a foundation for 21st century global trade. A more secure supply chain also can be a more efficient supply chain**. ... . **Technology plays a particularly important role in providing for screening of cargo at the critical nodes of the supply chain through data acquisition, delivery, and analysis** (e.g., the secure transmission of cargo manifests). **It also provides for certainty, through scanning and imaging of cargo at those nodes where multiple cargo flows join**, (e.g., **at ports of departure and entry). Such information built into normal business process as a preventative measure also leverages recovery capabilities by providing necessary information to key decision makers on the safety, security and prioritization of cargo**. B**etter technologies may permit more efficient cargo screening and examinations of a larger number of containers, ideally, prior to departing for and entering United States ports**. Certainly**, a continued focus on technology is appropriate.**

Economy Add-On

#### [\_\_\_\_] Terrorist attack sparks global depression

Richard Haas, President, Council on Foreign Relations, 2006

(PREVENTING CATASTROPHIC NUCLEAR TERRORISM, March, <http://www.cfr.org/content/-publications/attachments/NucTerrCSR.pdf>

**A nuclear attack by terrorists against the United States has the potential to make the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, look like a historical footnote**. In addition to the immediate horrific devastation, **such an attack could cost trillions of dollars in damages, potentially sparking a global economic depression**. Although, during the 2004 presidential campaign, President George W. Bush and Democratic challenger Senator John F. Kerry agreed that terrorists armed with nuclear weapons worried them more than any other national security threat, the U.S. government has yet to elevate nuclear terrorism prevention to the highest priority. Despite several U.S. and international programs to secure nuclear weapons and the materials to make them, major gaps in policy remain

#### [\_\_\_\_] Any nuclear attack would devastate the global economy

Matthew C. Weinzierl, Council of Economic Advisers Economist, 2004

(The National Interest, "The Cost of Living: The Economics of Preventing Nuclear Terrorism," Spring, LN)

**Nuclear terrorism presents an unparalleled threat to the United States. The economic impact alone of a nuclear terrorist attack would undoubtedly be staggering. Estimates of the direct economic cost of one potential scenario-a crude nuclear device detonated in lower Manhattan-range well over $ 1 trillion.** Even this estimate cannot capture the full tragedy of such a scenario, which could include half a million deaths, a zone of total destruction one mile wide, and radiation extending for miles around the blast's center. For the protectors of America's national interest, **no single issue is more urgent and frightening.**

Answers to: Port Screening Now

#### [\_\_\_]

#### [\_\_\_] Less than 3% of cargo entering US ports is scanned

Janice Hahn, US Representative, 2012

(<http://hahn.house.gov/press-release/rep-hahn-congressional-leader-ports-wins-passage-port-security-amendment>, May 9, “Rep. Hahn - Congressional Leader on Ports - Wins Passage of Port Security Amendment”)

Unfortunately **less than 3% of cargo coming into the country is scanned, giving terrorist opportunities to smuggle themselves or their weapons into the United States with little risk of detection.** An attack on the Port of Los Angeles complex, for example, would cost billions to the regional economy and put thousands of port employees out of work and cause the demise of hundreds of local businesses.

#### [\_\_\_] Department of Homeland Security is not scanning containers

Laura Richardson, US Representative (D-CA), 2012

(Congressional Documents and Publications, May 9, Congresswoman [Laura Richardson](http://w3.nexis.com/new/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T14683658970&returnToId=20_T14683673387&csi=247474&A=0.13662523131856086&sourceCSI=162599&indexTerm=%23PE000A0V6%23&searchTerm=Laura%20Richardson%20&indexType=P) Asks GAO to Examine Port Security Vulnerabilities; Rep. [Laura Richardson](http://w3.nexis.com/new/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T14683658970&returnToId=20_T14683673387&csi=247474&A=0.13662523131856086&sourceCSI=162599&indexTerm=%23PE000A0V6%23&searchTerm=Laura%20Richardson%20&indexType=P) News Release)

Today, Congresswoman [Laura Richardson](http://w3.nexis.com/new/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T14683658970&returnToId=20_T14683673387&csi=247474&A=0.13662523131856086&sourceCSI=162599&indexTerm=%23PE000A0V6%23&searchTerm=Laura%20Richardson%20&indexType=P) submitted a request to the Government Accountability Office (GAO) to examine security vulnerabilities in our nation's ports. "As Ranking Member of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response and Communication, I have been a strong advocate for ensuring the safety of our nation's ports. I have repeatedly asked the Secretary of Homeland Security when she has appeared before the committee on what the department has done to address risks at our ports. Unfortunately, **the Department of Homeland Security has been inherently slow in addressing the need to scanning containers before they enter U.S. ports and have not made any substantial efforts to study what is needed to need to keep our ports safe from a terrorist attack. As a senior member of the Committee on Homeland Security, I have been consistent and strong voice on** **port security and that is why I have asked the GAO to study security gaps that currently exist."**

Answers to: Action Now Solves

#### [\_\_\_]

#### [\_\_\_] Customs-Trade Partnership and Container Security Initiative fail

Jon D. Haveman and Howard J. Shatz, Public Policy Institute of California, 2006

(Protecting the Nation’s Seaports: Balancing Security and Costs, www.ppic.org/content/pubs/repo-rt/r\_606jhr.pdf)

Compliance is the weaker link. **The Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism, for example, depends on U.S. Customs and Border Protection validation of security plans for thousands of companies**. However, **given a lack of enforcement mechanisms, there is no guarantee that firms, once validated, will continue to carry out their security plans and procedures**. Likewise, the Container Security Initiative depends on the cooperation of foreign governments. In some cases, foreign governments decline to inspect containers that U.S. authorities deem high-risk. The United States can then order the containers not to be loaded onto the ship at the foreign port or can inspect the container in its U.S. port of arrival. However, even with these options, some high-risk containers go uninspected (U.S. Government Accountability Office, 2005b**). Even full compliance will not guarantee success. As part of the Container Security Initiative, oceangoing ship operators must provide the manifest, or list of the contents of ship cargo, to U.S. officials in advance. However, the carrier has no way of knowing the accuracy of the manifest, since it gets the information from the individual companies shipping the goods.**

#### [\_\_\_] Port security isn’t getting funding

Jesse Hereford, Vice Chairman of the Border Trade Alliance, 2012

(May 1, “House Homeland Security Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security Hearing;   
"Using Technology to Facilitate Trade and Enhance Security at Our Ports of Entry." [p://homeland.house.gov/sites/homeland.house.gov/files/Testimony%20-%20Hereford.pdf](http://homeland.house.gov/sites/homeland.house.gov/files/Testimony%20-%20Hereford.pdf)

**In port security**, much like in aviation, **there is no more important technology than an experienced CBPO who can spot an anomaly or identify a traveler who might seek to do us harm. Unfortunately, this vital element of border and port security is growing increasingly hard to come by**. Your Subcommittee will get no argument from the trade community and the constituency that the BTA represents that the Border Patrol is not an integral component of our nation's border security strategy. But the increased attention that Congress and this and previous administrations has directed towards Border Patrol has left the agency responsible for security at the ports of entry, Customs and Border Protection, **coming up short in the chase for dwindling human and technological resources**.

Answers to: Terrorists Can’t Get Weapons Into Ports

#### [\_\_\_]

#### [\_\_\_] Terrorists can use ports as weapons conduits

Jon D. Haveman and Howard J. Shatz, Public Policy Institute of California, 2006

(Protecting the Nation’s Seaports: Balancing Security and Costs, www.ppic.org/content/pubs/repo-rt/r\_606jhr.pdf)

The need to secure ports and the supply chain feeding goods into the ports stems from two concerns. The first is that transporting something from one place to another—**the very activity that the ports facilitate—is an important activity for terrorists. Terrorists could use a port as a conduit through which to build an arsenal within the nation’s borders.**

Answers to: Port Disruptions Won’t Hurt the Economy

#### [\_\_\_]

#### [\_\_\_] Seaports are terrorist targets, attacks disrupt the economy

Jon D. Haveman and Howard J. Shatz, Public Policy Institute of California, 2006

(Protecting the Nation’s Seaports: Balancing Security and Costs, www.ppic.org/content/pubs/repo-rt/r\_606jhr.pdf)

**Temporarily shutting down a major U.S. port could impose significant economic costs throughout not only the United States but also the world.** Al-Qaeda leader Osama bin Laden has labeled the destruction of the U.S. economy as one of his goals: “If their economy is finished, they will become too busy to enslave oppressed people. It is very important to concentrate on hitting the U.S. economy with every available means.” The potential for a port closure to disrupt economic activity has been made clear several times in recent years. In 2002, the closure of all West Coast ports was clearly responsible for some element of economic disruption, with estimates of lost activity ranging from the hundreds of millions of dollars per day to several billion. In September 2005, Hurricane Katrina further served to reinforce the fact that ports are an integral feature of our goods distribution system. The closure of the Port of New Orleans and many smaller ports along the Gulf Coast is likely to have adversely affected U.S. grain exports, although at the time of this writing, cost estimates were not available. **Hurricane Katrina further illustrated the effects of disruptions to the flow of oil, gasoline, and natural gas to the nation’s economy**. **That a natural disaster can produce such a result implies that an attack on oil terminals at U.S. ports could be both desirable and effective for terrorists.**

#### [\_\_\_] An attack on the LA-Long Beach ports would disrupt the US economy

Jon D. Haveman and Howard J. Shatz, Public Policy Institute of California, 2006

(Protecting the Nation’s Seaports: Balancing Security and Costs, www.ppic.org/content/pubs/repo-rt/r\_606jhr.pdf)

**Combined, the complex is the largest port by value in the United States and the fifth-largest container port in the world. If terrorists wanted to wreak havoc on the U.S. economy, the Los Angeles–Long Beach complex would certainly be a prime target for attack**. In 2004, the complex processed $243 billion worth of traded goods, just over 10 percent of all U.S. trade, 25 percent of all waterborne trade, or an amount equal to about 2 percent of U.S. gross domestic product (GDP). **Because imports constitute the vast majority of this trade, and because these imports are often used as inputs to other products, a terrorist attack on these ports could disrupt the U.S. economy.**

Answers to: Terrorists Can’t Get Weapons Into Ports

#### [\_\_\_]

#### [\_\_\_] WMDs can be moved through shipping containers

Lt. Morgan James et al, Naval Postgraduate School, 2007

(Port Security Strategy 2012, edocs.nps.edu/npspubs/scholarly/TR/2007/NPS-97-07-003.pdf)

Containers provide terrorist a method to gain unauthorized access into a country. **It is possible for terrorist to infiltrate a shipping container in the container’s country of origin and travel inside the container to its destination with WMDs. If the terrorists are not detected, they will have unauthorized access to the importing nation, enabling them to execute malicious intentions.**

#### [\_\_\_] An Improvised Explosive Device (IED) attack on a port will directly shut it down

Lt. Morgan James et al, Naval Postgraduate School, 2007

(Port Security Strategy 2012, edocs.nps.edu/npspubs/scholarly/TR/2007/NPS-97-07-003.pdf)

The second scenario considered localized damage to power sub-stations, fuel storage/distribution location, or passenger cruise ship terminal by forceful by a vehicle-borne IED. The non redundant power supply to the port’s cranes is located within the premises of the port, but only protected by small mesh fencing and bollards**. It is possible for a vehicle carrying an IED to penetrate the port’s perimeter fencing, or refuse to stop at the gate, and proceed to drive through the fencing protecting a power substation and detonate the IED. This action would result in damaging the power substation which disrupts the power supplied to a substantial portion of the port’s cranes. If the ports’ cranes lost power, the port would loose ship on-load and off-load capabilities. This action would halt port operations in the affected portions of the port until the power substation could be repaired. An attack on a fuel storage location would likely causes severe pollution. If a terrorist was able to attack a cruse ship, they would likely kill several people, and decimate the cruise industry by inducing fear in its customers.**

Answers to: Terrorism Not an Existential Threat

**[\_\_\_]**

#### [\_\_\_] Retaliation means terror attack causes extinction

Greg Easterbrook, senior editor with The New Republic, 2001

(November, p. www.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/0111/01/gal.00.html)

Terrorists may not be held by this, especially suicidal terrorists, of the kind that al Qaeda is attempting to cultivate. But I think, if I could leave you with one message, it would be this: that the search for terrorist atomic weapons would be of great benefit to the Muslim peoples of the world in addition to members, to people of the United States and Western Europe, because **if an atomic warhead goes off in Washington, say, in the current environment or anything like it, in the 24 hours that followed, a hundred million Muslims would die as U.S. nuclear bombs rained down on every conceivable military target in a dozen Muslim countries.**

#### [\_\_\_] Even a small nuclear attack would instantly collapse the economy

John Kenneth Galbraith, Harvard Economics Prof, 2000

(“Economic Aspects,” http://www.reachingcriticalwill.org/legal/nwc/mon1galb.html)

Such is the vulnerability of **the American economy** that in the form we know it; it **could be brought to an end by the most elementary of nuclear attacks**. This **could be accomplished by a tactical nuclear weapon on downtown New York. With such an attack there would, of course, be massive death and destruction**. But additionally **the American economy would be made non-functional.** No longer in the economic world would it be known what was owned and what possessed in the banks. That knowledge would be destroyed along with the people that convey the information. **The trading of securities would, of course, come to an end but, as seriously, so would the knowledge throughout the country of what is owned. Those with ownership in and income from the financial world** — stocks, bonds and other financial instruments — **would find a record of their possessions eliminated.** It would be true for individuals and for corporations throughout the country. Ownership would come to an end; of assets possessed there would no longer be a record. **Capitalism as it is known would be finished. This**, to repeat, **would be the result of one small nuclear weapon.**

Answers to: Low Risk of Terror Attack

**[\_\_\_]**

#### [\_\_\_] Impact of a terror attack means the risk cannot be dismissed

Virginia Pilot, 2012

(February 5, <http://hamptonroads.com/2012/02/millions-containers-now-find-%E2%80%98boom-box%E2%80%99>)

They look harmless enough. And, so far, they have been – just the same old shipping containers we’ve seen rumbling along our highways for decades. The one rattling by in the lane next to you could be loaded with anything from fruit to furniture. Mark Laria dwells on the tiny chance that it carries the next 9/11. Laria is port director at the Norfolk field office of U.S. Customs and Border Protection. In the 10 years he’s been here, roughly 10 million containers have come and gone. **None has been the dreaded “boom box” – the one security experts warn could be rigged with a terrorist bomb. Even so, Laria said, the stakes are too high to blow off the risk: “I don’t know if I’d be able to recover if some event happened – some 9/11 – and it was tracked back to a container that came through Hampton Roads.”**

Answers to: Terrorists Can’t Get Material

#### [\_\_\_]

#### [\_\_\_] This attack will be nuclear-secret documents prove terrorists have the necessary material

Graham Allison, Prof @ Harvard, 2010

(Foreign Policy, A Failure to Imagine the Worst, 25 January, <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/01/25/a_failure_to_imagine_the_worst?page=0,0>)

The U.S. national security establishment's principal failure prior to Sept. 11, 2001, was, the commission found, a "failure of imagination." Summarized in a single sentence, the question now is: Are we at risk of an equivalent failure to imagine a nuclear 9/11? After the recent attempted terrorist attack on Northwest Airlines Flight 253, this question is more urgent than ever. The thought that terrorists could successfully explode a nuclear bomb in an American city killing hundreds of thousands of people seems incomprehensible. This essential incredulity is rooted in three deeply ingrained presumptions. First, no one could seriously intend to kill hundreds of thousands of people in a single attack. Second, only states are capable of mass destruction; nonstate actors would be unable to build or use nuclear weapons. Third, terrorists would not be able to deliver a nuclear bomb to an American city. In a nutshell, these presumptions lead to the conclusion: inconceivable. Why then does Obama call nuclear terrorism "the single most important national security threat that we face" and "a threat that rises above all others in urgency?" Why the unanimity among those who have shouldered responsibility for U.S. national security in recent years that this is a grave and present danger? In former CIA Director George Tenet's assessment, "the main threat is the nuclear one. I am convinced that this is where [Osama bin Laden] and his operatives desperately want to go." When asked recently what keeps him awake at night, Secretary of Defense Robert Gates answered: "It's the thought of a terrorist ending up with a weapon of mass destruction, especially nuclear." Leaders who have reached this conclusion about the genuine urgency of the nuclear terrorist threat are not unaware of their skeptics' presumptions. Rather, they have examined the evidence, much of which has been painstakingly compiled here by Rolf Mowatt-Larssen, former head of the CIA's terrorism and weapons-of-mass-destruction efforts, and much of which remains classified. Specifically, who is seriously motivated to kill hundreds of thousands of Americans? Osama bin Laden, who has declared his intention to kill "4 million Americans -- including 2 million children." The deeply held belief that even if they wanted to, "men in caves can't do this" was then Pakistani President Pervez Musharraf's view when Tenet flew to Islamabad to see him after 9/11. As Tenet (assisted by Mowatt-Larssen) took him step by step through the evidence, he discovered that indeed they could. Terrorists' opportunities to bring a bomb into the United States follow the same trails along which 275 tons of drugs and 3 million people crossed U.S. borders illegally last year

Answers to: Terrorist Threat Decreasing

**[\_\_\_]**

#### [\_\_\_] Regional Al Qaeda affiliates are growing

Rick Nelson, CSIS, 2011

(Confronting and Uncertain Threat: The Future of Al Qaeda and its Associated Movements, September 7, <http://csis.org/publication/confronting-uncertain-threat>, p. X)

**Al Qaeda and associated movements (AQAM) has become an increasingly diffuse security threat**. Although the Afghanistan-Pakistan borderlands may have represented the epicenter of global terrorism in the past decade**, al Qaeda’s various regional affiliates are growing in prominence. The past several years also have seen a rise in al Qaeda–inspired plots by small cells or unaffiliated individuals based in the West.**

#### [\_\_\_] Demographic trends indicate the terror threat will grow

Rick Nelson, CSIS, 2011

(Confronting and Uncertain Threat: The Future of Al Qaeda and its Associated Movements, September 7, <http://csis.org/publication/confronting-uncertain-threat>, p. X)

According to a CSIS study on demographics, **there is a strong linkage between “youth and poverty on the one hand and chronic violence**, social instability, and recurring civil war on the other.” **Many al Qaeda–affiliated groups have emerged from the type of stratified, chaotic, and conflict- ridden environments often catalyzed by demographic shifts.**

Violence and instability are also important for AQAM on the ideological level. Bin Laden and other AQAM figures have seized on disparate local tensions and conflicts in an attempt to weave a single global narrative. Without such grievances, this global narrative would have very little resonance on a local level.

One should not assume that all future conflict and social unrest will automatically lead to AQAM infiltration. Muslim insurgents in the ethnically Malay provinces of south Thailand, for example, have rejected offers of assistance from foreign militants. That said, **as long as conflicts like the one in southern Thailand persist, the potential exists for AQAM infiltration**.

Answers to: Arab Spring Solves Terrorism

#### [\_\_\_]

#### [\_\_\_] Terrorists being released from jails, anti-US sentiment still strong, radicalization due to moderates selling out

[Daniel L. Byman](http://www.brookings.edu/experts/bymand.aspx), Director of Research, [Saban Center for Middle East Policy](http://www.brookings.edu/saban.aspx), 2011

(September 1,<http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2011/0901_al_qaeda_byman.aspx> Al Qaeda’s Future: How Likely is Another Attack?)

Fortunately for Zawahiri, the operating environment in much of the Arab world is freer than it has been in decades. **The Libyan uprising and Egyptian revolution resulted in the opening of jails,** [**releasing many jihadists**](http://www.almasryalyoum.com/en/node/484767)**. Some have laid down arms, but others may rejoin the struggle. In Yemen, the collapse of the Saleh regime has increased AQAP's freedom of action, enabling it to expand operations in many parts of the country.** Even in countries where the regimes remain intact, their security services will now focus on student demonstrators and intellectuals, not jihadists—because democratic activists, not terrorists, are the biggest threat to their hold on power. Fortunately for Zawahiri, it will be easy to keep lambasting the United States. Although the Obama administration played an important role in helping ease out Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak and U.S. forces were integral to ending Moammar Qaddafi's rule in Libya, the United States remains deeply unpopular in the Arab world. Even though U.S. forces are officially supposed to end their presence in Iraq at the end of the year, significant numbers are likely to remain in Iraq in some capacity. Although these forces will play a lesser role in safeguarding the country, and U.S. officials hope they will stay off the front pages, their presence still angers many in the region. And of course the United States will stay in Afghanistan for years to come. **Nor will the United States end its cozy relationship with the region's dictators anytime soon**. Already, the United States has turned a blind eye as Saudi Arabia has tried to stop demonstrators from toppling Bahrain's al-Khalifa family. In addition, Washington will be caught between its desire to maintain good relationships with other friendly dictators like Jordan's King Abdullah and its need to work with new democrats. This balancing act will leave everyone dissatisfied and give al Qaeda fodder for a public relations offensive. And of course the United States and Israel will remain close friends. **The inevitable disappointments of Arab-world Islamists will also provide al Qaeda with a fertile atmosphere for recruitment. In Egypt, Islamists are expected to do well in coming elections. But they are not expected to abrogate the peace treaty with Israel or forcibly Islamicize society.** Such pragmatism meets with applause internationally, but it may anger the more radical and idealistic members of these groups. Eventually there will be charges that moderate Islamist leaders are selling out, charges that [Zawahiri has already made and will make again](http://www.almasryalyoum.com/en/node/484767).

Answers to: Al Qaeda Threat Decreasing/Bin Laden Dead

**[\_\_\_]**

#### [\_\_\_] Al Qaeda is still a threat – Complacency about Osama’s death increases the risk al Qaeda will rebound

Max Boot, National Security at CFR, 2011

(Max, August 8, “A False Sense of National Security” Los Angeles Times, [http://www.cfr.org/national-security-and-defense/false-sense-national-security)](http://www.cfr.org/national-security-and-defense/false-sense-national-security%29)

**U.S. government officials are probably premature when they rush to proclaim,** as the Washington Post reported, **that Al Qaeda is "on the brink of collapse." Such predictions have been made many times before, and each time have been disproved by this terrorist group with its alarming ability to regenerate itself. It does not take much in the way of resources to carry out a terrorist strike** (the Sept. 11 operation cost an estimated $500,000), **so Al Qaeda does not need much infrastructure to pose a threat. Moreover, Al Qaeda is not the only terrorist organization we have to worry about. Other Islamist extremists are capable of planning attacks with scant direction or assistance from Al Qaeda Central.** These organizations range from Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula and Al Qaeda in Iraq to the Haqqani network, the Afghan Taliban, the Pakistani Taliban, Lashkar-e-Taiba, Hezbollah, Kataib Hezbollah and Hamas. None of these groups have pulled off anything on the scale of Sept. 11, thank goodness, but several of them have undoubtedly killed far more people — and dominated far more territory — than Bin Laden ever did. Al Qaeda in Iraq managed to take over a substantial portion of the Sunni Muslim areas of Iraq before suffering devastating defeats in 2007 and 2008, but it continues to set off bombs**. Hamas has taken over the Gaza Strip and is rapidly building up its arsenal. Hezbollah is the most powerful force in Lebanon and has more missiles than some nation-states.** The Pakistani Taliban is steadily undermining the government in Islamabad with one atrocity after another. Lashkar-e-Taiba has almost sparked war between India and Pakistan with its terrorist attacks in India and undoubtedly will strike again. Kataib Hezbollah, along with other Iranian-backed Shiite terrorist groups, is asserting its power in Iraq as the U.S. prepares to withdraw. **By focusing too much on Al Qaeda and its charismatic founder — now resting at the bottom of the Arabian Sea — we risk not devoting sufficient resources or attention to these other threats**, which are less publicized but ultimately may be just as dangerous. We have already seen one sign of this premature triumphalism: President Obama ordered 30,000 "surge" troops to come home from Afghanistan by September 2012 against the advice of his military commanders. The battle against the Haqqani network and Taliban — two of the most dangerous terrorist groups in the world — is far from won. It will be much harder to defeat Bin Laden's allies in Afghanistan with the U.S. force reduced by a third before the end of next summer's fighting season. Defenders of the administration's Al Qaeda-centric approach may argue that only Al Qaeda has shown the will and capacity to strike the American homeland. But **other groups are targeting us as well, and sooner or later they may succeed.**

Answers to: Detection Fails

**[\_\_\_]**

#### [\_\_\_] Improved sensor placement solves

Lt. Morgan James et al, Naval Postgraduate School, 2007

(Port Security Strategy 2012, edocs.nps.edu/npspubs/scholarly/TR/2007/NPS-97-07-003.pdf)

Several studies have examined the use of container ships to deliver undesired cargo to a United States seaport. Explosives may be denoted upon container ship arrival or after transportation to a high-value installation within the United States. **Detecting undesired cargo, especially biological and chemical agents, inside a container presents technical challenges. Coupled with the vast amount of containers arriving at domestic ports, the task of detecting WMD and other undesired cargo is difficult. In most cases, sensors need to be placed in close proximity to the container to be effective.**

#### [\_\_\_] All ports should be equipped with nuclear and radiation detection devices

Lt. Morgan James et al, Naval Postgraduate School, 2007

(Port Security Strategy 2012, edocs.nps.edu/npspubs/scholarly/TR/2007/NPS-97-07-003.pdf)

**The CBP works closely with the port operators, port authority, USCG and other agencies and use the most recent technology for the detection of nuclear and radioactive materials at the various check points. In addition, they have implemented a layered defense security strategy by extending the surveillance zone to the host countries through the Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism (C-TPAT). These initiatives and activities have hardened the security of the border but presently not every port is equipped with the same capability. To deter and prevent the smuggling of radio active materials, every port needs to be equipped with the nuclear and radioactive detectors.**

Answers to: Terrorists Will Attack the Port Directly

#### [\_\_\_]

#### [\_\_\_] Improving port security infrastructure deters terror attacks

Lt. Morgan James et al, Naval Postgraduate School, 2007

(Port Security Strategy 2012, edocs.nps.edu/npspubs/scholarly/TR/2007/NPS-97-07-003.pdf)

The objective of deterrence has its own objective hierarchy and its two sub- objectives which are to prevent physical attack attempts and to prevent the attempted importation of WMDs and terrorist cells. **In order to prevent an attempted physical attack, it is necessary for the port to maintain the perception that it has adequate security measures. In order to accomplish this task, the sub-objective of preventing physical attack attempts is adequate sensors in place: adequate visible physical barriers, visible security checkpoints, and physical patrols. The sub-objectives of preventing attempted importation of WMD or terror cells are similar to those of prevent physical attack attempts. They include: random inspections, intelligence-based inspections, sensors (both the right type of sensors and an appropriate number), and an effective manifest screening process.**

Answers to: Plan Leads to Shipping Delays

#### [\_\_\_]

#### [\_\_\_] New advances in screening technology means no delays

Jerrold L. Nadler, Edward J. Markey and Bennie G. Thompson, Democratic representatives from New York, Massachusetts and Mississippi, 2012

(Cargo, the Terrorists’ Trojan Horse; June 26, <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/06/27/opinion/the-dangerous-delay-on-port-security.html>)

Homeland Security says it uses a “layered, risk-based approach” to cargo scanning, which, instead of comprehensive scanning, targets specific cargo thought to be high-risk. But this approach is inadequate. Recent advances in screening technologies have undermined Homeland Security’s contention that the technology is not available to scan all cargo containers without disrupting commerce. An effective high-volume container screening system was installed in the Port of Hong Kong in 2005. Trials of new, American-made technology have demonstrated that scanning all containers would be feasible at many ports. The world’s largest marine terminal operators have offered to work with the department to put the law into effect. Cost and technology have never been the primary obstacles to meeting this mandate. What is missing is a sense of urgency and determination. We recognized that the scanning of 100 percent of all cargo containers in five years could be a challenging deadline to meet. That is why we included the authority to extend the deadline in cases in which Homeland Security certified that there are at least two major obstacles relating to the availability and accuracy of the technology, the logistics of its deployment and use, or impacts to trade. Now Homeland Security is using this authority to simply exempt itself from any meaningful compliance with the law we wrote to close a dangerous loophole in United States security. We have urged the department over the last five years to make the law a reality, to no avail. Our nation can no longer risk such delays.

States Counterplan Answers

**[\_\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_\_] Permutation – do the plan where the federal government has jurisdiction

Jon D. Haveman and Howard J. Shatz, Public Policy Institute of California, 2006

(Protecting the Nation’s Seaports: Balancing Security and Costs, www.ppic.org/content/pubs/repo-rt/r\_606jhr.pdf)

Jurisdictional conflicts. **Federal, state, and local governments all may have oversight over some portion of port activities. In addition, some ports are managed by local or regional port authorities, whereas others are managed by local or state governments or by private entities.**

States Counterplan Answers

#### [\_\_\_]

#### [\_\_\_] Federal jurisdiction over sea port security

Ariel Ghaith Pinto, Engineering Management and Systems Engineering Old Dominion University, 2011 (US Port Security; Chapter 12)

The U.S. Maritime Transportation Security Act (MTSA), designed to protect U.S. ports and waterways from terrorist attacks, was signed into law on November 25, 2002. The MTSA seeks to prevent security incidents in the maritime supply chain, in particular, the port link in this chain. The MTSA also incorporated the international security requirements found in the International Ship and Port Security (ISPS) Code that was ratified earlier in 2002 by the United Nations’ International Maritime Organization (IMO). The ISPS Code is a risk management code for securing ships and ports, e.g., monitoring the access and control of people and cargo to ships and ports and ensuring the availability of security communications. The Code requires ports and marine terminals, serving seagoing vessels of 500 gross tonnage and upwards, to have security plans, officers and certain equipment in place (i.e., in order to comply with the Code) by July 1, 2004. Port security plans include access control, responses to security threats and drills to train staff (Staff, 2004). On March 1, 2003 the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) was established. The DHS has federal responsibility for funding, standards and strategies (to do so) for the security of ports and other transportation infrastructures. Further, the U.S. Coast Guard was removed from the U.S. Department of Transportation and placed under the authority of the DHS. The U.S. Coast Guard’s maritime security program includes, for example, the deployment of Coast Guard personnel as “Sea Marshalls” aboard certain ships entering and leaving ports, the creation of the High Interest Vessel Boarding Program and the establishment of port security zones around ships and high-risk port facilities (to prevent sabotage or other subversive acts). Sea Marshals provide security to a vessel’s pilot and crew during its transit while in port, thereby diminishing the potential for vessel hijacking. Security zones protect port waterways, vessels and facilities from security incidents. The Coast Guard has also established the Maritime Security Level (MARSEC) system to indicate the severity of a security threat: 1) level one -- a threat is possible, but not likely; 2) level two -- terrorists are likely active in an area; and 3) level three -- a threat is imminent to a given target. The DSH unit, the U.S. Bureau of Customs and Border Protection (CBP), has established voluntary international security programs that are designed to provide point-of-origin to final destination visibility and control over containerized freight movements. These voluntary programs include the: 1) the Container Security Initiative (CSI), in which CBP works with foreign ports to identify potentially dangerous shipments before they arrive in the U.S. and 2) the Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism (C-TPAT), through which CBP provides streamlined clearance of cargo to shippers that establish appropriate security procedures. The CSI is a bilateral agreement between the U.S. and a foreign port, whereby the foreign port is to identify high risk containerized cargo and work with deployed CBP officers (at the foreign port) to target such cargo.

States Counterplan Answers

**[\_\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_\_] Only the federal government has jurisdiction over federal channels

Marinelink 2012

(Ports Urge Congress to Support Port Security Grants; March 7, <http://www.marinelink.com/news/congress-security-support342938.aspx>)

At two separate Congressional hearings, representatives of the American Association of Port Authorities (AAPA) emphasized the need for federal support for seaport security and maintenance and improvements to federal navigation channels. Port industry leaders illustrated the challenges underfunding security and dredging pose for national security and U.S. international competitiveness. As the House Appropriations Committee begins work on the Fiscal Year 2013 budget, AAPA executives reminded Congressional leaders of the critical role ports play for the nation – serving as a front line of defense on international borders and facilitating overseas trade, 99 percent of which moves by water. Captain John Holmes, Deputy Executive Director of Operations at the Port of Los Angeles, testified before the Homeland Security Subcommittee regarding Port Security Grants within the Federal Emergency Management Agency. “The fiscal year 2012 funding level represents a 59 percent cut from the prior year and 75 percent less than the authorized level,” Holmes stated. “This will harm our ability to expand protection of our maritime assets, carry out Port-Wide Risk Management Plans, and fund federal mandates, such as installation of TWIC readers.” Kurt Nagle, President and CEO, submitted testimony to the Energy and Water Subcommittee on the budget for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers’ Civil Works program. The testimony focused on the need for full use of the Harbor Maintenance Tax annual revenue for maintenance dredging and the need to adequately fund needed channel deepening projects. “The federal government has a unique Constitutional responsibility to maintain and improve the infrastructure which enables the flow of commerce, and much of that infrastructure in and around seaports have been neglected for too long, particularly the capacity of the federal channels, which affects the ports’ ability to move cargo efficiently into and out of the U.S,” Nagle wrote. “This hurts U.S. business, hurts U.S. workers, and hurts our national economy.”

Topicality – Infrastructure

**[\_\_\_]**

**[\_\_\_] Security measures are infrastructure**

Lt. Morgan James et al, Naval Postgraduate School, 2007

(Port Security Strategy 2012, edocs.nps.edu/npspubs/scholarly/TR/2007/NPS-97-07-003.pdf)

The **security measures undertaken by the port authority and port operators play a key role in deterring intrusions. First, the infrastructure that port operators install, such as container scanners, would help to defray intruders from planting contraband in containers.**

**[\_\_\_] Security expansion is part of infrastructure expansion**

Michael McFaul, US Representative, 2012

(House Homeland Security Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security Hearing; May 1,  
"Using Technology to Facilitate Trade and Enhance Security at Our Ports of Entry.";   
Testimony by [Rep. McCaul,](http://w3.nexis.com/new/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T14683658970&returnToId=20_T14683734313&csi=247474&A=0.9660863238063168&sourceCSI=162599&indexTerm=%23PE000A255%23&searchTerm=Rep.%20McCaul,%20&indexType=P) Michael <http://homeland.house.gov/sites/homeland.house.gov/files/05-01-12%20McCaul%20Open.pdf>

Over the last few years **the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) has increased the number of CBP officers. While these men and women may be needed to address specific gaps, it is clear that we cannot secure the ports of entry only with boots on the ground. A key to security is the maintenance and expansion of infrastructure. Our nation's ports of entry need modernization**.

Article: Maritime Industry Awaits Action in Congress

Stamford Advocate, May 8, 2012, “Maritime Industry Awaits Action in Congress”, <http://www.stamfordadvocate.com/news/article/Martime-industry-awaits-action-in-Congress-3544112.php>

The maritime businesses should not expect any industry-related legislation soon from Congress as the Republican-controlled House and Democratic-controlled Senate continue to do battle.

[Joan M. Bondareff](http://www.stamfordadvocate.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=news&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22Joan+M.+Bondareff%22), an attorney with the Washington, D.C., office of Blank Rome LLP, told more than 150 participants at the Tugs & Barges Marine Log Conference & Expo on Tuesday at the Stamford Marriott that the impasse will continue until after the presidential and congressional elections in November.

"This Congress is in considerable gridlock, and nothing much will happen until after election," said Bondareff, who focuses on marine transportation and environmental issues.

Much of proposed transportation funding that is tied up in the 2013 federal budget pertains to maritime programs, including port security and improvements, said Bondareff, who encouraged the audience to contact their senators and representatives to urge action on maritime-related legislation.

"Don't wait for the lame-duck session to make your case to Congress," she said, commenting that there is federal funding immediately available to help ship operators to curb pollution emitted from their diesel engines. "There's $29 billion out there. If you don't apply for it, someone else will get it."

Bondareff is one of a series of speakers addressing participants during the two-day event, which ends today.

Besides federal legislation, other topics revolve around environmental issues, ship building, markets and regulatory issues.

Stamford is ideally suited to host the conference and expo because of the number of companies involved in the industry in Greater New York and Fairfield County, said [John Snyder](http://www.stamfordadvocate.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=news&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22John+Snyder%22), editor and publisher of MarineLog, the 135-year-old publication serving vessel owners and operators, ship builders and maritime architects. It has a circulation of 32,000.

"There are a lot of operator’s rights here in this area -- Moran, McAllister, Reinauer and K-Sea. These conferences focus on the coastal tug and barge market," said Snyder, pleased with the turnout, which includes 32 vendors, exhibiting their products and services.

The number of registrants surpassed last year's total.

"I think the economy is picking up," said Snyder, who attended a similar event last month in Houston which saw a 14 percent increase in participation. "What impressed me was that companies were hiring right at the show."

One of those expanding its staff is [Machine Support USA](http://www.stamfordadvocate.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=news&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22Machine+Support+USA%22) Inc., in Houma, La., a division of [SKF Group](http://www.stamfordadvocate.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=news&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22SKF+Group%22), which is participating for the first time. It sent [Kevin St. Pierre](http://www.stamfordadvocate.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=news&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22Kevin+St.+Pierre%22), area sales manager, to man a booth displaying its products.

"We're hiring in the field and in sales. The federal government is issuing more permits (for oil exploration)," he said, noting that it impacts his company's clients. "We do a lot of work for customers who are here."

Next to him, [Michael Feder](http://www.stamfordadvocate.com/?controllerName=search&action=search&channel=news&search=1&inlineLink=1&query=%22Michael+Feder%22), sales manager for Wallingford-based Infra-Metals, also a first-time participant was ready to do business.

"We're a structural steel supplier. Our product goes into tug boats, barges and marine work platforms. We've been selling into the marine industry more than 10 years," he said. "There are lots of towing companies in the Northeast."

Article: US Bound Cargo Remains Vulnerable to Terrorists

Daily Examiner, February 22, 2012, <http://www.examiner.com/article/u-s-bound-cargo-remains-vulnerable-to-terrorists-wmd>

It’s been more than a decade since Islamic terrorists attacked the U.S., yet the agency created to protect the nation from another strike is asleep at the wheel, failing to adequately screen the monstrous amounts of cargo that enter the country each day, according to a government report issued this week.

"Cargo containers that are part of the global supply chain -- the flow of goods from manufacturers to retailers -- are vulnerable to threats from terrorists [including [weapons of mass destruction](http://www.examiner.com/topic/weapons-of-mass-destruction)]," state the government analysts who assembled data for the [**new report**](http://www.gao.gov/assets/590/588253.pdf)**.**

It may seem unbelievable to most Americans that the Department of [Homeland Security](http://www.examiner.com/topic/homeland-security) (DHS) that more than ten years after the worst terrorist attack in U.S. history, the vast majority of cargo containers entering the U.S. go unchecked. Incredibly, it’s true and the alarming details are outlined in the GAO report published this week by the [Government Accountability Office](http://www.gao.gov/assets/590/588253.pdf) (GAO), the investigative arm of the U.S. Congress.

The [Maritime Transportation Security Act](http://www.tsa.gov/assets/pdf/MTSA.pdf) (MTSA) of 2002 and the Security and Accountability For Every (SAFE) Port Act of 2006 required the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to take actions to improve maritime transportation security.

Also, the Implementing Recommendations of the [9/11 Commission Act of 2007](http://www.intelligence.senate.gov/laws/pl11053.pdf) (9/11 Act) required, among other things, that by July 2012, 100 percent of all U.S.-bound cargo containers be scanned. Within DHS, U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) is responsible for container security programs to address these requirements.

Sadly, the GAO report reveals that the DHS agency responsible for screening cargo, Customs and Border Protection (CBP), still lacks the ability to check 100% of the containers that enter the U.S. through seaports each day. Under the 9/11 Commission Act, all U.S-bound cargo containers must be scanned because they are vulnerable to threats from terrorists and could be used to smuggle nuclear and radiological materials.

To meet the goal, DHS has spent hundreds of millions of dollars on faulty systems that didn’t get the job done. In fact, the agency dropped more than $200 million on 1,400 radiation portal monitors that weren’t up to the task, according to a blog published by a public-interest group that investigates and exposes government corruption and ineptitude -**-** [**Judicial Watch.**](http://www.judicialwatch.org)

“Uncertainty persists over how DHS and CBP will fulfill the mandate for 100 percent scanning given that the feasibility remains unproven in light of the challenges CBP has faced implementing a pilot program for 100 percent scanning,” state the GAO investigators.

In addition, the GAO reveals that several years ago it asked Homeland Security officials to perform an analysis to determine whether 100% scanning is even feasible, but the agency hasn’t bothered doing it.

Congressional investigators have logically concluded that CBP is “no longer pursuing efforts to implement 100 percent scanning” by the mandatory July 2012 deadline.

The GAO reveals that several years ago it asked Homeland Security officials to perform an analysis to determine whether 100% scanning is even feasible, but the agency never did it. Congressional investigators have logically concluded that CBP is “no longer pursuing efforts to implement 100 percent scanning” by the mandatory July 2012 deadline.

The GAO’s findings could not have come at a worst time, on the heels of an [**international study**](http://www.homelandsecuritynewswire.com/dr20120208-major-shipping-companies-inadvertently-aid-smugglers) on maritime trafficking that reveals weapons, drugs and banned missile are regularly smuggled aboard reputable ships owned by major companies in the U.S. and Europe.

As an example it lists the case of weapons traffickers who evaded international embargoes on Iran and North Korea by hiding illegal goods in sealed [shipping containers](http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d0886t.pdf) using a tactic pioneered by drug smugglers.

The GAO report concludes: "Uncertainty persists over how DHS and CBP will fulfill the mandate for 100 percent scanning given that the feasibility remains unproven in light of the challenges CBP has faced implementing a pilot program for 100 percent scanning. In response to the [**SAFE Port Act**](http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d0886t.pdf) requirement to implement a pilot program to determine the feasibility of 100 percent scanning, CBP, the Department of State, and the Department of Energy announced the formation of the Secure Freight Initiative (SFI) pilot program in December 2006."

Article: SMART Port Security

**Representative Candice Miller,** March 22, **2012**, “SMART Port Security,” http://candicemiller.house.gov/2012/03/miller-smart-port-security-act-to-combat-threats-before-they-reach-our-shores.shtml

WASHINGTON – U.S. Representative Candice Miller (MI-10), Chairman of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security, today introduced the Securing Maritime Activities through Risk-based Targeting for Port Security Act (SMART Port Security Act) in the U.S. House of Representatives. Miller’s bipartisan bill seeks to improve and update our maritime and port security. Miller said:

“More than 11 million cargo containers arrive in America’s ports every year which present the potential for dangerous materials to be smuggled into our country through the supply chain. Port and maritime security are becoming increasingly essential components of a total national security plan. We are faced with the fact that if there is a major disruption at one of the nation’s ports, especially a terrorist attack, the resulting potential effects will cause a crippling of the global supply chain and cause severe economic damage to the nation.

“Recognizing the growing threat to the global supply chain, I introduced this legislation to improve and update our laws governing our ports by enhancing security measures overseas before threats reach our shores, to foster a collaborative environment between Customs and Border Protection and the U.S. Coast Guard in sharing port security duties, and to leverage the maritime security work of our trusted allies. Our nation’s maritime borders are equally important as our southern and northern borders and each one is vital to our global commerce and our national security. In an era of tight budgetary times, we must ensure that we are making the best use of limited tax-payer dollars. My legislation seeks to guard against these threats in a risk-based, coordinated way that enhances the programs in place to protect our maritime borders.”

Miller’s SMART Port Security Act will:   
• Encourage the Department of Homeland Security components with shared jurisdiction to cooperate in maritime operations and partner with state and local law enforcement agencies in order to enhance the nation’s maritime security;  
• Secure the supply chain through the use of a risk-based methodology;  
• Find cost savings through increased collaboration with international, federal, state, and local partners.

Miller’s legislation builds upon the SAFE Port Act of 2006 (P.L. 109-347) by enhancing security measures overseas before threats reach our shores, emphases a stronger collaborative environment between Customs and Border Protection and the U.S. Coast Guard in sharing port security duties, and leverages the maritime security work of our trusted allies. Miller’s bill is the result of more than a year of congressional oversight hearings focused on the nation’s maritime security, including hearings with the Commandant of the Coast Guard, Customs and Border Protection Air and Marine Officials and a hearing on the Global Supply Chain. Additionally, the SMART Port Security Act incorporates several maritime provisions from the DHS Authorization bill.

**Port Security Negative**

Port Security Neg – Table of Contents

Glossary 2-3

Harms

Economy Add-on Answers 4-5

Low Risk of Port Terrorism 6-7

Al Qaeda Threat Decreasing 8-9

No WMD Terrorism 10-12

Solvency

No Solvency – Detection 13-14

No Solvency – Delays Turn 15

No Solvency – Delays Turn – Link Extension 16

Off Case Positions

Spending Link 17

States Counterplan Solvency 18

Topicality – Infrastructure 19

Glossary

Vocabulary

**Al-Qaeda.** The terrorist organization that is responsible for the 9-11 attacks.

**Containers.** Large boxes of goods that arrive in the United States from abroad. They are off-loaded from large ships and then distributed via truck and train throughout the United States.

**Dirty bomb.** The explosion of nuclear material as a way to spread the nuclear material around. It is not a direct explosion.

**Fissile material.** Nuclear material that can be detonated.

**Imports.** Goods that enter the US and are then sold in the US.

**Port.** A place where goods arrive via a container ship and are imported into a country.

**Weapon of Mass Destruction (WMD**)**.** Nuclear, Chemical, and Biological weapons are considered to be WMDs.

Glossary

Acronyms

**CBP.** Customs & Border Patrol

**CBPO.** Customs & Border Patrol Officer

**CBW.** Chemical and Biological Weapons  
  
**DOD.** Department of Defense

**DHS.** Department of Homeland Security

**IED.** Improvised Explosive Device

**GAO.** General Accounting Office.

**HEU.** Highly Enriched Uranium

**NPT.** Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty

**RDD.** Radiological Dispersion Device

**RPG.** Rocket Propelled Grenade

**URC.** United States Regulatory Commission

**WMD.** Weapons of Mass Destruction

Economy Add-on Answers

#### [\_\_\_]

**[\_\_\_] The costs of an attack would be a drop in the bucket compared to the size of the US economy**

Jon D. Haveman and Howard J. Shatz, Public Policy Institute of California, 2006

(Protecting the Nation’s Seaports: Balancing Security and Costs, www.ppic.org/content/pubs/repo-rt/r\_606jhr.pdf)

In the scenario of a one-year reconstruction, **the U.S. economy could suffer losses of almost $45 billion, the authors argue**. These include direct costs, indirect costs, and induced costs. Direct costs arise as a direct result of the halt in shipping. For example, if car parts are being imported, the car manufacturer can neither assemble nor sell more cars. Indirect costs result from the fact that other domestic firms supply parts to the same car manufacturer. These parts would no longer be needed, so these firms would sell fewer parts as an indirect result of the halt in trade. Induced costs result from the reduction of consumption spending by households whose members worked in the affected industries. About 64 percent of this loss would occur outside the five-county Los Angeles region; some would occur elsewhere in California, but most would occur outside the state. These are not trivial costs. For comparison, **the new eastern span of the San Francisco–Oakland Bay Bridge is expected to cost around $6 billion, and policymakers have gone to enormous pains finding money to pay for it. The estimated costs of a one-year closure of Terminal Island are more than seven times that large. Nevertheless, U.S. GDP is more than $11.7 trillion, next to which the economic costs of an attack do seem small.**

**[\_\_\_] The economy will adapt to closed ports**

Jon D. Haveman and Howard J. Shatz, Public Policy Institute of California, 2006

(Protecting the Nation’s Seaports: Balancing Security and Costs, www.ppic.org/content/pubs/repo-rt/r\_606jhr.pdf)

The more sanguine estimate of the economic effects, in Chapter 2, results from an evaluation of the observed economic disruption from previous similar events. This more direct examination of the economic evidence indicates that in many cases, particularly port closures of relatively short duration, economic activity is more delayed than disrupted. The authors find that **consumers and producers wait out the strike, storm, or other disruption, all the while accumulating demand that occurs in a flurry once the flow of goods resumes. The evidence indicates that for longer disruptions, economic agents are very creative and can find ways to work around a bottleneck such as a closed port.**

Economy Add-on Answers

#### [\_\_\_]

#### [\_\_\_] Redundancies and contingencies reduce disruption impacts

Edward E. Leamer and Christopher Thornberg, professor of statistics at UCLA and senior economist with the UCLA Anderson Forecast, 2006

(UCLA Anderson Forecast, Protecting the Nation’s Seaports: Balancing Security and Costs, www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/r\_606jhr.pdf)

Of course, a labor action is not the same as a terrorist attack; labor actions can be anticipated to some extent, whereas lack of anticipation is intrinsic to terrorist attacks. However, similarities remain. The labor actions of the sixties and seventies were often marked by wildcat strikes and work slowdowns, deliberately created to reduce or prevent mitigating actions on the part of the companies involved. Furthermore, there cannot now be an unexpected, surprise terrorist strike at U.S. ports. **Because of the terrorist threat, many businesses have put in place redundancies and contingencies that will help mitigate the disruption caused by a port attack, just as they undoubtedly did in anticipation of the port strikes that loomed in the 1960s.**

#### [\_\_\_] Other sectors offset

Edward E. Leamer and Christopher Thornberg, professor of statistics at UCLA and senior economist with the UCLA Anderson Forecast, 2006

(UCLA Anderson Forecast, Protecting the Nation’s Seaports: Balancing Security and Costs, www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/r\_606jhr.pdf)

Our results do not say that no business was hurt by port labor actions or that profits were not adversely affected by the increase in transaction costs. Some industries, some firms, and some regions were surely adversely affected. Nor do we claim that a terrorist attack on the ports and the resultant disruption to the supply chain would not harm any region or company—certainly some firms and regions would be affected. However, as is often the case in a modern complex economy, when one industry or area suffers as a result of some economic disturbance, another prospers as a result of an offsetting shift in demand: There are winners and losers. Our main point here is that these **past disruptions were insufficient to cause any noticeable change in the aggregate flow of the economy: Either the losses were small compared with the overall economy or they were largely offset by gains elsewhere.** We believe that **the same would be likely after a terrorist attack on a port: Its effects are not likely to show up other than in imports and exports.**

Low Risk of Port Terrorism

#### [\_\_\_]

#### [\_\_\_] Risks decreasing, alternative transportation methods solve, catastrophic impacts empirically denied

Edward E. Leamer and Christopher Thornberg, professor of statistics at UCLA and senior economist with the UCLA Anderson Forecast, 2006

(UCLA Anderson Forecast, Protecting the Nation’s Seaports: Balancing Security and Costs, www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/r\_606jhr.pdf)

**Although the United States is considerably more trade-dependent today than in earlier periods, this potential vulnerability is offset by a number of factors. One is the shift from ship to aircraft for delivery of many high-value, time-sensitive goods, particularly on the export side. Second, countermeasures to a terrorist strike, such as increased inspections of containers**, may be more onerous for imports coming from uncertain ports than for exports packaged in the United States. And although a widespread labor action would stop most maritime trade completely, a terrorist strike would only slow trade rather than stop it. **When added together, these factors mean that the disruption to the flow of goods as a result of a current terrorist attack could be roughly similar in size to the effect of a major port strike in the 1960s**. Therefore, we feel that these historic labor actions correspond closely enough to the kind of port disruption that a terrorist attack might bring to tell us a lot about the probable effect on the national economy of a terrorist attack on the ports. **We will show how these labor actions are visible in the import data and export data of the period. In all cases, there was a small increase in import volume before these actions, a drop in volume during the action, and a large surge in import volume after the dispute was settled. Because of the size of that postdisruption volume surge, the overall loss of trade during a labor action was very small and in some cases nonexistent.**

Low Risk of Port Terrorism

#### [\_\_\_]

#### [\_\_\_] Only a 1 in 80,000 chance of being killed by a terrorist

The New Republic, 2008

(December 24, p. 22)

As a result of this psychological bias, large numbers of **Americans have overestimated the probability of future terrorist strikes:** In a poll conducted a few weeks after September 11, respondents saw a 20 percent chance that they would be personally harmed in a terrorist attack within the next year and nearly a 50 percent chance that the average American would be harmed. Those alarmist predictions, thankfully, proved to be wrong; in fact, **since September 11, international terrorism has killed only a few hundred people per year around the globe, as John Mueller points out in Overblown. At the current rates, Mueller argues, the lifetime probability of any resident of the globe being killed by terrorism is just one in 80,000.**

#### [\_\_\_]Terrorism is not an existential threat

The New Republic, 2008

(December 24, p. 22)

Last March he declared that, "if we don't recognize the struggle we are in as a significant existential struggle, then it is going to be very hard to maintain the focus." **If nuclear attacks aren't likely and smaller events aren't existential threats, I asked, why did he say the war on terrorism is a "significant existential struggle**"? "**To me, existential is a threat that shakes the core of a society's confidence and causes a significant and long-lasting line of damage to the country**," he replied. **But it would take a series of weekly Virginia Tech-style shootings or London-style subway bombings to shake the core of American confidence; and Al Qaeda hasn't come close to mustering that frequency of low-level attacks in any Western democracy since September 11. "Terrorism kills a certain number of people, and so do forest fires," Mueller told me. "If terrorism is merely killing certain numbers of people, then it's not an existential threat**, and money is better spent on smoke alarms or forcing people to wear seat belts instead of chasing terrorists."

Al Qaeda Threat Decreasing

#### [\_\_\_]

**[\_\_\_] Al Qaeda has alienated its supporters**

[Bruce Riedel](http://www.brookings.edu/experts/riedelb.aspx), Senior Fellow, [Foreign Policy](http://www.brookings.edu/foreign-policy.aspx), [Saban Center for Middle East Policy](http://www.brookings.edu/saban.aspx), 2011

**(**How the United States Enable Al Qaeda, http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/-2011/0905\_al\_qaeda\_911\_riedel.aspx)

**But al Qaeda also made its share of mistakes. The terror group’s lack of a vision is an existential lapse. By offering only violence and death, it denies Muslims what they yearn for, such as democracy and a just peace settlement for the Palestinians. And by killing thousands of fellow Muslims and blowing up civilians in the streets and markets of Iraq, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia, al Qaeda has alienated its own constituents by drowning them in blood.**

**[\_\_\_] Al Qaeda no longer capable of large scale attacks**

Brian Michael Jenkins, senior adviser to the president of the RAND Corporation, 2011

(The Long Shadow of 9/11: America’s Response to Terrorism, Ed. Bruce Michael Jenkins and Paul Hodges, p. 4)

**There is consensus in this volume that the United States has accomplished a great deal in the past ten years. Al Qaeda’s capacity for centrally directed, large-scale terrorist operations has been greatly reduced, if not eliminated entirely.**

Al Qaeda Threat Decreasing

#### [\_\_\_]

**[\_\_\_] Military and police security measures have decimated Al Qaeda**

Brian Michael Jenkins, senior adviser to the president of the RAND Corporation, 2011

(The Long Shadow of 9/11: America’s Response to Terrorism, Ed. Bruce Michael Jenkins and Paul Hodges, p. 4)

**The United States cannot prevent every terrorist attack, but it is much better equipped today to handle future terrorist threats. U.S. intelligence has shifted its priorities from nation-states to transnational actors and has reconfigured itself to meet the new threats. The intelligence operation that led to the successful raid on bin Laden’s compound in Abbottabad, Pakistan, displayed this greatly increased effectiveness. Al Qaeda’s ranks have been decimated, its capabilities degraded, not only as a result of U.S. intelligence, military, and Special Operations but also very much as a consequence of unprecedented international cooperation among the world’s security services and law enforcement organizations.**

No WMD Terrorism

#### [\_\_\_]

#### [\_\_\_] No nuclear terror – terrorists cant acquire, build, or deliver a bomb

Steve Chapman,reporter and editorial writer for Chicago Tribune, 2012

(RealClearPolitics, “The Implausibility of Nuclear Terrorism”, http://reason.com/archives/2012/05/17/the-implausibility-of-nuclear-terrorism)

But remember: After Sept. 11, 2001, we all thought more attacks were a certainty. Yet **al-Qaida** and its ideological kin **have proved unable to mount a second strike**. Given their inability to do something simple -- say, shoot up a shopping mall or set off a truck bomb -- it's reasonable to ask if they have a chance at something much more ambitious. Far from being plausible, **argued** Ohio State University **professor John Mueller** in a recent presentation at the University of Chicago, "**the likelihood that a terrorist** group **will come up with an atomic bomb seems** to be **vanishingly small.**" **The events required** to make that happen **comprise** a multitude of **Herculean tasks**. First, **a terrorist group has to get a bomb** or fissile material, perhaps from Russia's inventory of decommissioned warheads. **If that were easy, one would have already gone missing**. Besides, **those devices are** probably **no longer a danger**, since **weapons that are not** scrupulously **maintained** (as those have not been) **quickly** **become** what one expert calls "radioactive **scrap metal**." If terrorists were able to steal a Pakistani bomb, **they would still have to defeat** the **arming codes and other safeguards** designed to prevent unauthorized use. As for Iran, **no nuclear state has ever given a bomb to an ally** -- for reasons even the Iranians can grasp. Stealing some 100 pounds of bomb fuel would require help from rogue individuals inside some government who are prepared to jeopardize their own lives. The terrorists, notes Mueller, would then have to spirit it "hundreds of miles out of the country over unfamiliar terrain, and probably while being pursued by security forces." Then comes the task of **building a bomb**. It's not something you can gin up with spare parts and power tools in your garage. It **requires millions of dollars, a safe haven and advanced equipment** -- plus people with **specialized skills**, lots of time and a willingness to die for the cause. And if al-Qaida could make a prototype, another obstacle would emerge: **There is no guarantee it would work**, and there is **no way to test** it. Assuming the jihadists vault over those Himalayas, **they would have to deliver the weapon** onto American soil. Sure, drug smugglers bring in contraband all the time -- but seeking their help would confront the plotters with possible exposure or extortion. **This,** like every other step in the entire process, **means expanding the circle of people who know what's going on, multiplying the chance someone will** blab, back out or **screw up**.

No WMD Terrorism

#### 

#### [\_\_\_]

[\_\_\_] The risk of nuclear terrorism is low – it is too expensive for terrorist organizations

John Mueller, department of political science at Ohio State University, 2008

(1/1/2008, The Atomic Terrorist, p. http://polisci.osu.edu/faculty/jmueller/APSACHGO.PDF)

Assessing the financial costs. The discussion so far has neglected to consider the **financial costs** of the extended operation in all its cumulating, or cascading, entirely, but these **could** easily **become monumental. There would be expensive equipment** to buy, smuggle, and set up, **and people to pay**--or pay off. Some operatives might work for free out of utter dedication to The Cause, but the **vast conspiracy requires in addition the subversion of a considerable array of criminals and opportunists, each of whom has** **every incentive to push the price** for cooperation **as high as possible**. Alarmists **Zimmerman and Lewi**s (2006) **suggest the** entire **caper could be pulled off for $10 million. The conspirators would be lucky to buy off three people** with such a paltry sum. Moreover, **the terrorists would be required to expose** **their** ultimate **goals** to at least some of the corrupted, **and at that point** (if not earlier) **they would become potential extortion victims. They could not afford to abandon unreliable people** who know their goals (though they could attempt to kill them), **and such people would** now **enjoy** essentially **monopoly powers ever to escalate their price**. **The cost** of the operation in bribes alone **could** easily **become ten times the sum** suggested by Zimmerman and Lewis. And **even at that, there would be,** of course, **a considerable risk that those so purchased would**, at an exquisitely opportune moment of their choosing, decide to **take the money and run**--perhaps **to the authorities** representing desperate governments with essentially bottomless bankrolls and an overwhelming incentive to expend resources to arrest the atomic plot and to capture or kill the scheming perpetrators.

No WMD Terrorism

#### [\_\_\_]

#### [\_\_\_] No risk of nuclear terrorism

Jason Sigger,Defense Policy Analyst focusing on Chemical, Biological, and Nuclear Defense issues, 2010

(“Terrorism Experts Can Be Alarmists, Too”, http://armchairgeneralist.typepad.com/my\_weblog/-2010/01/terrorism-experts-can-be-alarmists-too-1.html)

**You find the famous bin Laden 1998 quote about WMDs, references from George "slam dunk" Tenet's book on al Qaeda** intentions and actions in the desert, meetings between Muslim scientists and suppliers, statements by terrorists that were obtained under "interrogations," **and yes, even Jose Padilla's "dirty bomb**" - a charge which people may remember **the US government dropped because it had no evidence on this point. And no discussion about AQ would be complete without the "mobtaker" device that never really emerged in any plot against the West**. That is to say, **we have a collection of weak evidence of intent without any feasible capability and zero WMD incidents - over a period of fifteen years, when AQ was at the top of their game, they could not develop even a crude CBRN hazard**, let alone a WMD capability. **Mowatt-Larsen doesn't attempt to answer the obvious question - why didn't AQ develop this capability by now**? He points to a June 2003 article where the Bush administration reported to the UN Security Council that there was a "high probability" that al Qaeda would attack with a WMD within two years. The point that the Bush administration could have been creating a facade for its invasion into Iraq must have occurred to **Mowatt-Larsen,** but he dodges the issue. This is an important report to read, but not for the purposes that the author intended. It **demonstrates the extremely thin thread that so many terrorist experts and scientists hang on when they claim that terrorists are coming straight at the United States with WMD capabilities.**

No Solvency – Detection

#### [\_\_\_]

#### [\_\_\_] No solvency for port shut-downs: If a WMD is detected, the port will be shut-down

Lt. Morgan James et al, Naval Postgraduate School, 2007

(Port Security Strategy 2012, edocs.nps.edu/npspubs/scholarly/TR/2007/NPS-97-07-003.pdf)

**A detection or activation of a WMD in the port would result in the disruption all port operations. Importation of a WMD provides terrorists the ability to inflict severe damage in the importing country**.

#### [\_\_\_] Detection devices don’t solve direct ship attacks

Lt. Morgan James et al, Naval Postgraduate School, 2007

(Port Security Strategy 2012, edocs.nps.edu/npspubs/scholarly/TR/2007/NPS-97-07-003.pdf)

The first scenario considered small boat attacks on ports. **Small boats loaded with explosives can penetrate the waterside of the port and detonate in the port vicinity. This action would cause damage to the ports’ systems and equipment and disrupt the normal operations of the port. From the military point of view, a small boat attack would elevate the force protection level of the ship. It would also create psychological effects within the U.S. populace and generate retaliatory outcries**. The USS COLE (DDG 67) attack in Yemen in October 2000 and French tanker Limburg’s attack in October 2002 demonstrated the potential major threat from the explosive-laden boats.

#### [\_\_\_] Bad weather undermines security sensors

Lt. Morgan James et al, Naval Postgraduate School, 2007

(Port Security Strategy 2012, edocs.nps.edu/npspubs/scholarly/TR/2007/NPS-97-07-003.pdf)

**Weather also determines the effectiveness of the in-place security measures**. For example, **a rain storm would greatly affect the performance of sensors or communications equipment** along with the patrolling profile of the security personnel.

No Solvency – Detection

#### [\_\_\_]

#### [\_\_\_] Explosives can be divided, making detection impossible

Lt. Morgan James et al, Naval Postgraduate School, 2007

(Port Security Strategy 2012, edocs.nps.edu/npspubs/scholarly/TR/2007/NPS-97-07-003.pdf)

**The first scenario considers an individual or group with the purpose to cause maximum destruction to the port facility and the in-port ship. One way to achieve this goal is to break up the explosive weapons into various parts carried by different shipments into the port. The insider would coordinate the different shipment of weapons by selecting a shipment that is less likely to be marked for inspection. It is difficult to detect any possible existence of weapons since most components can be mixed with other legitimate items such as electronics, machinery and raw manufacturing materials. Alternatively, the random check conducted can also be exploited.** Assembly of the weapons would be done by the insider(s) disguised as workers of the port (e.g. machinery operators, dock workers etc). **Detonation of explosives would be coordinated in conjunction with the docking of a ship. The explosives could be installed near the bay and cargo landing areas (near to the fuel tanks of the ship). The attack potentially could generate enough fuel explosives to cause substantial destruction to the port.**

No Solvency – Delays Turn

#### [\_\_\_]

[\_\_\_] Enhanced port security leads to serious delays in shipping that harm the economy and national security

Conrad et al, Sandia National Laboratories, 2003

(Stephen Conrad, Walter Beyeler, Richard Thomas, Thomas Corbet, Theresa Brown, Gary Hirsch, and Christopher Hatzi, How Do We Increase Port Security Without Imperiling Maritime Commerce? Using Flight Simulators and Workshops to Begin the Discussion, http://www.garybhirsch.com/industry\_files/A-port-paper.pdf)

Especially since the events of 9-11, container shipments through US ports are believed to be a potential pathway for introduction of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) into the United States. Currently only about 2% of all cargo containers are inspected. New security measures have been implemented, and others proposed, in an effort to reduce this perceived threat. These measures call for additional processes and equipment to be used in container shipment in an effort to better characterize and control cargo. **Requiring new security measures can change** important performance characteristics of the port such as **the time and cost required to import and export goods. These** performance **changes can suppress overall demand for shipping,** and change the relative attractiveness of ports to importers, exporters, and cargo carriers. The current inspection process was designed primarily to enforce tariffs and intercept illicit drugs and other contraband, and may not be well suited to interdicting WMD. In addition to any long-term performance changes created by security measures, **the transition from the current system to an inspection system tailored for security may impose additional costs and delays**. Effective security measures must take account of the economic consequences they entail. The National Strategy for the Protection of Critical Infrastructures and Key Assets (2003) issued by the White House states that “**security solutions to the container shipping challenge should recognize that**, in many cases, **commerce**, including essential national security materials, **must continue to flow…Stifling commerce to meet security needs simply swaps one consequence of a security threat for another**.” Successful port operations requires the coordinated action of many disparate people and organizations, including ship owners, port authorities, importers and exporters, labor unions, and government agencies. Negotiating the appropriate balance between security and cost requires considering the consequences of alternatives on these diverse interests.

No Solvency – Delays Turn – Link Extension

#### [\_\_\_]

#### [\_\_\_] Enhanced port security leads to delays in shipping, undermining the economy

Lt. Morgan James et al, Naval Postgraduate School, 2007

(Port Security Strategy 2012, edocs.nps.edu/npspubs/scholarly/TR/2007/NPS-97-07-003.pdf)

**The port operators are primarily concerned with continued operation with minimal cost while maintaining an efficient and continuous flow of cargo. Additional costs incurred in enhancing security will erode profit margin**. **Since the port operators are profit-conscious, it is desired that the terminals continue to operate with minimal cost.** The second scenario considered was a large ship attack on ports. Ships laden with WMDs pose a potential threat. Another aspect to study is the use of the ship itself. Because of their large size and weight, the use of the ship as a kinetic weapon to port operations or to the military installations is a very viable threat. The large amount of momentum created by the large ship enables the infliction of severe damage to any vessel. If the large ship is laden with volatile cargo, the ship presents a major concern for port operations. Explosives from the ship can cause severe damage to the port, severely disrupting normal port operations.

Spending Link

[\_\_\_\_] Enhanced port security would cost billions

ABC News 2006

(How Much Is Too Much for Port Security?, [Z. BYRON WOLF](http://abcnews.go.com/author/z_byron_wolf)

Sept. 13, 2006, http://abcnews.go.com/US/Politics/story?id=2425748&page=1#.UATHLxxrP7p)

Then he implied the same was true of port security, suggesting **there was no way to entirely** **safeguard America's ports.** The federal government has spent $10 billion on port security since 2004, according to Chertoff. **The new bill would allocate nearly $9 billion more over the next five years** to beef up security at the nation's ports. While Chertoff encouraged its passage, he tried to convince Sen. Frank Lautenberg, D-N.J., that **scanning 100 percent of the cargo coming into the country was logistically impossible.** "You know, it's like I get in my car or I put my daughter in my car. I understand it's not 100 percent safe. If I wanted my daughter to be 100 percent safe, I'd put a 5-mile-an-hour speed limit cap on the car, and it wouldn't go more than 5 miles an hour." Noting that the costs would be immense, he also argued against an amendment offered by Sen. Charles Schumer, D-N.Y., that would require screening of all shipping containers coming into the United States. "No matter how hard we may try, we cannot eliminate every possible threat to every individual in every place at every moment. And if we could, it would be at an untenable cost to our liberty and our prosperity," Chertoff said to the committee. **"We don't want to undercut our economy while trying to protect it.** We also don't want to undercut our civil liberties while trying to protect them."

States Counterplan Solvency

[\_\_\_\_] **State, local, and private entities own the ports – they are the correct ones to do the plan**

American Society of Civil Engineers, 2009

(Report Card of America‘s Infrastructure <http://www.infrastructurereportcard.org/> sites/default/files/RC2009\_full\_report.pdf)

Due to a lack of adequate data, ASCE was unable to assess the condition of, or assign a grade to, the infrastructure of the nation’s more than 300 ports and harbors. **Ports**, which **are owned and operated largely by state, local, and private entities, are not required to report on the condition of their infrastructure to the federal government.**

Topicality – Infrastructure

**[\_\_\_]**

**[\_\_\_]** **“Port Security” includes more than port infrastructure**

Jon D. Haveman and Howard J. Shatz, Public Policy Institute of California, 2006

(Protecting the Nation’s Seaports: Balancing Security and Costs, www.ppic.org/content/pubs/repo-rt/r\_606jhr.pdf)

**Each container trip to the United States has, on average, 17 different stop**s, or points at which the container’s journey temporarily halts. The adage “goods at rest are goods at risk” readily applies to the terrorist threat. **The container will be at rest at any point in the journey that involves a change in mode of transportation**. While at rest, the container is vulnerable to thieves and terrorists alike. **Providing port security therefore involves closely scrutinizing activities not only at the port but at points all along the shipping chain**. The truck driver picking up the container at the U.S. port, often poorly paid and possibly an illegal immigrant not well integrated into U.S. society may himself represent vulnerability in the system.

**[\_\_\_] Port Security is not infrastructure**

Jon D. Haveman and Howard J. Shatz, Public Policy Institute of California, 2006

(Protecting the Nation’s Seaports: Balancing Security and Costs, www.ppic.org/content/pubs/repo-rt/r\_606jhr.pdf)

There is no way to completely inspect all of the millions of containers entering the United States. They are about as large as a full- size moving van and are often tightly packed. Inspecting each thoroughly would bring commerce to a halt, exactly the kind of reaction that terrorists hope to generate.

Given the difficulties of complete inspection, defense needs to be layered, with checks at multiple stages on a container’s journey. Even if a check at one stage has a low probability of uncovering a problem, multiple checks throughout the supply chain raise that probability a great deal. Such a **layered defense can be divided into five areas: (1) intelligence—gaining information about which containers might be risky, (2) information about contents—having shippers notify authorities about the goods they are shipping, (3) procedural uniformity—creating standard procedures regarding packing and moving goods so that anomalies will be seen more easily, (4) limiting access—enforcing greater control over who may come near containers and ports, and (5) technology—the development of new inspection and tracking technologies**.

**High Speed Rail Affirmative**
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Summary

This Affirmative case argues that the United States should support the development of a national high-speed rail network.

There are two main reasons that developing high speed rail is a good idea. First, the development of high speed rail stands to improve the US economy because it will reduce the congestion of cars on the interstates and will employee a lot of engineers and construction workers, boosting employment and the overall US economy. Second, by reducing the use of cars, high speed rail will help to decrease the amount of gasoline used and reduce the emission of gases that cause global warming

Another critical component of the high speed rail Affirmative is that it is necessary for the federal government to act to develop high speed rail because the states lack the necessary financial resources to do it and the private, non-governmental sector is unlikely to do it because they fear that it will not be profitable.

Glossary

Vocabulary

**Amtrak**. The **National Railroad Passenger Corporation**, [doing business as](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Doing_business_as) **Amtrak** is a [government-owned corporation](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Government-owned_corporation) that was organized on May 1, 1971, to provide [intercity](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Inter-city_rail) [passenger train](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Passenger_train) service in the United States (Wikipedia)

**Annual**. Annual is every year. For example, if you have a subscription to an annual magazine you will receive that magazine once a year.

**Anthropogenic.** Anthropogenic means it is caused by humans. In context, anthropogenic warming is warming caused by humans.

**Appropriation**.An appropriation is the amount of money that is made available for a specific purpose. For example, Congress could appropriate $1 billion to develop new railroads.

**Climate change**.“Climate change” refers to the total average change in the earth’s climate that is due to human influence, particular the burning of fossil fuels (primarily coal and oil)

**Commuter**. Many people live outside large American cities and take local trains to work. These people are referred to as commuters.

**Competitiveness**.Competitiveness refers to the ability of the United States to compete economically by being able to sell goods at affordable prices, particularly prices that lower than companies from other countries. Competiveness refers to the quality of the goods.

**Coral reef.** Coral reefs are underwater structures made from [calcium carbonate](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Calcium_carbonate) secreted by [corals](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Coral). Coral reefs are colonies of tiny living animals found in marine waters that contain few nutrients. Most coral reefs are built from [stony corals](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Stony_coral), which in turn consist of [polyps](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Polyp) that cluster in groups. The polyps are like tiny [sea anemones](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sea_anemone), to which they are closely related.

**Domestic**. Domestic refers to within the United States. The term is contracted to “foreign,” which means outside the United States.

**Depression**.A depression is a severe economic downturn that lasts for many years.

**Electricity grid**.The electricity grid is the power stations and power lines that supply electricity throughout the country.

**Electrification**. Electrification refers to making rail tracks capable of supporting trains that run on electricity.

Glossary

**Export**. When goods are sold and shipped abroad they are exported.

**Federal**. Federal refers to a government structure. In the United States, the federal government is the central governing body of the United States.

**Freight.** Freight is goods that are transferred on things like rail, boats, and airplanes

**Global warming.** Global warming is another term for climate change.

**Great Power.** Great Powers are the major, most powerful countries on Earth. The US, China, and Russia are currently great powers.

**Indisputable**. Indisputable means that something is true and that the truth cannot be refuted.

**Intercity.** Between cities

**Manufacturing**. Manufacturing is the production of goods.

**Monopoly**. A monopoly is an entity that has complete control.

**Oil dependence**. Oil dependence refers to the idea that a country needs to import its oil in order to have enough to meet the domestic demand for oil.

**Revenue.** Revenue is money that is taken in or earned as part of a particular project.

**State**. State refers to the individual 50 states.

**Spearhead**. Spearhead means to lead.

**Strait of Hormuz**. The Strait of Hormuz is a narrow, strategically important [strait](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Strait) between the [Gulf of Oman](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gulf_of_Oman) in the southeast and the [Persian Gulf](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Persian_Gulf). On the north coast is [Iran](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Iran) and on the south coast is the [United Arab Emirates](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_Arab_Emirates) and [Musandam](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Musandam), an [exclave](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Exclave) of [Oman](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Oman).

Acronyms

**PWRG.** Passenger Rail Working Group

**UCS**. Union of Concerned Scientists
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#### Contention 1 – The Current Situation

#### United States passenger rail capacity is becoming maxed out – more investment is needed

American Society of Civil Engineers 2009

(“Rail”, <http://www.infrastructurereportcard.org/fact-sheet/rail> , DOA: 4-20-12)

**Amtrak anticipates reaching and exceeding capacity in the near future on some routes**. For example, approximately half of trains traveling on one northeast regional line were 85% full and 62% were at least 75% full during one week in July 2008. Even though the current economic downturn has dampened growth, **trains will soon reach capacity as the economy rebounds** and the growth patterns of recent years are reestablished, and the fleet of cars and locomotives continues to age. In the long term, the Passenger Rail Working Group (PRWG), which was formed as part of the National Surface Transportation Policy and Revenue Study Commission, determined that an annual investment of $7.4 billion through 2016, totaling $66.3 billion, is needed to address the total capital cost of a proposed intercity rail network. It is further estimated that an additional $158.6 billion is needed between 2016 and 2030 and an additional $132.3 billion between 2031 and 2050 to achieve the ideal intercity network proposed by the PRWG. These costs do not include the mandated safety upgrades for freight rail lines that carry both passenger as well as freight traffic and for those routes that carry toxic chemicals as required by the Rail Safety Improvement Act of 2008. 7 While the investments set forth by the PRWG are significant, the benefits would be significant as well. The PRWG estimated a net fuel savings of nearly $4 billion per year by diverting passengers to rail if the proposed vision was adopted. 5 In addition, the investments would reduce the need for even greater capacity investments in other modes. **Intercity passenger rail faces particular concerns not faced by other modes of transportation, such as the lack of a dedicated revenue source**. Amtrak owns and/or operates 656 miles of track that are maintained and upgraded using funds from its general operating budget, impacting its ability to fund other projects. **The annual congressional appropriations process has provided minimal** funding in recent years, **leading to a major backlog of deferred track maintenance** on the track that Amtrak owns and operates, more than half of which is shared with commuter and freight railroads.
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#### Contention 2 – Harms

First, a lack of high speed rail is devastating for the United States’ global economic competitiveness

The current lack of investment putts the US at a global economic disadvantage as well as furthering car dependence and congestion

American Public Transportation Association 11

(February 2011, “The Case for Business Investment in High-Speed and Intercity Passenger Rail”, http://www.apta.com/resources/reportsandpublications/Documents/HSRPub\_final.pdf)

The Urban Land Institute’s Infrastructure 2010: Investment Imperative asserts that **failure to invest could delay economic recovery and put the United States at increased disadvantages in the global marketplace.** The report clarifies the need for infrastructure investment including investment in high-speed rail to modernize America’srail transportation system. **High-speed rail is** seen as **the solution for taking pressure off airports and highways** in regional intercity markets as travel demand increases. The report states that: “**Car dependence and** ever-escalating driving **delays** in most large American cities **have exposed the need for** more passenger **rail** service **to take the pressure off** crowded **interstates and** clogged **airports**, which struggle to handle current traffic volumes. **The urgency of addressing the issue becomes more apparent since the country’s population will increase by 120 million over the next 40 years,** with growth concentrated in the nation’s primary urban centers and surrounding suburbs. All these people will want to move around and **current systems won’t be able to handle prospective volumes.”**

And automobile congestion is a massive economic drain

Staley, economic development policy analyst for the New York Times, 07

(Sam, November 25, 2007, “A Congested Economy”, http://www.nytimes.com/2007/11/25/opinion/nyregionopinions/25CIstaley.html?pagewanted=all)

But **if congestion continues**, eventually **it will eat away at economic productivity** in the region. **Congestion reduces** the pool of **resources available** to businesses **and workers** by reducing access to jobs and employees. A 30-minute commute to work might become 45 minutes or an hour, pushing the job outside a worker’s “opportunity circle,” which is the amount of time a typical worker is willing to travel to a job. Productivity can compensate for the economic drag of congestion but only to a certain point. **If congestion becomes too severe, the economy begins to fragment**, which means that businesses drawing on a large metropolitan labor pool will be forced to tap into only those who live within a certain time and distance to the job. **A fragmented economy hurts productivity.** It’s already happening in the region. The Partnership for New York City, a business group, estimates that **eliminating** excess traffic **congestion would add** as much as **$4 billion and 52,000 jobs to the** regional **economy**. Congestion drains the region’s manufacturing sector of $2 billion in revenue and 8,674 jobs. Wholesale trade takes a congestion hit worth $1.3 billion in increased operating costs.
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An extended decline in US economic competitiveness could have serious global effects

Mandelbaum, John Hopkins Foreign Policy Program director, 2005

(Michael, The Case for Goliath: How America Acts as the World’s Government in the Twenty-First Century, pg 192-195)

Although the spread of nuclear weapons, with the corresponding increase in the likelihood that a nuclear shot would be fired in anger somewhere in the world, counted as the most serious potential consequence of the abandonment by the United States of its role as the world's government, it was not the only one. **In the** previous period of American international reticence**, the 1920s and 1930s, the global economy suffered serious damage** that a more active American role might have mitigated. **A twenty-first-century American retreat could have similarly adverse international economic consequences. The economic collapse of the 1930s caused extensive hardship throughout the world and led indirectly to World War II by paving the way for the people who started it to gain power in Germany and Japan**. In retrospect, the Great Depression is widely believed to have been caused by a series of errors in public policy that made an economic downturn far worse than it would have been had governments responded to it in appropriate fashion. Since the 1930s, acting on the lessons drawn from that experience by professional economists, governments has taken steps that have helped to prevent a recurrence of the disasters of that decade.' In the face of reduced demand, for example, governments have increased rather than cut spending.

Second, a lack of high speed rail capacity has serious environmental effects. Decreasing US car use is crucial to combat global warming

West, professional writer and editor, 12

(Larry, “U.S. Autos Account for Half of Global Warming Linked to Cars Worldwide,” http://environment.about.com/od/globalwarming/a/autoemissions.htm)

U.S. **automobiles** and light trucks **are responsible for** nearly **half of all greenhouse gases** emitted by automobiles **globally**, according to a new study by Environmental Defense.The study, Global Warming on the Road [PDF], also found that the Big Three automakers—General Motors, Ford and DaimlerChrysler—accounted for nearly three-quarters of the carbon dioxide released by cars and pickup trucks on U.S. roads in 2004, the latest year for which statistics were available**.“Cutting** greenhouse gas **emissions from U.S. automobiles will be critical to** any strategy for **slowing global warming**,” said John DeCicco, author of the report and senior fellow at Environmental Defense, in a press release. “To address global warming, we’ll need a clear picture of what sources are contributing to the problem. This report details, by automaker and vehicle type, the greenhouse gas contributions from America's auto sector, for the first time.”Carbon dioxide **emissions from** personal **vehicles** in the United States **equaled 314 million metric tons** in 2004. **That much carbon could fill a coal train 55,000 miles long—long enough to circle the Earth twice**. Cars and trucks made by GM gave off 99 million metric tons of carbon dioxide or 31 percent of the total; Ford vehicles emitted 80 million metric tons or 25 percent; and Daimler Chrysler vehicles emitted 51 million metric tons or 16 percent, according to the report.
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#### Climate change is the most serious environmental threat the world has ever faced

Mayer Hillman et al, Senior Fellow, Policy Institute in London, 2007

(The Suicidal Planet: how to prevent climate catastrophe, p. 11)

**Climate change is the most serious environmental threat that the world has ever faced. The** dangers can hardly be exaggerated. Climate scientists predict that by the end of this century, temperatures could rise 10 degrees F worldwide. But even if they rise by "just" 5 degrees F, **major parts of the earth's surface could become uninhabitable and many species on the planet could be wiped out**. Just within the next fifty years, there will be more heat waves, higher summer temperatures, fewer cold winters, and rising sea levels. As a consequence, **hundreds of millions of people will be at serious risk from flooding, there will be a huge loss of life from excessively hot weather, diseases from warmer regions will become established, some species and habitats will be lost forever, and patterns of agriculture and business will have to change radically.** And then, before too long, the whole world may face the even greater dangers of longterm and irreversible catastrophic changes as warming threatens the Greenland Ice shelf, the Gulf Stream, and the West Antarctic ice sheet.

In light of these harms we present the following

**Plan: The United States federal government should substantially increase its investment in a national high-speed rail network.**

#### **Contention 3 – Solvency**

High speed rail would significantly reduce car usage, helping both the economy and the environment

Calthorpe, principal at the planning firm Calthorpe Associates, 2-27

(Peter, author of "Urbanism in the Age of Climate Change", February 27, 2012, http://www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2012/01/26/does-california-need-high-speed-rail/high-speed-rail-is-a-catalyst-for-better-development)

**In a** development **future built around high-speed rail** and enhanced local transit, **average vehicle miles** traveled per **household would be reduced 40 percent, the equivalent of taking 18.6 million cars off the road**. New **highway construction would be reduced by 4,700 lane miles, saving** around **$400 billion. This** type of development **means less air pollution, fewer respiratory diseases, less water consumption, efficient local infrastructure and lower costs to local governments. California would consume 300 billion fewer gallons of fuel over the next 40 years.** When these savings are combined with other transportation and energy savings, households would save close to $11,000 per year. More compact communities require 67 percent less land — saving prime farmland in the Central Valley and key open space in coastal regions.
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And, Federal investment in high speed rail will stimulate the economy and lead to long term growth

Williams, American Public Transportation Association's Dir Advocacy Communications, 2011

(Mantil, April 6, 2011, “Federal Investment in High-Speed Rail Could Spur 1.3 Million Jobs”, http://www.apta.com/mediacenter/pressreleases/2011/Pages/110406\_HSR\_Business.aspx)

Washington, DC – April 6, 2011 –The American Public Transportation Association (APTA) released a report detailing the enormous impact high-speed and intercity passenger rail projects will have in driving job development, while also rebuilding America’s manufacturing sector and generating billions of dollars in business sales. This report focuses on key issues critical to private investors as they consider investments or future expansion into businesses serving the growing passenger rail markets. The report, “The Case for Business Investment in High-Speed and Intercity Passenger Rail” reinforces the point that **investments in high-speed** and intercity **rail will have many** direct and indirect **benefits.** Nationally, due to proposed federal investment of high-speed rail over a six-year period, **investment can result in** supporting and creating more than **1.3 million jobs.** This **federal investment will be the catalyst for attracting state, local and private capital which will result in the support and creation of even more jobs.**  According to this new report, **investments** in building a 21st century rail system **will not only lead to a large increase in construction jobs, but to** the sustainable, long-term growth of **new manufacturing and service jobs across the country.** “It is evident that investing in **high-speed** and intercity **rail projects presents** one of **the clearest and fastest ways to create** green, American jobs and spur **long-term economic growth**,” said APTA President William Millar. “Investing in high-speed rail is essential for America as we work to build a sustainable, modern transportation system that meets the environmental and energy challenges of the future.” APTA noted for each $1 billion invested in high-speed rail projects, the analysis predicts the support and creation of 24,000 jobs. In addition to the thousands of new construction jobs, **investments in high-speed rail will jumpstart the U.S. economy.** The Economic Development Research Group for the U.S. Conference of Mayors studied the business impact of high-speed rail investment in different urban regions. For example, in Los Angeles, CA, high-speed rail investment generates $7.6 billion in business sales and $6.1 billion in Chicago, IL. “Federal **high-speed rail investment is a strong driver in getting private companies to invest**,” said Kevin McFall, Senior Vice President at Stacy and Witbeck Inc., a leading public transit construction firm. “This program can be a shot in the arm for the manufacturing industry. These high-speed rail projects will give us the opportunity to put people to work building the rail infrastructure this country desperately needs.” “U.S. businesses have been known for their cutting edge technologies and innovations, said Jeffrey Wharton, President of IMPulse NC. “We need to put this expertise to work, providing business and employment opportunities while catching up with the rest of the world in high-speed rail and its associated benefits.” “We are excited about the prospect of **putting Americans to work building the rail tracks** and equipment that **will keep America’s economic recovery moving forward**,” said Charles Wochele, Vice President for Industry and Government Relations at Alstom Transport. “We look forward to partnering with the federal and state governments to ensure these projects get off the ground.”

Answers to: Private Sector Solves

**[\_\_\_\_]**

**[\_\_\_\_] Private investment is insufficient because safety costs and capacity need public investment.**

Wall Street Journal 2011

(“The Future of Rail”, 5-11, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703834804576301230350030512.html>, DOA: 4-19-12)

MR. MCCLELLAN: The biggest challenge for the railroads will be to build the needed capacity in a timely fashion and at a cost that the market prices can support. MR. RENNICKE: Future investments must also be considered in the context of the unfunded mandate for the railroads to spend billions on installing anticollision technology and potentially accept the operation of increasing numbers of passenger trains over their lines. Both have the potential to further limit the existing capacity of the network and the ability to meet future growth. Improved transit times and consistent reliability are key to long-term rail-industry viability. Both measures have steadily improved over the last several decades but still have a way to go.

**[\_\_\_\_] Private investment is not enough to solve the harms that are occurring now**

American Society of Civil Engineers, 2009

(American Society of Civil Engineers, “Rail”, <http://www.infrastructurereportcard.org/fact-sheet/rail> , DOA: 4-20-12)

After years of shedding excess capacity, railroads have been increasing infrastructure investment and spending in recent years. In 2006, overall spending on rail infrastructure was $8 billion, a 21% increase from 2005. 2 More specifically, spending on construction of new roadway and structures increased from $1.5 billion in 2005 to $1.9 billion in 2007. 4 Increased spending on maintenance of railroad networks and systems has become necessary as investments are made in more costly signaling technology, heavier rail, and the improved substructure necessary to accommodate heavier train**s**. 3 Demand for freight transportation is projected to nearly double by 2035—from 19.3 billion tons in 2007 to 37.2 billion tons in 2035. 4 If current market shares are maintained, railroads will be expected to handle an 88% increase in tonnage by 2035. 4 However, as many look to rail as a more efficient and environmentally friendly freight shipper, rail’s market share could increase and lead to additional increases in freight rail tonnage. An estimated $148 billion in improvements will be needed to accommodate the projected rail freight demand in 2035.

Answers to: Other Reasons the US Isn’t Competitive

**[\_\_\_\_]**

#### [\_\_\_\_] Transportation inefficiency is the key reason that the US can’t compete

BAF Educational Fund, a bipartisan coalition of elected officials dedicated to bringing about a new era of U.S. investment in infrastructure, 2011

(“Building America’s Future Educational Fund, “Building America’s Future: Falling Apart and Falling Behind”, August, <http://www.bafuture.org/sites/default/files/Report_0.pdf>, DOA: 4-10-12)

Economic growth now depends on American businesses’ ability to participate in this growing global trade, and moving freight cheaply, easily, and reliably is now more directly related to the overall health of our economy than ever. As much as 60% of American-made products are now exported, and so the success of the manufacturing sector depends on our ability to export what we make here and sell it in the global marketplace. Billions of dollars’ worth of goods move around this country every day, by rail, truck, and air, to and from manufacturing plants, packaging centers, warehouses and distribution facilities, cargo airports and international shipping terminals. The supply chain now spans the globe, and a significant contributor to the American economy is the ability to transport goods cheaply, efficiently, and reliably across national corridors to and from international gateways. An explosion in shipping from China has fundamentally altered global shipping patterns and increased congestion at major U.S. ports. The expansion of the Panama Canal currently underway will direct more mega-ships from Asia directly to our east coast ports—but only if they are deep enough to accommodate the new supertankers. The surge in global trade is expanding and realigning American business transportation needs. International merchandise and goods are now transported in shipping containers, which can be moved, packed full of goods, and directly transferred from a ship to a truck or a train. New trade features and patterns are straining access to and from ports, increasing the need for sophisticated logistics to oversee more complicated supply chains, and making “intermodal”— involving one or more types of transport— the new necessity for 21st-century freight transportation. This is how business is done in the 21st century, but the U.S. is falling behind. Our freight transportation system was not built for the explosive growth of coast-to coast shipping and international trade experienced over the past two decades, and our economically vital gateways and corridors—our primary port, road, and rail routes for shipping goods in and out of the country—now operate at or over capacity. Congestion plagues our freight corridors and acts as a drag on the American economy as a whole. In Chicago, the nation’s biggest rail center, congestion is so bad that it takes a freight train longer to get through the city limits than it does to get to Los Angeles. 3 Freight bottlenecks and other forms of congestion cost about $200 billion, or 1.6% of the U.S. gross domestic product (GDP), a year.

Answers to: Climate Change Theory is False

**[\_\_\_\_]**

#### [\_\_\_\_] It is nearly certain that climate change is happening and that humans are causing it

Robert W. Corell, The Heinz Center, May 2008

**(**Global Climate Change National Security Implications http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/PUB862.pdf)

Second, **“Warming of the climate system is unequivocal, as is now evident from observations of increases in global average air and ocean temperatures, widespread melting of snow and ice, and rising global mean sea level**.” Note the use by the Panel of wordslike “**unequivocal” which means 90 percent certain or better. Third,** “**Most of the observed increase in globally averaged temperatures since the mid-20th century is *very likely* due to the observed increase in anthropogenic greenhouse gas concentrations**.” **This also means that there is a 90 percent likelihood.** The Report documentedseveral long-term changes in climate: “The globalaverage temperature trend over 1906–2005 is 0.74°C(1.3°F), increasing to 0.2°C (0.36°F) per decade overthe last 3 decades; Global average sea level rose 0.17meters (6.7 inches) over the 20th century; Mountainglaciers and snow cover have declined on average inboth hemispheres.”

**[\_\_\_\_] An overwhelming amount of evidence proves that warming is occurring and that it is caused by humans**

New Scientist, 2007

(May 19, p. 34)

Our planet's climate is anything but simple; it depends on the interplay of many factors, from massive events in the sun to microscopic creatures in the oceans. Yet, **a clear picture has emerged, supported by an overwhelming amount of evidence: the world is warming, this warming is due to increasing levels of greenhouse gases caused by human activity, and if emissions continue unabated the warming will too, with ever more serious consequences.** True, there are big uncertainties in some predictions, but these swing both ways: the response of clouds might slow warming or could speed it up instead, for instance.

Answers to: No Impact to Climate Change

**[\_\_\_\_]**

#### [\_\_\_\_] Climate change will undermine ecosystem biodiversity because species cannot adapt

Achim Steiner, Administrator Executive Director United Nations Development Programme, 2007

(United Nations Environment Programme, Fighting Climate Change: Human Solidarity in a Divided World, <http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/hdr_20072008_en_complete.pdf>)

**Climate change is** already **transforming ecological system**s. Around one-half of **the world’s coral reef systems have suffered ‘bleaching’ as a result of warming seas**. **Increasing acidity in the oceans is another long-term threat to marine ecosystems**. Ice-based ecologies have also suffered devastating climate change impacts, especially in the Arctic region. While some animal and plant species will adapt, **for many species the pace of climate change is too rapid: climate systems are moving more rapidly than they can follow**. With 3°C of warming, 20–30 percent of land species could face extinction. Climate’s impact on development irreversible None of these five separate drivers will operate in isolation. They will interact with wider social, economic and ecological processes that shape opportunities for human development. Inevitably, the precise mix of transmission mechanisms from climate change to human development will vary across and within countries. Large areas of uncertainty remain. What is certain is that **dangerous climate change has the potential to deliver powerful systemic shocks to human development across a large group of countries**. In contrast to economic shocks that affect growth or inflation, many of the human development impacts—lost opportunities for health and education, diminished productive potential, loss of vital ecological systems, for example—are likely to prove irreversible.

#### [\_\_\_\_] Hundreds of millions of people threatened by rapidly changing climates

Catherine Mitchell, Professor of Energy Policy, University of Exeter, 2008

(The Political Economy of Sustainable Energy, p. 199)

As the Stern Review stated: “**Climate change will affect the basic elements of life for people around the world, access to water, food production, health and the environment. Hundreds of millions of people could suffer hunger, water shortages and coastal flooding as the world warms”**, and around 15-40% of species face extinction with 2 degrees C of warming.

Answers to: Climate Change is Too Fast

**[\_\_\_\_]**

**[\_\_\_\_] If we act now we can prevent climate change in time**

**German Advisory Council on Global Change, 2008,** CLIMATE CHANGE AS A SECURITY RISK, <http://www.wbgu.de/wbgu_jg2007_engl.pdf>

**A narrow window of opportunity for climate policy** the first of WBGU’s findings offers a major opportunity, but also presents a considerable challenge to policy-makers. Global climate change is a gradual process which, so far, has not posed any serious risks to human security. It is only likely to impact severely on international security in the medium to long term. **If in the next two decades, the international community is successful, through effective climate policy, in setting a course towards an emissions pathway that makes compliance with the 2 °C guard rail possible, such climate-induced conflicts can probably be avoided**. However, any delay in setting this course towards a reversal of global emissions trends will mean that even higher emissions reduction rates will be required later on. **There is also a risk that such a delay will entrench path dependencies in favour of emissions-intensive technologies, making compliance with the 2 °C guard rail more expensive, more difficult and ultimately impossible** (WBGU, 2007). In other words, **there is a narrow window of opportunity for successful prevention, making swift action essential.**

Answers to: Adaptation Solves

**[\_\_\_\_]**

**[\_\_\_\_] Mitigation strategies won’t solve**

**Intergovernmental Panel on Climate** Change, 2007

(November 16, http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/assessment-report/ar4/syr/ar4\_syr\_spm.pdf)

**Adaptive capacity is intimately connected to social and economic development but is unevenly distributed across and within societies. A range of barriers limit both the implementation and effectiveness of adaptation measures.** The capacity to adaptis dynamic and is influenced by a society’s productive base including: natural and man-made capital assets, socialnetworks and entitlements, human capital and institutions, governance, national income, health and technology. **Even societies with high adaptive capacity remain vulnerable to climate change, variability and extremes**. **Both bottom-up and top-down studies indicate that there is *high agreement* and *much evidence* of substantial economic potential for the mitigation of global GHG emissions over the coming decades that could offset the projected growth of global emissions or reduce emissions below current levels While top-down and bottom-up studies are in line at the global level (Figure SPM.9) there are considerable differences at the sectoral level.** No single technology can provide all of the mitigation potential in any sector. The economic mitigation potential,which is generally greater than the market mitigation potential, can only be achieved when adequate policies are inplace and barriers removed (Table SPM.5).

Answers to: US Irrelevant/China Key

**[\_\_\_\_]**

#### [\_\_\_\_] US policy will shape global climate response

Paul Roberts, 2004

(Harper's Magazine, Finalist for the National Magazine Award, The End of Oil: A Perilous New World, p. 325-326)

**Politically,** a new U.S. energy policy would send a powerful message to the rest of the players in the global energy economy. **Just as a carbon tax would signal the markets that a new competition had begun, so** **a progressive, aggressive American energy policy would give a warning to international businesses, many of which now regard the United States as a lucrative dumping ground for older high-carbon technology. It would signal energy producers — companies and states — that they would need to start making investments for a new energy business, with differing demands and product requirements. Above all,** a progressive energy policy would not only show trade partners in Japan and Europe that the United States is serious about climate but would give the United States the leverage it needs to force much-needed changes in the Kyoto treaty. With a carbon program and a serious commitment to improve efficiency and develop clean-energy technologies, **says one U.S. climate expert,** “the United States could really shape a global climate policy. **We could basically say to Europe, ‘Here is an American answer to climate that is far better than Kyoto. Here are the practical steps we’re going to take to reduce emissions, far more effectively than your cockamamie Kyoto protocol?” Similarly,** the United States would finally have the moral credibility to win promises of cooperation from India and China. **As James MacKenzie, the former White House energy analyst who now works on climate issues for the Washingtonbased World Resources Institute, told me, Chinese climate researchers and policymakers know precisely what China must do to begin to deal with emissions but have thus far been able to use U.S. intransigence as an excuse for their own inaction. “‘Whenever you bring up the question of what the Chinese should be doing about climate, they just smile. They ask,** ‘Why should we in China listen to the United States and take all these steps to protect the climate, when the United States won’t take the same steps itself?” With a nudge from the United States, **argues Chris Flavin, the renewables optimist at World Watch Institute**, China could move away from its “destiny” as a dirty coal energy economy.

Answers to: Transportation Sector Irrelevant to Climate Change

**[\_\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_\_] Reducing emissions in the transportation sector is key to solve climate change

United Nations News Center, 2008

**(**“Transportation Sector Must Lead in Climate Change Fight, UN Official Says,” <http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=26856&Cr=climate&Cr1=transport>)

**The transport sector is expected to contribute so much to greenhouse gas emissions in the future that it must play a key role in shaping the global climate change deal which countries have agreed to try to clinch next year**, a senior United Nations environmental official [says](http://unfccc.int/files/press/news_room/press_releases_and_advisories/application/pdf/20080529_press_release_leipzig_english_final.pdf). Yvo de Boer, the Executive Secretary of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change ([UNFCCC](http://unfccc.int/2860.php)), told the [International Transport Forum](http://www.internationaltransportforum.org/) yesterday in Leipzig, Germany, that **data indicates that emissions from the sector will rise by more than 30 per cent by 2010 when compared to 1990 levels – the highest increase of any sector.**  “You have a choice,” he told participants at the forum. “The question is whether you as transport stakeholders are willing to proactively shape the Copenhagen deal [scheduled for next year] or have your policies shaped by it.”

Solvency – Economy

**[\_\_\_\_]**

**[\_\_\_\_] Rail investment leads to significant job growth**

Reilly et al., AAR Communications VP, 2011

(Patrick, “Great Expectations 2011 Freight Rail’s Role in U.S. Economic Recovery”, March, <http://onerail.org/sites/onerail.org/files/documents/rail-study/aar-great-expectations-2011.pdf>, DOA: 4-20-12)

At the end of 2010, railroad employment was up roughly 5.2 percent, bringing total employment at the nation’s freight railroads to more than 175,000. Every railroad job supports an additional 4.5 jobs. Railroad business activities and buying power support an additional 1.2 million jobs across the broader economy. Railroads also support jobs in industries such as manufacturing, construction, iron and steel, as well as communications and information technology jobs that are supported by rail supplier industries. Railroads also are well positioned to sustain hiring in the years ahead – both to fill jobs needed to meet growing demand and those vacated through retirements and attrition. According to the U.S. Railroad Retirement Board, more than 67,000 railroad employees, or roughly 30 percent of the total workforce, will be eligible to retire in the next five to 10 years. Railroads also have said they plan to hire more workers in 2011, as rail traffic continues to recover. Among the seven major Class I railroads, the companies estimate they will hire close to 10,000 workers in 2011 – some to address these retirements and general attrition, while others will be filling jobs needed to meet increased demand. Railroad employees are among America’s most highly compensated workers. According to U.S. government data, the average full-time worker in 2009, the most recent year for data, earned wages of $81,563 and benefits of $25,522 for a total average compensation of $107,085. That compares with the average U.S. employee who in 2009 saw average total compensation of $64,552, or roughly 60 percent of the average total annual compensation for a rail employee.

Solvency – Economy

**[\_\_\_\_]**

#### [\_\_\_\_] Public investment in rail is critical to stimulating the private sector and strengthening US economic competitiveness

Renner et al., Worldwatch Institute senior researcher, 2010

(Michael, “Global Competitiveness in the Rail and Transit Industry”, September, <http://www.worldwatch.org/system/files/GlobalCompetitiveness-Rail.pdf>, DOA: 4-20-12)

In all of the countries profiled in this report, the creation of a strong rail manufacturing industry has depended to a significant degree on a large and steady stream of investments in rail and public transit, which has created substantial domestic markets. Japan **and Germany** have done just that for many decades—essentially since they re-emerged from the ashes of World War II. Spain and China have begun more recently to shift their transportation investments dramatically from road to rail. In the process, they are creating world-class industries and positioning themselves for continued domestic growth and export opportunities, and creating rising numbers of rail manufacturing jobs—close to 200,000 in Germany, 116,000 in Spain, and rapidly rising numbers in China. These positive experiences should persuade the United States to follow similar strategies.So far, spending levels on rail and transit in the United States are not anywhere near adequate**.** Although the stimulus funds contained in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA) are a welcome source of financing, they can be considered no more than an initial down payment. Investments need to be ratcheted up and sustained at a high level, providing a clear signal of long-term commitment to building a modern, attractive U.S. public transportation system.

Answers to: State Governments Reject the Money

**[\_\_\_\_]**

#### [\_\_\_\_] California proves that states will accept the money

CBS News, 2012

(<http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-505245_162-57467408/california-assembly-approves-high-speed-rail/>, July 6,)

**The California Assembly on Thursday approved legislation that would authorize the state to begin selling about $4.5 billion in state bonds for the nation's first high-speed rail system**, taking an initial step toward the ambitious $68 billion project that Gov. Jerry Brown hopes will be a part of his legacy.  
 Lawmakers approved SB1029 on a 51-27 vote Thursday afternoon, with Republicans opposing it, sending the legislation to the state Senate, where it is expected to face a more contentious vote Friday.  
 The bill paves the way for California to begin selling $2.6 billion in voter-approved bonds and allocates another $1.9 billion for regional rail improvements in Northern and Southern California, and allows the state to tap $3.2 billion in federal grants to start construction of the first segment in the Central Valley.

Answers to: Railroads Say No

**[\_\_\_\_]**

**[\_\_\_\_] Railroads find the plan desirable and will accept it**

Longman, New American Foundation senior fellow, 2009

(Phillip, “Back on Tracks”, 1-21, <http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/features/2009/0901.longman.html>, DOA: 4-21-12, ldg)

The railroad has long been reluctant to accept government investment in its infrastructure out of fear of public meddling, such as being compelled to run money-losing passenger trains. But now, like most of the industry, it has changed its mind, and it happily accepted Virginia’s offer last year to fund a small portion—$40 million—of the investment needed to get more freight traffic off I-81 and onto the Crescent Corridor. The railroad estimates that with an additional $2 billion in infrastructure investment, it could divert a million trucks off the road, which is currently carrying just under five million. State officials are thinking even bigger: a study sponsored by the Virginia DOT finds that a cumulative investment over ten to twelve years of less than $8 billion would divert 30 percent of the growing truck traffic on I-81 to rail. That would be far more bang for the state’s buck than the $11 billion it would take to add more lanes to the highway, especially since it would bring many other public benefits, from reduced highway accidents and lower repair costs to enormous improvements in fuel efficiency and pollution reduction. Today, a single train can move as many containers as 280 trucks while using one-third as much energy—and that’s before any improvements to rail infrastructure.

Answers to: Government Action Undermines Rail

**[\_\_\_\_]**

#### [\_\_\_\_] Government action critical to making sure that investments are properly targeted

Michael Renner et al., Worldwatch Institute senior researcher, 2010

(“Global Competitiveness in the Rail and Transit Industry”, <http://www.worldwatch.org/system/files/GlobalCompetitiveness-Rail.pdf>, DOA: 4-20-12)

The U.S. federal government needs to play a strong guiding role in targeting investments, selecting key corridors, and creating a well-integrated passenger transportation system (as well as ensuring sufficient separation of passenger and freight tracks). While there is a role to play for state and local governments (especially with regard to urban and commuter rail lines), leaving policy decisions to a multitude of authorities and agencies without clear performance goals is unlikely to bring about a system that works well. Smart coordination is a must, not just with regard to route and network planning, but also with regard to funding and revenue-sharing among different layers of government.

Answers to: Congestion Means People Won’t Use the Rails

**[\_\_\_\_]**

#### [\_\_\_\_] People will use the rails because the rails will be less congested than roads

CBS News, 2012

(<http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-505245_162-57467408/california-assembly-approves-high-speed-rail/>, July 6,)

**Panyanouvong said he loves the idea of jumping on a train, turning on his computer and getting some work done on his way to Tampa, "without having to worry about traffic or driving."** But the idea is much bigger than convenience, say supporters, who believe high-speed intercity rail will cut U.S. dependence on foreign oil, reduce climate-changing pollution and fatten wallets by triggering economic development. **Soon, Americans might find themselves rocketing along ribbons of rails at 200 mph in sleek, painted passenger cars -- never stopping until they arrive at destinations awake and refreshed.**

Answer to: Urban Sprawl Turn

**[\_\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_\_] There are many other causes besides transportation infrastructure

Dee Striker, writer for the San Francisco Chronicle, 2007

(“What are the Causes of Urban Sprawl”, http://homeguides.sfgate.com/causes-urban-sprawl-2577.html)

Urban sprawl is loosely defined as low-density residential, and sometimes commercial, development that is outside the borders of higher density urban centers. Urban sprawl communities are typically automobile-oriented as opposed to pedestrian-friendly. **Planners, scholars, community activists and public officials all offer numerous possibilities as to the causes of urban sprawl.** Lack of Comprehensive Planning The Planners Web Sprawl Guide suggests that **little to no regional planning is one of the major causes of urban sprawl.** If officials in densely populated urban centers plan in isolation without consulting nearby communities, the result is sometimes poorly planned developments on the outskirts of urban centers. Instead of bridging the existing infrastructure and amenities of surrounding communities, these less densely populated areas often incur new public expenses for infrastructure improvements without regard to a regional plan or pooled resources. A regional plan would anticipate the growth of new areas and gradually execute the necessary planning initiatives to create a cohesive community. Rapid Population Growth The Sierra Club notes that **although population growth is not the only cause of urban sprawl, it is a major factor.** Rapid population growth is a particularly large contributor to urban sprawl in the Western and Southern regions of the United States. A sharp increase in residents beyond the capacity of nearby urban centers necessitates the creation of new communities. As the regional population continues to increase, communities begin to spread farther and farther away from city centers. Subsidized Infrastructure Improvements One condition that encourages urban sprawl, according to Towson University Center for Geographic Information Sciences, occurs when municipalities subsidize the cost of infrastructure such as roads and sewers to un- or under-developed areas. Such an action incentivizes the creation of communities outside of city centers without requiring comprehensive plans or suggesting alternative development options. Consumer Preferences One cause of urban sprawl that is difficult to quantify is preference. Useful Community Development, a site dedicated to progressive urban planning, cites the desire for larger homes, more bedrooms and bigger yards as one of the causes of urban sprawl. **Some people simply prefer more space or more home square footage than what is affordable or available in more crowded city centers.**

Answer to: Urban Sprawl Turn

**[\_\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_\_] Sprawl is increasing now – the Aff will have little effect

Mark Miller, analyst at the National Center for Policy Analysis, 2003

(October 02, 2003, No. 459, <http://www.ncpa.org/pub/ba459/>)

**Any public policy that attempts to decrease sprawl must contend with the fact that** approximately **75 percent of Americans prefer to live in sprawling communities rather than dense, urban areas**, according to polling data released by the Competitive Enterprise Institute. Thus land-use restrictions primarily reflect the preferences of urban planners rather than consumers. Furthermore, **antisprawl policies seldom take into account the extent to which government policies have exacerbated the problems created by development and the failure of previous attempts to limit growth.** While **many factors spur Americans' shift from urban to suburban living, the main force behind this transition is our increasing wealth**. This has raised living standards and allowed widespread automobile ownership. Economists Edward Glaeser and Matthew Kahn (2003) have shown that **even in the absence of any government policies that encourage sprawl, low-density suburban communities still would proliferate** because many people prefer living in areas with less traffic congestion, larger lot sizes and cheaper housing costs. Since the automobile has made transportation to and from urban centers easy and inexpensive, urban living has lost the advantage of convenience.

States Counterplan Answers

**[\_\_\_\_]**

**[\_\_\_\_] Adopting a national policy is critical to solve because strong investment and coordination is needed**

Hillestad et al., Ph.D. in engineering and applied science UCLA, 2009

(Richard, “Fast-Forward Key Issues in Modernizing the U.S. Freight-Transportation System for Future Economic Growth”, <http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2009/RAND_MG883.pdf>, DOA: 4-20-12)

The renewal and expansion of freight transportation infrastructure to date have suffered from an overall lack of system planning. Solutions tend to be local and stakeholder-specific and do not consider the broader system consequences and costs. For example, the social costs in safety, environmental impacts, and congestion of using trucks for transport are generally greater than moving goods by rail, yet most users do not consider such costs in their planning. Furthermore, most infrastructure planning and development is done at the local and state levels, with little national, central coordination or oversight. Indeed, the policy at the end of the George W. Bush administration was to put even more responsibility in the hands of the states (U.S. Department of Transportation Web site, Freight Transportation page, 2009). Another aspect of the system issue is that there are behavioral responses to policy actions that are not always easy to predict, such as how shippers might respond to congestion pricing on selected roadways or to increased container fees at ports meant to deal with, for example, construction of new port-area infrastructure or environmental mitigation (Leachman et al., 2005). Without considering the adaptive behavioral responses and the system as a whole, the predicted value of policy and mitigation actions may be far off the mark

Article: Can High Speed Rail Succeed in America

Time, January 29, 2010, “Can High-Speed Rail Succeed in America?,” <http://www.time.com/time/health/article/0,8599,1957575,00.html>

Environmentalists came away from President Obama's first State of the Union address on Wednesday with mixed feelings. Yes, the President focused on the importance of investment in clean energy and energy efficiency as the best way to sustainably grow America's moribund economy, and he mentioned clean coal, biofuels and nuclear power (though not renewable energy), and he talked up the need to pass a "comprehensive energy and climate bill." But notably, he said nothing about putting a price on carbon — which is considered by most greens to be the key move to reduce global carbon emissions.

There was one part of the speech, however, that no green could fault: Obama's call for the creation of a high-speed rail system as a way to generate green jobs, enhance economic productivity and reduce carbon emissions. On Thursday, Jan. 28, the White House announced the awarding of $8 billion in stimulus funding to kick-start high-speed-rail projects and improve service in 13 corridors across the country. Obama and Vice President Joe Biden traveled to Tampa, Fla., to announce the projects, which include the construction of an 84-mile high-speed track from Tampa to Orlando.

"We want to start looking deep into the 21st century and say to ourselves, There's no reason why other countries can build high-speed rail lines and we can't," Obama told a crowd in a University of Tampa arena. "Right here in Tampa, we're building the future."

That's a nice sentiment, but America's antiquated rail system will have to advance a long way just to make it to the present, let alone the future. U.S. intercity railroads are a laughingstock compared with those in most other developed nations — and, increasingly, even those in developing nations like China, which is investing more than $300 billion to build more than 16,000 miles of high-speed track by 2020.

Today you can travel the 250 miles from Paris to Lyon on the high-speed TGV in two hours. Covering a similar distance from Philadelphia to Boston takes some five hours, and that's on an Amtrak Acela train, the closest thing the U.S. has to high-speed rail. "Every other major industrialized nation has recognized that high-speed rail is key to economic growth and mobility," says Petra Todorovich, director of the America 2050 program at the Regional Planning Association. "It's time for America to realize that as well."

When the White House announced last spring that it would allocate billions of stimulus dollars to high-speed-rail projects, states submitted 45 applications for more than $50 billion in aid. In the end, the Federal Railroad Administration decided to distribute $8 billion in funding to 31 states, with the biggest single grants going to California ($2.3 billion) and Florida ($1.3 billion).

But whatever the public's vision of a sparkling new 150-m.p.h. bullet train like those in Japan and Europe, the reality is that not all, or even most, of the stimulus money will go toward creating entirely new rail service. Instead, much of the initial funding will be spent improving and speeding up existing service.

In Florida, however, the money will in fact help build a new stretch of track between Tampa and Orlando, which will allow trains to travel at speeds up to 168 m.p.h. It is the first leg of an intercity corridor that is expected to continue southward to Miami.

Demographically, Florida is an ideal state in which to launch the rail projects. Together, the metro areas of Tampa and Orlando are a major economic unit, home to more than 3.4 million people and close enough on the map to make high-speed rail competitive with air and auto travel. The region is also a tourist hub, which makes it likely that a Tampa-Orlando rail line will be well-used by Americans from around the country. That makes it a smart advertisement for other high-speed-rail projects back in their home regions.

Florida's project is also an optimal test case, having already been approved by the state and relatively free of red tape. The line is set to open by 2015, the environmental-impact assessment has already been done, and the state owns more than 90% of the route's right of way. That should reduce the property struggles and legal challenges that have slowed other new rail projects. "Florida is relatively cheap compared to other projects," says Todorovich. "This is the sort of project they can use to build support on a national basis. You need a success."

Still, the initial round of $8 billion — which Biden referred to as "seed money" during his remarks in Tampa — is just a tiny percentage of what it would cost to significantly overhaul the country's rail system. And there are concerns that by spreading the funds to so many different projects in so many different states, it won't be possible to make a real difference in any one place, as Mark Reutter wrote in a new report for the Progressive Policy Institute. It doesn't help that the one region that could most obviously benefit from truly high-speed rail — the Boston-to-Washington corridor — received a mere $112 million in funding, in part because building new track in the congested area would be prohibitively expensive and politically challenging.

Nevertheless, high-speed rail is an idea whose time has come — at least for environmentalists. According to Environment America, high-speed rail uses a third less energy per mile than auto or air travel, and a nationwide system could reduce oil use by 125 million bbl. a year. In addition, high-speed rail represents the kind of long-term infrastructure investment that will pay back for decades, just as the interstate highway system of the 1950s has. "This is a down payment on a truly national program," said Biden, who has logged more than 7,900 round trips of his own on Amtrak. "It will change the way we travel and change the way we work and live." Greens will be happy to see that.

Article: Obama Plans Massive New High Speed Rail

Treehugger, February 17, 2009, “**Obama Plans Massive New High Speed Railroad,”** <http://www.treehugger.com/corporate-responsibility/obama-plans-massive-new-high-speed-railroad.html>

More good news from that [economic stimulus bill](http://www.treehugger.com/files/2009/02/green-stimulus-bill-60-billion.php) that's poised to pump some serious money into green projects across the country: a big chunk of the funding will be used to create a [huge new railroad system](http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0209/18924.html). Now I know what you're thinking—either I'm reporting on the wrong major recession, or now Obama is just copying the New Deal line by line. Not so. This is the biggest investment in rail in US history—and it could seriously change the way Americans travel. Here's how.  The $8 billion investment in a high-speed rail system could effectively modernize much of the US railroads. And in the process, modernize the very concept of traveling by train as well—an idea of travel [deemed antiquated](http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9500E7D71F3FF93AA25751C0A9649C8B63) by much of the nation. The only sector in which Amtrak makes an actual operating profit on running trains is in the Northeast, where larger cities are closer together than in other parts of the nation, and the primary infrastructure has been in place for decades.

Obama hopes to build upon that model by installing railroads to link cities in other parts of the nation—an effort he believes could help revitalize the Midwest. A faster rail service could relieve traffic congestion, conserve energy, prevent pollution, and offer greater accessibility for intercity travel. Which may be why it’s a key part of Obama’s vision for America’s future—you may have heard him mention it a couple months back on the campaign trail?

From Politico: "The time is right now for us to start thinking about high-speed rail as an alternative to air transportation connecting all these cities," Obama said. "And think about what a great project that would be in terms of rebuilding America."

A New Era for Railroads?

And change is possible—after 9/11, for instance, train ticket sales skyrocketed by 40 percent. With the proper incentives, many could again be convinced to ride a less expensive train to their destination instead of flying or driving. Which would be great news: [railroads are one of the most sustainable modes of transportation](http://www.treehugger.com/files/2005/08/railroads_for_s.php) available.

Railroads in places like the Midwest and California routinely operate at a loss, and survive only on government subsidies. And the idea that train travel is outdated—along with a dearth of destination options and [lackluster service](http://www.treehugger.com/files/2009/01/amtrak-arrest-photographer.php)—is among the reasons it struggles. This $8 billion dollar overhaul, combined with an additional $1 billion scheduled for 2010, could go a long way to remedy America's railroad woes. The extensive project will also create thousands of jobs in the process.

With high speed service, more destinations on the menu, and a modern image, Americans might just be willing to park their SUVs and get on the train again.

Article: A Vision for High Speed Rail

WhiteHouse.gov, 2009, **A vision for High Speed Rail,** http://www.whitehouse.gov/blog/09/04/16/a-vision-for-high-speed-rail

"I'm happy to be here. I’m happier than you can imagine," said the Vice President, a noted rail enthusiast, before introducing the President for the release of his [strategic plan](http://www.fra.dot.gov/us/content/31) for high speed rail in America.  Revolving around the $8 billion in the Recovery Act and the $1 billion per year for five years requested in the President’s budget to get these projects off the ground, the [President painted the picture](http://www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/Remarks-by-the-President-and-the-Vice-President-on-High-Speed-Rail/) that will become a reality as a result of these investments: What we're talking about is a vision for high-speed rail in America.  Imagine boarding a train in the center of a city.  No racing to an airport and across a terminal, no delays, no sitting on the tarmac, no lost luggage, no taking off your shoes.  (Laughter.)  Imagine whisking through towns at speeds over 100 miles an hour, walking only a few steps to public transportation, and ending up just blocks from your destination.  Imagine what a great project that would be to rebuild America.

Now, all of you know this is not some fanciful, pie-in-the-sky vision of the future.  It is now.  It is happening right now.  It's been happening for decades.  The problem is it's been happening elsewhere, not here.

In France, high-speed rail has pulled regions from isolation, ignited growth, remade quiet towns into thriving tourist destinations.  In Spain, a high-speed line between Madrid and Seville is so successful that more people travel between those cities by rail than by car and airplane combined.  China, where service began just two years ago, may have more miles of high-speed rail service than any other country just five years from now.  And Japan, the nation that unveiled the first high-speed rail system, is already at work building the next:  a line that will connect Tokyo with Osaka at speeds of over 300 miles per hour.  So it's being done; it's just not being done here.

There's no reason why we can't do this.  This is America.  There's no reason why the future of travel should lie somewhere else beyond our borders.  Building a new system of high-speed rail in America will be faster, cheaper and easier than building more freeways or adding to an already overburdened aviation system –- and everybody stands to benefit.

The [inclusion of high speed rail in the Recovery Act](http://www.fra.dot.gov/us/content/2153) was one of many symbols of the new vision for America and its economy that guided the plan.  As the Vice President explained in his introduction, joined by Transportation Secretary LaHood, in addition to putting Americans to work across the country it went towards several the Recovery Act’s key goals:

And we're making a down payment today, a down payment on the economy for tomorrow, the economy that's going to drive us in the 21st century in a way that the other -- the highway system drove us in the mid-20th century.  And I'm happy to be here.  I'm more happy than you can imagine -- (laughter) -- to talk about a commitment that, with the President's leadership, we're making to achieve the goal through the development of high-speed rail projects that will extend eventually all across this nation.  And most of you know that not only means an awful lot to me, but I know a lot of you personally in this audience over the years, I know it means equally as much to you.

With high-speed rail system, we're going to be able to pull people off the road, lowering our dependence on foreign oil, lowering the bill for our gas in our gas tanks.  We're going to loosen the congestion that also has great impact on productivity, I might add, the people sitting at stop lights right now in overcrowded streets and cities.  We're also going to deal with the suffocation that's taking place in our major metropolitan areas as a consequence of that congestion.  And we're going to significantly lessen the damage to our planet.  This is a giant environmental down payment.

The report formalizes the identification of ten high-speed rail corridors as potential recipients of federal funding. Those lines are: California, Pacific Northwest, South Central, Gulf Coast, Chicago Hub Network, Florida, Southeast, Keystone, Empire and Northern New England. Also, opportunities exist for the Northeast Corridor from Washington to Boston to compete for funds to improve the nation’s only existing high-speed rail service.

**High Speed Rail Negative**
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Glossary

Vocabulary

**Amtrak**. The **National Railroad Passenger Corporation**, [doing business as](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Doing_business_as) **Amtrak** is a [government-owned corporation](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Government-owned_corporation) that was organized on May 1, 1971, to provide [intercity](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Inter-city_rail) [passenger train](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Passenger_train) service in the United States (Wikipedia)

**Annual**. Annual is every year. For example, if you have a subscription to an annual magazine you will receive that magazine once a year.

**Anthropogenic**. Anthropogenic means it is caused by humans. In context, anthropogenic warming is warming caused by humans.

**Appropriation.** An appropriation is the amount of money that is made available for a specific purpose. For example, Congress could appropriate $1 billion to develop new railroads.

**Climate change.** “Climate change” refers to the total average change in the earth’s climate that is due to human influence, particular the burning of fossil fuels (primarily coal and oil)

**Commuter**. Many people live outside large American cities and take local trains to work. These people are referred to as commuters.

**Competitiveness.** Competitiveness refers to the ability of the United States to compete economically by being able to sell goods at affordable prices, particularly prices that lower than companies from other countries. Competiveness refers to the quality of the goods.

**Coral reef.** Coral reefs are underwater structures made from [calcium carbonate](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Calcium_carbonate) secreted by [corals](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Coral). Coral reefs are colonies of tiny living animals found in marine waters that contain few nutrients. Most coral reefs are built from [stony corals](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Stony_coral), which in turn consist of [polyps](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Polyp) that cluster in groups. The polyps are like tiny [sea anemones](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sea_anemone), to which they are closely related.

**Domestic**. Domestic refers to within the United States. The term is contracted to “foreign,” which means outside the United States.

**Depression.** A depression is a severe economic downturn that lasts for many years.

**Electricity grid.** The electricity grid is the power stations and power lines that supply electricity throughout the country.

**Electrification.** Electrification refers to making rail tracks capable of supporting trains that run on electricity.

Glossary

**Export**. When goods are sold and shipped abroad they are exported.

**Federal**. Federal refers to a government structure. In the United States, the federal government is the central governing body of the United States.

**Freight.** Freight is goods that are transferred on things like rail, boats, and airplanes

**Global warming.** Global warming is another term for climate change.

**Great Power.** Great Powers are the major, most powerful countries on Earth. The US, China, and Russia are currently great powers.

**Indisputable**. Indisputable means that something is true and that the truth cannot be refuted.

**Intercity.** Between cities

**Manufacturing**. Manufacturing is the production of goods.

**Monopoly**. A monopoly is an entity that has complete control.

**Oil dependence**. Oil dependence refers to the idea that a country needs to import its oil in order to have enough to meet the domestic demand for oil.

**Revenue.** Revenue is money that is taken in or earned as part of a particular project.

**State**. State refers to the individual 50 states.

**Spearhead**. Spearhead means to lead.

**Strait of Hormuz**. The Strait of Hormuz is a narrow, strategically important [strait](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Strait) between the [Gulf of Oman](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gulf_of_Oman) in the southeast and the [Persian Gulf](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Persian_Gulf). On the north coast is [Iran](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Iran) and on the south coast is the [United Arab Emirates](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_Arab_Emirates) and [Musandam](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Musandam), an [exclave](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Exclave) of [Oman](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Oman).

**Urban Sprawl.** The development of large suburbs on the outskirts of big cities where people live and then commute into work.

Glossary

Acronyms

**AAR.** American Association of Railroads

**CBO.** Congressional Budget Office

**CFR.** Council on Foreign Relations

**CO2.** Carbon Dioxide

**GDP.** Gross Domestic Product

**GHG.** Greenhouse gases

**IPCC.** International Panel on Climate Change

**K-12.** US grades kindergarten-12th grade

**MIT.** Massachusetts Institute of Technology

**NASA.** National Aeronautic and Space Agency

**PTC.** Positive Train Control

**PWRG.** Passenger Rail Working Group

**STB.** Surface Transportation Board

**UCS.** Union of Concerned Scientists

No Harms – Climate Change – Not True

#### [\_\_\_\_]

#### [\_\_\_\_] Climate change theory is false – humans not to blame

Senate Minority Report, 2007

(December, http://epw.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?FuseAction=Minority.SenateReport#report)

**Atmospheric scientist Dr. Nathan Paldor, Professor of Dynamical Meteorology and Physical Oceanography at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem has authored almost 70 peer-reviewed studies and won several awards**. **"First, temperature changes, as well as rates of temperature changes** (both increase and decrease) **of magnitudes similar to that reported by IPCC to have occurred since the Industrial revolution** (about 0.8C in 150 years or even 0.4C in the last 35 years) **have occurred in Earth's climatic history. There's nothing special about the recent rise!"** Paldor told EPW on December 4, 2007. "Second, our ability to make realizable (or even sensible) future forecasts are greatly exaggerated relied upon by the IPCC. This is true both for the numerical modeling efforts (the same models that yield abysmal 3-day forecasts are greatly simplified and run for 100 years!)," Paldor explained. "Third, **the rise in atmospheric CO2 is much smaller** (by about 50%) than **that expected from the anthropogenic activity** (burning of fossil fuels such as oil, coal and natural gas), which implies that the missing amount of CO2 is (most probably) absorbed by the ocean.

No Harms – Climate Change – Humans Can Adapt

**[\_\_\_\_]**

#### [\_\_\_\_] Adaptation to climate change solves

World Bank, 2012

(“Climate Change Adaptation,” http://climatechange.worldbank.org/overview/climate-change-adaptation)

Climate change affects the poor and the vulnerable in two main ways. First, agriculture productivity is very sensitive to changes in rainfall and the length of seasons, and poor people are heavily dependent on agriculture as a source of income and sustenance. Many poor people also live in areas that are acutely vulnerable to severe weather, and greater extremes will continue to make their lives more fragile. **The World Bank is helping developing countries and their people find ways to adapt to the changes that have begun.** Traditional development activities often enhance adaptive capacity, but some can worsen problems. Adaptation is thus not a standalone issue, but needs to be integrated throughout national, sectorial, regional, and local planning processes, as well as at the project level. Developing drought-resistant crops, managing scarce water supplies, protecting forests and coastal ecosystems, and improving access to energy will all help vulnerable groups survive in coming decades.

The World Bank is helping countries adapt in many ways, **including:**

**Improving weather data collection and forecasts** (for farmers and insurers)

**Providing technical assistance** (such as extension services on new crop varieties, help for health systems addressing new diseases)

**Developing and sharing knowledge on options in land use, forestry, and agriculture**

**Assessing risk and vulnerability**

**Prioritizing investment through better understanding of options and costs**

**Helping develop drought- and saline-resistant crops**

Policies:

Eliminating counterproductive incentives (such as subsidies for water-intensive crops)

Creating appropriate incentives for private sector action (including private insurance)

Improving land security and social protection

Improving integrated river-basin and ecosystems-based planning

Institutions:

**Strengthening institutions in key sectors** (including water, agriculture, infrastructure)

Increasing coordination among sectors for disaster risk management

Improving participatory processes and community involvement in decisions

Strengthening disaster preparedness and safety nets for disaster-hit households

Providing key public services (hydro-meteorological services, early warning systems)

No Harms – Competitiveness – Private Sector Solves

#### [\_\_\_\_]

#### [\_\_\_\_] Private capital is sufficient now

McClellan et al., Woodside Consulting vice president, 2011

(Jim, “The Future of Rail”, 5-11, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703834804576301230350030512.html>, DOA: 4-19-12)

MR. MCCLELLAN: I am moderately bullish on the freight railroads. The mainline network is in great shape; as good as I have seen it in my 40-plus years in the business. Railroad finances are in good order. Railroads showed remarkable ability to weather the great recession, and they now seem able to deal with wide swings in traffic volumes in an efficient manner, which is in marked contrast to what I saw in the '60s and '70s. MR. RENNICKE: If the traffic-level trajectories are correct, then ton-mile [one ton of paying freight shipped one mile] growth could be in the 80% range by 2035 to 2040, and on this basis, industry prospects are bright. Rail activity could possibly even double by the midpoint of the century. North American rail-freight rates would continue to be the lowest or one of the lowest in the world, and the industry would finance most or all of its capital requirements without public support.

#### [\_\_\_\_] Private sector solves

Business Insider 2012

(“A Complete Breakdown Of Freight Railroad Spending In The US”, 1-31, <http://www.businessinsider.com/a-complete-breakdown-of-freight-railroad-spending-in-the-us-2012-1>, DOA: 4-19-12)

The Association of American Railroads (AAR) announced yesterday that it plans to spend a record $13 billion on the nation's freight railroads and hire more than 15,000 new employees in 2012. “Unlike trucks, barges or airlines, America’s freight railroads operate on infrastructure they own, build and maintain themselves so taxpayers don’t have to. And this year they are investing at a record rate to meet the demands of the recovering economy,” Edward R. Hamberger, AAR President and CEO, said in a press release.

No Harms – Competitiveness – Economic Collapse Doesn’t Cause War

#### [\_\_\_\_]

#### [\_\_\_\_] Collapse doesn’t cause war – best statistical and historical analyses prove.

Morris Miller, former Executive Director and Senior Economist at the World Bank, 2000

(Interdisciplinary Science Reviews, Vol. 25, Iss. 4, Winter, “Poverty as a cause of wars?” p. Proquest)

The question may be reformulated. **Do wars spring from a popular reaction to a sudden economic crisis** that exacerbates poverty and growing disparities in wealth and incomes? Perhaps one could argue, as some scholars do, that it is some dramatic event or sequence of such events leading to the exacerbation of poverty that, in turn, leads to this deplorable denouement. This exogenous factor might act as a catalyst for a violent reaction on the part of the people or on the part of the political leadership who would then possibly be tempted to seek a diversion by finding or, if need be, fabricating an enemy and setting in train the process leading to war. According to a study undertaken by Minxin Pei and Ariel Adesnik of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, there would not appear to be any merit in this hypothesis. **After studying ninety-three episodes of economic crisis** in twenty-two countries in Latin America and Asia in the years since the Second World War they concluded that:19 **Much of the conventional wisdom about the political impact of economic crises may be wrong ... The severity of economic crisis - as measured in terms of inflation and negative growth - bore no relationship to the collapse of regimes ... (or, in democratic states, rarely) to an outbreak of violence ... In the cases of dictatorships and semidemocracies, the ruling elites responded to crises by increasing repression (thereby using one form of violence to abort another).**

#### [\_\_\_\_] And, every card they read will be based off World War II – that theory is false.

Nial Ferguson, professor of history at Harvard, 2006

(Foreign Affairs, “The Next War of the World”, p. online)

Nor can economic crises explain the bloodshed. What may be the most familiar causal chain in modern historiography links the Great Depression to the rise of fascism and the outbreak of World War II. But **that simple story leaves too much out**. **Nazi Germany started the war in Europe only after its economy had recovered**. Not all the countries affected by the Great Depression were taken over by fascist regimes, nor did all such regimes start wars of aggression. In fact, **no general relationship between economics and conflict is discernible for the century as a whole**. **Some wars came after periods of growth, others were the causes rather than the consequences of economic catastrophe**, and some severe economic crises were not followed by wars.

No Solvency – States Will Reject

#### [\_\_\_\_]

#### [\_\_\_\_] Governors will reject federal money

Business Insider, 2012

(June 5, <http://www.businessinsider.com/californias-failing-project-could-spell-the-end-of-high-speed-rail-for-the-whole-country-2012-6> “California’s Failing Project Could Spell the End of High Speed Rail.”

Republican **governors across the country have criticized high-speed projects and rejected federal** [**money**](http://www.businessinsider.com/californias-failing-project-could-spell-the-end-of-high-speed-rail-for-the-whole-country-2012-6) **to fund rail developmen**t. Mr Obama, meanwhile, has redistributed the rejected money to states like California that are run by Democrats and are more receptive to high-speed rail. All this makes sense. Mr Obama made high-speed-rail funding a big part of his 2008 stimulus package, and political scientists generally believe that a president weighing in on an issue polarizes people's opinions about it. In California, 76% of Republicans now oppose the high-speed-rail project, compared to just 47% of Democrats.  The other problem, of course, is **that powerful local and regional interests are threatened by the high-speed-rail plans. Airlines, freight transporters and not-in-my-backyard activists all have problems with the project. High-speed rail's opponents smell blood and are not going to fall in line, and the train plan is many years from completion**. Unless California's [leaders](http://www.businessinsider.com/californias-failing-project-could-spell-the-end-of-high-speed-rail-for-the-whole-country-2012-6) are truly committed to pushing high-speed rail forward and spending political capital to do so this plan is probably doomed. And when it comes to high-speed rail, as goes California, so goes the nation.

No Solvency – Climate Change

**[\_\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_\_] Building new rail lines expends energy, doesn’t solve climate change

Keet, Steering Committee of the Adirondack Recreational Trail Advocates, 2012

(Lee, “Why we don’t need the railroad restored, even if gas goes to $8/gallon”, 2-20, <http://www.adirondackdailyenterprise.com/page/content.detail/id/529392/Why-we-don-t-need-the-railroad-restored--even-if-gas-goes-to--8-gallon.html?nav=5041>, DOA: 5-15-12, ldg)

And then the final argument: greenhouse gasses. Surely, trains are better. Sorry, not true. To quote Mr. O'Toole's article, "Construction of new rail lines, or reconstruction of existing ones, is very expensive in dollars, energy, and greenhouse gas emissions; yet the most successful lines have attracted only a tiny percentage of motorists out of their automobiles. Even the best rail transit lines provide only small energy and greenhouse benefits relative to the most efficient automobiles. And most rail transit lines in the United States actually consume more energy per passenger mile than the average passenger c**ar**.

No Solvency – Climate Change – Too Fast

**[\_\_\_\_]**

#### [\_\_\_\_] Climate change is too fast – the small emissions reductions of the affirmative are just a drop in the bucket

Atkinson et al., president of the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation, 2010

(Robert, “Ten Myths of Addressing Global Warming and the Green Economy”, June, <http://www.itif.org/files/2010-green-economy-myths.pdf>)

Perhaps no social and economic issue is getting so much attention these days as the need to transition to a low-carbon economy. Most scientific evidence suggests that a 50 to 85 percent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions (GHG) must occur by 2050 to prevent global temperatures from rising more than two degrees Celsius. Toward that end, numerous advocacy groups, scholars, think tanks and others have proposed a variety of steps to take based on a set of assumptions about the green economy. Yet, while we need to take bold action to address climate change, much of what passes for conventional wisdom in this space is in fact either wrong or significantly exaggerated. There are several key reasons why conventional wisdom is incorrect, or at best significantly overstated. One is that because the magnitude of change needed is much larger than many realize, many conventional solutions simply won’t achieve the global scale needed. The simple equation below demonstrates the scale of the challenge. Growth in global GHG emissions is largely a factor of population change, per capita income change, and our “dirtiness” of every unit of consumption. The last factor describes how much less polluting (in terms of GHG emissions) our business-as-usual economy needs to become as the other two factors vary. Greenhouse Gas Change = Population Change \* Per-Capita Income Change \* Dirtiness Factor **If** the goal is to reduce GHG by 50 percent by 2050, it’s not enough for each unit of economic activity to be 50 percent “cleaner.” Global population is expected to grow by 46 percent (not a desirable goal and one we can and should take efforts to slow). Moreover, per-capita income growth is expected to increase by 129 percent (a desirable goal). Put those two factors together, and now the planet’s economic activity must become 84 percent less polluting to achieve the over 50 percent reduction in GHG. That is, we need an 84 percent reduction in our “dirtiness” for every unit of energy we utilize. By any measure, this is a great hurdle given the expectations that neither population nor income growth are going to hold steady over the next four decades. A second factor limiting the discourse is the belief of many that innovation is “manna from heaven” that either just happens or perhaps occurs if we raise the price of carbon by some modest amount. But in fact, innovation in general, and energy innovation in particular, is a quite difficult and complex process that is dependent on much more than modest price signals. Energy innovation requires a coherent energy innovation policy.

No Solvency – Climate Change – China Outweighs

**[\_\_\_\_]**

#### [\_\_\_\_] US irrelevant, China key to climate change

MIT News, 2012

(May 24, “China’s Actions are Crucial on Climate Change,” http://web.mit.edu/newsoffice/2012/china-focus-addressing-climate-change.html)

The report — titled "The Role of China in Mitigating Climate Change" — published in the journal Energy Economics, compares the impact of a stringent emissions reduction policy with and without China's participation. It finds that **China's actions are "essential**." **"As the largest greenhouse gas emitter in the world, without China, climate goal**s — like the 2 degrees Celsius target that most agree is necessary to prevent serious irreversible consequences — **are out of reach," says Sergey Paltsev, the lead author of the study and the assistant director for economic research at MIT's Joint Program on the Science and Policy of Global Change.**  Specifically, the study finds that with China's help the global community is able to limit warming to 2 degrees Celsius, relative to pre-industrial levels. But without China, we miss that mark by about 1 degree Celsius. Not only will it be close to impossible to achieve the 2 degrees mark without China's participation, but **emissions reductions will also be more expensive because substantial costs would shift to only some countries**. That is why the researchers argue for a global economy-wide greenhouse gas tax that spreads the burden of responsibility.

#### [\_\_\_\_] China is the number one CO2 emitter

MIT News, 2012

(May 24, “China’s Actions are Crucial on Climate Change,” http://web.mit.edu/newsoffice/2012/china-focus-addressing-climate-change.html)

The importance of China's participation in a global climate treaty increases with each year, as the country's population, economy and energy use continue to grow rapidly. **From 2000 to 2010, China's energy use grew 130 percent**. That's up from a growth of just 50 percent the previous decade. **With a growing, wealthier population, China has become the world's largest energy consumer — and with it, the world's greatest source of greenhouse gas emissions.** China's share of global energy-related CO2 emissions has increased in just eight years from 14 percent in 2000 to 22 percent in 2008. **Eighty percent of those emissions came from coal, making China the consumer of about half the world's coal.**

No Solvency – Climate Change – Other Emissions Outweigh

**[\_\_\_\_]**

#### [\_\_\_\_] Transportation sector is only 13% of all emissions

Transportation Consultancy, 2012

(“Climate Change in the Transport Sector,” <http://www.trl.co.uk/transport_consultancy/climate_change_in_the_transport_sector.htm>)

Climate change is internationally recognized as one of the greatest challenges facing the world today**. The transport sector generates around 13% of global greenhouse gas emissions and is also one of the sectors most vulnerable to climate change impacts.**

#### [\_\_\_\_] 40% of climate change is due to electricity production

Low Impact Living, 2012

**(**“The Power Behind Our Lives,” <http://www.lowimpactliving.com/pages/your-impacts/electricity1>)

The primary environmental impact of electricity consumption is the production of greenhouse gases that contribute to global warming**. In 2004, 40% of the US total emissions of greenhouse gases was from electricity generation2, and 35% of this was from residential use (higher than the electricity-related greenhouse gases from either industrial or commercial use). Doing the math, this means that the electricity that we consume in our houses represents almost 15% of the US total greenhouse gas emissions.**

No Solvency – Competitiveness

**[\_\_\_\_]**

#### [\_\_\_\_] No economy solvency – high speed rail is not net economic grain

The America Interest, 2012

(May 20, <http://blogs.the-american-interest.com/wrm/2012/05/20/new-high-speed-rail-fail-in-uk/> “New High Speed Rail Fail in UK?”)

**A high profile plan for a high speed rail link between London and England’s rustbelt in the north is running into trouble.** The roughly $50 billion line is backed by those who hope it will boost incomes and business in northern English cities like Birmingham, Manchester and Leeds. **The trouble is that the harder the British stare at the economic impact of the proposed rail line, the less useful it looks — and the more it looks like a huge white elephant of a development project that will never break even. The early calculations of the cost-benefit ratio of the project predicted that every dollar** (actually, pound, but the ratios are the same) **spent would yield $2.4 in economic benefits. The latest figures** [**cut that ratio in half**](http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2012/apr/11/railways-hs2-fewer-economic-benefits)**; there have been four revisions of the rosy figures first proposed, and every new look has reduced the likely benefits**.

No Solvency – Competitiveness – China Example

**[\_\_\_\_]**

#### [\_\_\_\_] High speed rail has been a failure in China

Huffington Post, 2012

(August 12, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/08/12/chinas-high-speed-rail-network\_n\_925260.html)

China's infatuation with high-speed rail soured at bullet train velocity. Six months ago, the rail network was a success symbol and the basis of a planned high-tech export industry. But **after a July crash that killed 40 people, Beijing has suspended new construction and is recalling problem-plagued trains, raising questions about the future of such prestige projects. It was an extraordinary reversal for a project that once enjoyed political status on a level with China's manned space program. High-speed rail has been, along with nuclear power, among an array of areas where critics warn that breakneck, government-driven development might be jeopardizing public safety and adding to financial risks.**

No Solvency – Competitiveness – Other Issues Outweigh

**[\_\_\_\_]**

#### [\_\_\_\_] Many reasons the US is not competitive

Harvard Business Review, 2012

(January, “Capitalism Concerns,” http://harvardmagazine.com/2012/01/harvard-business-school-survey-weaker-u-s-economic-competitiveness)

Although the respondents regarded American universities, **the context for entrepreneurship, and the innovation infrastructure very favorably as they evaluated the business environment, a majority held the American K-12 education system, political system, and tax code in very low regard. Majorities felt that regulation, economic policy, transportation infrastructure, the complexity of the tax code, K-12 education, and the effectiveness of the domestic political system were all factors in making the United States fall behind in competitive terms**.

#### [\_\_\_\_] Our failing educational system is a much larger reason the US competitiveness is declining

Council on Foreign Relations, 2012

(“U.S. Education Reform and National Security,” http://www.cfr.org/united-states/us-education-reform-national-security/p27618?co=C007301)

**The United States' failure to educate its students leaves them unprepared to compete and threatens the country's ability to thrive in a global economy and maintain its leadership role, finds a new Council on Foreign Relations** (CFR)–sponsored Independent Task **Force report on U.S. Education Reform and National Security.** "Educational failure puts the United States' future economic prosperity, global position, and physical safety at risk," warns the Task Force, chaired by Joel I. Klein, former head of New York City public schools, and Condoleezza Rice, former U.S. secretary of state**. The country "will not be able to keep pace—much less lead—globally unless it moves to fix the problems it has allowed to fester for too long,**" argues the Task Force.

No Solvency – Competitiveness – Other Issues Outweigh

**[\_\_\_\_]**

#### [\_\_\_\_] High health care costs undermine competitiveness

Toni Johnson, Council on Foreign Relations, 2012

(March 26, “Healthcare Costs and US Competitiveness,” http://www.cfr.org/health-science-and-technology/healthcare-costs-us-competitiveness/p13325)

**The United States spent more than** [**17 percent of its GDP**](http://www.commonwealthfund.org/Content/Newsletters/Washington-Health-Policy-in-Review/2010/Feb/February-8-2010/National-Health-Expenditures-Now-Grab-173-Percent-of-GDP-Study-Projects.aspx) **on health care, higher than any other developed nation**. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimated in 2008 that number would rise to 25 percent by 2025 **without changes to federal law. Employer-funded coverage is the structural mainstay of the U.S. health insurance system.** A November 2008 Kaiser Foundation report says access to employer-sponsored health insurance has been [on the decline](http://www.kff.org/uninsured/upload/7840.pdf) among low-income workers, and health premiums for workers have risen114 percent in the last decade. Small businesses are less likely than large employers to be able to provide health insurance as a benefit. At 12 percent, **health care is the** [**most expensive benefit**](http://www.uschamber.com/healthcare.htm) **paid by U.S. employers**, according to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Some economists say **these ballooning dollar figures place a heavy burden on companies doing business in the United States and can put them at a substantial competitive disadvantage in the international marketplace. For large multinational corporations, footing healthcare costs presents an enormous expense**..

No Solvency – Urban Sprawl Turn

[\_\_\_\_] High-speed rails causes urban sprawl, increasing car dependency

Jason Kambitsis, city planner and contributing editor for Wired.com, 2010

(Wired, “High-Speed Rail as a Conduit of Sprawl”, http://www.wired.com/autopia/2010/03/high-speed-rail-and-sprawl/)

**The goal for high-speed rail** in the United States, as in Europe — which, like Japan, is held as a model for HSR — **is linking large cities.** **But** the big difference between the European and American approach is Europeans have made a large investment in rail and the accompanying infrastructure that links it with stations and communities. The **United States**, on the other hand, **has invested heavily in a highway system**. The result is our **land use patterns are quite different.** In addition to making rail a priority, **Europe has** long supported public transit and multi-modal transportation infrastructure that supports bicycling, walking and other ways of getting around. It has all but taken the car out of the equation and solved the so-called “last mile” problem — addressing how people get from the transit stop to their final destination. Public transit options, along with dense, compact communities built around transit hubs (an approach called transit oriented development, or TOD) has created inherent convenience and in many cases eliminated dependence on cars. In the United States it is a completely different story. We rarely embrace TOD. **This could be a problem with  high-speed rail. Without a rapid transformation** of our building patterns and a push to make existing communities denser, **high-speed rail could be a conduit of sprawl, not a deterrent. If stations include vast parking lots, or they’re built in remote areas away from urban cores** instead of being made a part of the community, **it will all but guarantee people drive to the stations and create a system that is only accessible by car.** **Drivers** already comfortable with a commute of an hour or more **could move further away from urban centers,** **drive to a station and ride to work** and still enjoy a shorter overall commute time. “**High-speed rail will simply add another layer of access** to the far-flung suburbs/exurbs and Central Valley**, resulting in more mass-produced subdivisions**,” warns Robert Cervero, director of the University of California Transportation Center and author of Development Around Transit.

No Solvency – Urban Sprawl Turn

[\_\_\_\_] Urban sprawl destroys the environment and causes a variety of social ills

Leonardo R. Grabkowski, reporter for the San Francisco Chronicle, 2012

(San Francisco Chronicle, “Negative Effects of Urban Sprawl”, http://homeguides.sfgate.com/negative-effects-urban-sprawl-1716.html)

**Spreading out development creates water distribution problems and can lead to water overconsumption. A typical low-density or suburban community uses more water than a high-density city community.** Landscaping is the primary culprit for this excessive use of water. According to the EPA, 30 percent of the water used daily in the United States is devoted to outdoor use. Loss of Wildlife Habitat The San Francisco Bay Area, with over 400,000 acres of natural landscape, is one of the nation’s six hotspots for biological diversity, according to the Center for Biological Diversity. The region has a wide variety of plant and animal species; unfortunately, 90 of them, including the California tiger salamander, are listed as endangered or threatened. **Rapid development can negatively affect wildlife by tearing down, clearing, or building over its habitat, potentially threatening survival**. This is not only a problem in the San Francisco Bay Area; **it’s a problem in all of America.** Increased Racial and Economic Disparity **When residents relocate** outside of a city’s core, they take their tax dollars with them. Often, it’s **the city’s poorest residents that are left behind. This creates economic disparity and stratification based upon location. It also creates funding problems for the core, which directly affects the money available for education, crime prevention, and maintenance and upkeep.** **Urban sprawl can also lead to economic “white flight.”** According to “Urban Sprawl: A Reference Guide,” urban sprawl leads to racial segregation as minorities are often left behind in the poorest parts of a region. This problem may not be as widespread as it has been in the past, but it's present nonetheless. Increased Risk of Obesity People living in suburban areas are more likely to be obese than people living in urban areas, according to the Ontario College of Family Physicians and the American Planning Association. Both studies show that people living in suburban areas tend to rely on their vehicles more often--even for short trips--instead of walking or cycling. This lower level of activity increases the risk of obesity, which can lead to other health problems such as heart disease, high-blood pressure and diabetes.

No Solvency – Urban Sprawl Turn – Link Extension

**[\_\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_\_] Instead of increasing centralization, high-speed rails increase emigration out of the city

Jason Kambitsis, city planner and contributing editor for Wired.com, 2010

(Wired, “High-Speed Rail as a Conduit of Sprawl”, http://www.wired.com/autopia/2010/03/high-speed-rail-and-sprawl/)

It’s fast, it’s efficient and it is the future of transportation, but will high-speed rail cause sprawl? Yes, it could, warn some urban planners. **Despite the promise of creating more densely populated urban centers, high-speed rail could do quite the opposite by making it easier for people to live far from urban centers.** Let’s use California as an example, since high-speed rail has made the most progress there. The Golden State, long known as a trendsetter for transportation and environmental policy, has received more than [$2.3 billion in stimulus funds](http://gov.ca.gov/press-release/14304/) toward a proposed line [linking San Francisco and Los Angeles](http://www.cahighspeedrail.ca.gov/map.htm) by way of the Central Valley. The money is earmarked for construction, land acquisition and engineering and it follows the $9.95 billion allocated by a state ballot initiative. If and when the line is completed by 2030, riders will zip between the two cities in 2 hours and 38 minutes and pay less than half what it would cost to fly. **But that** convenience **could increase emigration from California’s urban centers to the exurbs and beyond. In other words, it could lead to more sprawl. An example of this can be seen in cities like Palmdale, which is** 58 miles **north of Los Angeles.** By **cutting the commute time** between those two cities from [1 hour and 25 minutes](http://maps.google.com/maps?client=firefox-a&rls=org.mozilla:en-US:official&channel=s&hl=en&source=hp&q=palmdale%20to%20los%20angeles&um=1&ie=UTF-8&sa=N&tab=wl), to 27 minutes**, outward growth** of the Los Angeles area **will undoubtedly continue.** It’s easy to see why — **home prices** **in Palmdale are more than** [half of those in L.A.](http://www.zillow.com/local-info/CA-Palmdale-home-value/r_40227/), and **high-speed rail could make getting downtown as quick and easy as living downtown.** **Pushing people further into the exurbs runs counter to a major goal of high-speed rail**, namely cutting our carbon output while creating denser, more sustainable communities.

No Solvency – Urban Sprawl Turn – Answers to: Urban Sprawl Increasing Now

**[\_\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_\_] Urban sprawl is decreasing now due to high transport costs

Kidd, real estate development advisor, 2012

(Judson Kidd “The Re-Urbanization of Atlanta” May 6th 2012 Coldwell Banker NRT Development Advisors.)

The Unites States Census Bureau recently released updated population estimates for the first time since 2010, and the results were quite surprising.  Despite signs of economic recovery and nearly two years after the technical end of the recession, a reverse trend has developed.  **The exodus of buyers to the outlying suburbs** where homes are larger **is over**.  In fact, **the annual rate of growth in American cities and surrounding urban areas has now surpassed that of the suburbs for the first time in over 20 years.**This decrease in population in outlying areas or “Exurbs” is due to various factors.  For one, the substantial loss in home values in these areas has buyers looking for property with increased price stabilization and higher short-term ROI potential.  With foreclosure inventory nearing the bottom within the I-285 corridor, market sales are on the rise and taking prices along for the ride.  **Energy costs have a direct impact on this new trend** as well.  **The high cost of gasoline discourages long commutes**, and larger suburban homes generally come with higher heating and cooling costs. Finally, young buyers prefer an urban location, and with the emergence of the “Echo Boomers” as the next wave of new home purchasers, **this trend is likely to continue.**

Spending/Taxes Link

#### [\_\_\_\_] High speed rail costs hundreds of billions just for a small section of line and isn’t self supporting even in the most heavily trafficked areas

Washington Post 2012

(Amtrak’s $151 billion high-speed rail plan: Are there cheaper options? July 16, http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/ezra-klein/wp/2012/07/16/amtraks-151-billion-high-speed-rail-plan-are-there-cheaper-options/)

Last week, **we** [**took a look**](http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/ezra-klein/wp/2012/07/10/who-will-get-high-speed-rail-first-california-or-the-northeast/)**at Amtrak’s $151 billion proposal to convert the heavily trafficked Northeast Corridor into true high-speed rail**. Under this vision, the Acela train would no longer average a plodding 70 mph across the system. A trip from New York to Washington, D.C., would take just 94 minutes instead of three hours. Boston to D.C. would take just three hours instead of seven.The catch, as always, is that the $151 billion plan is expensive. When the high-speed line is complete, **Amtrak would generate an operating surplus of about $1.65 billion per year**. That’s a nice jar of change, **but it’s not enough to finance the upgrade** of the rail line. Which means Amtrak would need help from Congress. And while $151 billion spread out over 28 years is a pittance compared with, say, [what the war in Iraq cost](https://twitter.com/mattyglesias/statuses/223779640223858688), the Republican-controlled House doesn’t appear to be in the mood to fund vast new rail infrastructure projects right now.

States Counterplan Solvency

#### [\_\_\_\_] States can invest in rail networks

Rich Sampson, Community Transportation Association, 2012

(Rewarding State Investment in Innercity Rail, <http://web1.ctaa.org/webmodules/webarticles/articlefiles/RAIL_27_Rewarding_State_Investment.pdf>)

**Various states have had a growing, but differ­ing approach to their involvement in the nation’s intercity passenger rail network** since Amtrak’s inception in 1971. Initially, Amtrak assumed responsibility in both financing and operat­ing the totality of the system, and inaugurated a coast-to-coast network, primarily focusing on the long-distance trains it inherited from the privately-owned railroads. The Northeast Corri­dor remained the most striking exception to this approach, where Amtrak continued the tradition of the Pennsylvania and New Haven railroads in providing frequent service along the nation’s most densely-populated corridor. Amtrak operated other corridor routes in Connecticut, Illinois, Massachu­setts, New York, Pennsylvania and Virginia less frequently without the requirement of correspond­ing state investment. Gradually, states began to desire more focused service between their communities than Amtrak was willing or able to provide. **Just a few years after Amtrak’s creation, a trio of states stepped forward with their own invest­ment to restore trains previously operated by the private railroads that had not been retained by the national rail service.** In 1974, California moved to return trains to the San Joaquin Valley and launched a route with that name connect­ing terminals in Oakland and Sacramento with Bakersfield. At the same time, Michigan sought to bring back its east-west line between Port Huron and Chicago, ultimately to be known as the Blue*Water*. Likewise, New York longed for its link be­tween its namesake city and Montreal and estab­lished the *Adirondack*. This set of state-supported trains set a pattern for their peers to emulate.

While the 1980s were largely quiet for expan­sion of state-supported service – aside from North Carolina’s creation of the *Carolinian* and Michi­gan’s *Pere Marquette*, both in 1984 – the 1990s and 2000s saw a steady ramp-up of state and regional corridor routes. California – already ac­customed to the state-funded train process with the *San Joaquin* – added two new routes, the *Capitol Corridor* and *Pacific Surfliner*. Today, they are Amtrak’s busiest routes outside the Northeast Corridor (*for more information on California’s ex­tensive intercity rail network, see RAIL #11 – ed*). **Vermont took the lead in New England,** debut­ing the *Vermonter* in 1995 between St. Albans and Washington, D.C – via the Northeast Corridor – and the *Ethan Allen Express* between Rutland and New York City the following year. Five years later, Maine followed suit, initiating the *Downeaster* between Portland and Boston. It has since become one of Amtrak’s fastest-growing lines since its 2001 opening *(for more information on Amtrak’s Downeaster, see RAIL #8 – ed)*.
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Summary

This Affirmative case argues that the United States should strengthen its investment in transportation infrastructure by supporting shipping through inland waterways – the domestic waterways (rivers and lakes) that are part of the geographic United States.

The Affirmative case claims one main advantage – U.S. agricultural exports. If critical infrastructure like locks (devices for raising and lowering boats) and dams were to fail on US rivers, ships would not be able to pass through for a long time. If ships couldn’t get though the rivers they would be unable to transport the large volume of grains and other goods produced by US farmers. A large percent of the crops grown by US farmers are sent to other countries and used to keep food cheap around the world. If exports of food were disrupted it would make food harder to get across the globe, leading to starvation and social unrest.

A second Affirmative “add-on” advantage about the efficiency of the transportation network increasing the economy and the effectiveness of the military is also included.

Glossary

Vocabulary

**Globalization.** The spread of capitalism throughout the globe and the integration of different countries into one market.

**Inland Waterways.** Domestic lakes and rivers.

**Locks.** A lock is a device for raising and lowering boats between stretches of water of different levels on river and canal waterways.

**Merchant Marine.** The fleet of commercially owned vessels that are operated by the private sector that can be utilized by the United States in the event of a national security emergency.

**Acronyms**

**(US) DOD.** United States Department of Defense. This is an executive agency that is in-charge of the US military.

**(US) DOT.** United States Department of Transportation. This is an executive agency that is in-charge of transportation in the United States.

**GDP.** Gross Domestic Product. The total economic output of the country.
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#### Contention I. The Status Quo

The infrastructure that supports our inland waterways is decaying—its failure could halt inland river commerce

Post-Gazette 2012

(Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, “Water torture: Congress needs to act on decaying locks and dams,” March 25, 2012, <http://old.post-gazette.com/pg/12085/1219052-192.stm> )hhs-ps

Pittsburgh, which owes its location and historic emergence to the meeting of three rivers, is particularly in peril. **The region's 23 locks and dams, key to the annual passage of 33 million tons of coal, petroleum and other commodities, are some of the oldest in the nation**. At the Elizabeth locks and dams, 105 years old, **chunks of concrete periodically fall from a collapsing roof in the tunnel that carries water to fill and empty the lock chambers**. Farther up the Monongahela River at Charleroi, the walls of a lock built in 1932 sway back and forth with each filling and emptying. **What happens if or when a catastrophic failure occurs? River traffic will shut down for months. Local economies will suffer. Cargoes will be put on more expensive rail cars and trucks** -- barges are estimated to be $14 a ton cheaper -- and this will have costly implications for businesses and consumers alike. Electricity rates will go up; an October study by the corps estimated that a **closure** of the Lower Mon **could increase electricity costs by $1 billion annually.** Communities that take water from the river could experience problems. When disaster strikes, it will come because of absent-minded, half-hearted political neglect. **More than half the nation's locks and dams, built to last 50 years, are still operating years after their projected life.** To put it another way, previous generations have bequeathed great works of engineering to Americans living today, but the challenge of keeping up the system has not been met. While some projects proceed, others are put off or delayed. **With each delay comes more complications and greater cost**. The Corps of Engineers is forced to play a losing game of catch-up, making emergency repairs to put off the day of reckoning.
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#### Contention II. Harms

#### Failure of one river lock could bring all river commerce to a standstill

Kristin Meira, Executive Director @ Pacific Northwest Waterways Association, 2012

(Political Transcript of a hearing of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, proquest)

Early in the last decade, our colleagues at the Portland and Walla-Walla Districts of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers recognized that our aging locks would require strategic repairs to remain operational and reliable. They also recognized that these projects would need to be planned and executed to have the least impact to our regional and national economy. It's important to remember the scale of our navigation infrastructure projects. A catastrophic failure of one of our lock gates would translate to at least a one-year closure of that project. That is how long it takes to design, fabricate, and install a lock gate of that size. We also do not have any smaller, backup locks at our projects. Allowing our locks to degrade to the point of failure simply is not an option. A closure of one of our projects creates a bottleneck for the entire system.
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#### Collapse of inland waterway infrastructure crushes US agricultural exports

Katie Micik, Writer at Agfax, 2012

(January 25, “Waterway Lock Failure Would be Severe Economic Blow, study finds”, http://agfax.com/2012/01/25/waterway-lock-failure-would-be-severe-economic-blow-study-finds/)

A failure at one of six focus locks in a new study would cost agricultural producers between $900,000 and $45 million depending on how long the lock was out of commission. A three-month lock closure on the nation’s inland waterway system would increase the cost of transporting grains and oilseeds by $71.6 million, according to new study funded by the United Soybean Board and the checkoff’s Global Opportunities program. “Should a catastrophic failure of lock and dam infrastructure occur, agricultural producers — and consequently the American consumer — will suffer severe economic distress,” the report stated. Barges carry 89% of the soybeans and 91% of the corn that U.S. companies export though the Gulf of Mexico each year. A lock closure on one of the nation’s main barge highways — the Mississippi, Ohio and Illinois Rivers — that lasted for three months would shift 5.5 million tons of grains and oilseeds to other modes of transportation, adding stress to congested highways and increasing railcar demand, driving up freight prices. The 352-page study conducted by the Texas Transportation Institute at Texas A&M University took a lock-by-lock look at the inland waterway system. It estimated the economic impact on crop prices paid to producers and transportation costs incurred by shifting modes. It delves into detail on six focus locks and even identifies the crop reporting districts used by USDA and congressional districts that would see the biggest drop in commodity prices. It identified bottlenecks and tracked how long barges have to wait to pass through locks. (A PDF of the study can be found here: http://www.unitedsoybean.org/…) If the LaGrange lock on the Illinois River failed, corn prices would drop $0.70 per ton and soybean prices would drop $2.45 per ton for the Illinois crop reporting district composed of LaSalle, McLean, Bureau and other counties in the state’s 11th Congressional District. (Note: this study uses current districts, not new districts that go into effect in ­the next election.) Switching to rail and trucks would cost $4.3 million in that crop reporting district alone. Most locks were built to last 50 years, and more than half of U.S. locks are older than that. More than one-third of the locks are more than 70 years old. Lock rehabilitation, another term for extensive maintenance and upgrades, can expand a lock’s lifespan from 50 to 75 years, the study said. Navigation outages have increased more than threefold since 2000, from about 25,000 hours to 80,000 hours on the Ohio River due to the wear and tear of age. Two locks failed recently: The Markland Lock was closed in 2009 for five months and the Greenup Lock in 2010 for a month. The combined cost of rehabilitation and maintenance on the study’s six focus locks totals $4 billion, but only $1.8 billion has been appropriated for the projects, according to the study. In the current budget environment, funding for large, multi-year infrastructure projects can be hard to come by. “Delays and budget overruns have become so severe that they are causing other projects to lose funding or be delayed by a number of years,” the study said, citing the Olmsted Locks and Dam project. The Olmsted Locks and Dam project on the Ohio River was first authorized by Congress in 1988 and has seen its estimated completion slip to 2014 and its cost balloon. “The GO (United Soybean Board’s and the soybean checkoff’s Global Opportunity) committee invested in this study to calculate the impact of the worsening condition of the lock and dam system and what the impact would be on the rail and highway System if those locks failed,” said GO committee chair Laura Foell, soybean farmer from Schaller, Iowa, in a news release. “It is important for all in the industry and in the public sector to have the information necessary to make informed decisions when it comes to investing in our locks and dams.” The models used in the study also indicated that by 2050, tonnage of crops shipped by truck and rail will increase by 5.5 million and 9.6 million tons, respectively. Tonnage transported by barge is projected to drop by nearly 15 million tons, reflecting a lack of investment in waterways. “It is important that we have a robust transportation system,” Foell said. “Only by using a combination of the lock and dam system, rail system and truck system can we continue to move our products in a manner that will help us feed the world.”

1AC – 4/6

This would be devastating for US farmers and our ability to feed the world

United Soybean Board 2012

(<http://www.unitedsoybean.org/topics/global-opportunities/u-s-farmers-and-consumers-could-pay-if-river-locks-fail/>, 1/26, “U.S. Farmers and Consumers Could Pay if River Locks Fail”)

Up to 89 percent of U.S. soybeans exported through the lower Mississippi ports, such as the port of New Orleans, arrive there via the locks along the Mississippi River and other U.S. inland waterways. With numbers like this, it’s apparent that these waterways and the locks moving barges through them remain vital to move U.S. soybeans and soy products. A United Soybean Board (USB) Global Opportunities (GO) program-funded study found that deteriorating concrete and failing electrical and mechanical systems of major U.S. locks and dams could cause failures and “…severe economic distress” for U.S. farmers and consumers. “U.S. farmers should begin to understand that we can produce all of the commodities that we want, but unless we have the infrastructure to ship those products to their final destination, we will not be successful in feeding our country and the world,” says Laura Foell, soybean farmer from Schaller, Iowa, and chair of the GO committee. More than half of the locks and dams that currently make up the U.S. Inland Marine Transportation System exceed their 50-year usable lifespan, according to the report. More than one-third top 70 years of age, a concern because usually major rehabilitation is necessary to expand the typical lifespan from 50 to 75 years, according to the study. Just on the Ohio River alone, the time locks have been out of service has more than tripled since 2000, rising from 25,000 hours to 80,000 annually. And that gets expensive. This study shows that a three-month lock closure would increase the cost of transporting 5.5 million tons of oilseeds and grain, the average amount of grain shipped by barge during that period, by $71.6 million. A failure at any of the locks examined by the study could cost U.S. farmers from up to $45 million in lost revenue. “The lock and dam system is rapidly deteriorating which puts added pressure on the rail and highway system to move our product from the farm to its destination,” adds Foell. “It is important that we have a robust transportation system. Only by using a combination of the lock and dam system, rail system, and truck system can we continue to be able to move our products in a manner that will help us feed the world.”
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Shocks to the global food supply could affect billions of the most vulnerable people on Earth

Tampa Tribune 1996

(Tampa Tribune, 1-20-96)

On a global scale, food supplies - measured by stockpiles of grain - are not abundant. In 1995, world production failed to meet demand for the third consecutive year, **said** Per **Pinstrup-Andersen, director of the International Food Policy Research Institute** in Washington, D.C. As a result, grain stockpiles fell from an average of 17 percent of annual consumption in 1994-1995 to 13 percent at the end of the 1995-1996 season, he said. That's troubling, Pinstrup-Andersen noted, since 13 percent is well below the 17 percent the United Nations considers essential to provide a margin of safety in world food security. During the food crisis of the early 1970s, world grain stocks were at 15 percent. "**Even if they are merely blips, higher** international **prices can hurt poor countries that import a significant portion of their food**," he said. "Rising **prices can** also **quickly put food out of reach of the 1.1 billion people** in the developing world **who live on a dollar a day or less**." He also said many people in low-income countries already spend more than half of their income on food.

To correct this problem we propose the following plan:

**The United States federal government should substantially invest in inland waterway modernization.**
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#### Contention III. Solvency

Federal government investment is crucial to create an effective system of waterway infrastructure

Colonel Donald E. Jackson, United States Army, 2007

(LEVERAGING THE STRATEGIC VALUE OF THE U.S. INLAND WATERWAY SYSTEM,www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA469583)

**The inland waterway system of the United States stands as a minimally exploited system that, if optimized, could help eliminate the congestion of overland transport, pollution, and provide a low cost alternative to long haul passages.** The USDOT should aggressively promote inland waterways as an effective alternative to overland transportation. U.S. Inland Waterway System stakeholders must embrace emerging technologies that more efficiently manage traffic on inland waterways to mitigate lock-imposed delays. **An intra-governmental approach to managing national water resources must be better integrated at the local, state, and federal level, eliminating political impediments to system efficiency**. **Integrated planning to effectively link the national transportation network with state and local intermodal infrastructure must be encouraged and managed strategically**. **The federal government must lead efforts to develop adequate funding strategies, seeking public-private collaboration**, to maintain the investment streams that support new construction, operations, and maintenance of the inland waterway system, **making it a reliable and affordable means of transportation in the future.** Inland waterway infrastructure must be prioritized and resources focused on the most value- added gateways supporting objectives of the national freight transportation system. **Overall the system should be repaired and modernized and, in certain cases, enlarged to meet the industry standard requirement for locks** of 1200 feet. **The federal government and the USDOT, using an interagency approach, must continue to develop transportation strategies that encourage the balanced growth of each industry sector, leading leads to more effective integration of inland waterway transportation**. The USTRANSCOM deployment and distribution model should be commercially replicated at the national level to highlight alternative freight transportation planning opportunities that leverage the capabilities of each transport mode. The USDOT must provide shippers incentives for increased use of inland waterways, expanding container-on- barge opportunities to alleviate congestion and increase capacity of the freight transportation system at the national level.

General Economy Add-On

#### [\_\_\_] Investing in waterway infrastructure will strengthen the economy

US Department of Transportation, 2011

(April, America’s Marine Highway Report to Congress, <http://www.marad.dot.gov/documents/MARAD_AMH_Report_to_Congress.pdf>)

America’s Marine Highway has an important role as an alternative and supplement to highway and rail movements of freight and passengers. An important component of the value of this role stems from its contribution to resiliency of the surface transportation system and in providing options to shippers and passengers who might otherwise be captive to another transportation mode. **A Marine Highway corridor that is fully integrated with landside infrastructure can help to maintain critical interstate, regional, and local personnel and freight flows even in the case of multiple landside failures, such as downed bridges or flooded highways. The value of this resiliency to shippers and the economy at large is real and can be enormous when disasters and other blockages occur** (see section of this report on Public Safety and Security). Even if such extreme events were not to occur, resiliency has a day-to-day value to the public. **Economists attempt to measure day-to-day benefits of this resiliency through “option values.”** Water transportation services, such as passenger ferries, may have an option value to car-owners who value the opportunity to use the ferry service at those times when their vehicles are unavailable (due to breakdowns or weather), highway bridges become congested due to traffic incidents, or when they cannot drive (due to physical impairments). Thus, even though they may not use the water service frequently or at all, its availability has a real value to them. The same logic would be true, more broadly, for freight shippers and the nation at large with regard to the Marine Highway system. **Although some shippers may choose not to use Marine Highway services, their availability during times of disruption to a preferred mode is of real value**. Further research would be needed to quantify the option value of this system. In a more direct sense, America’s Marine Highway offers real savings to shippers because it represents a competing transportation mode to rail and highway service. Shippers who have access to more than one competitive long-distance modal service may experience lower shipping rates than do shippers who have access to only one suitable long-distance mode.

General Economy Add-On

#### [\_\_\_] Inland water ways play a critical role in moving manufactured goods

David Grier, U.S. Army Engineer Institute for Water Resources, 2002

(The Challenge to Modernize the U.S. Inland Waterways, <ftp://ftp.hamburg.baw.de/pub/Kfki/Bib/2002_Dredging/PDFs/40680-021-005.PDF>)

**Inland waterways in the United States play a vital role in the movement of bulk cargoes and manufactured goods in both foreign and domestic commerce**. **The inland waterway system allows the competitive movement of** huge quantities of liquid and dry bulk **cargoes** between deep water ports and distant points of production or consumption in the nation's interior. In recent years, U.S. inland waterway traffic has approximated 630 million tons annually, accounting for about 15 percent of total intercity commerce by volume. Over 50 percent of U.S. grain exports depend on this river network. **Millions of tons of U.S. foreign trade in petroleum products, chemicals, forest products, metal ores, steel products and mineral aggregates all depend on the inland waterway system.**

Hegemony Add-on

#### [\_\_\_] Inevitable loss of economic dominance will erode United States global leadership unless the US is capable of projecting its military power abroad

Colonel Donald E. Jackson, United States Army, 2007

(LEVERAGING THE STRATEGIC VALUE OF THE U.S. INLAND WATERWAY SYSTEM,www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA469583)

The United States is currently the international leader in economic prosperity, producing the highest Gross Domestic Product (GDP) in the world. **As the only remaining military superpower, the United States also has the ability to rapidly project combat forces anywhere in the world to protect its vital national interests. Experts, however, predict U.S. economic dominance may be overcome by the year 2020. Globalization creates unlimited potential for both international economic growth and conflict around the world. In order to maintain a competitive edge, the United States must assure the strategic mobility of our economic and military elements of power.**

#### [\_\_\_] Inland waterways are critical to military power projection

Colonel Donald E. Jackson, United States Army, 2007

(LEVERAGING THE STRATEGIC VALUE OF THE U.S. INLAND WATERWAY SYSTEM,www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA469583)

**Inland waterways present a possible alternative to overland transport** that has been underutilized in the past. The EU recognizes and relies upon their existing water highways, committing to a more balanced approach for future transport. The core network links the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxemburg, France, Germany, and Austria via a myriad of easily accessible rivers and canals, carrying cargo such as heavy materials, bulk industrial goods, building products, containers, oversized loads, and waste. Inland waterway transport in the EU has experienced a growth rate of 17% over the past decade. Inland waterways are a strategic asset to the nation, **enabling the U.S. to significantly increase economic output in both domestic and international markets, and project military power more rapidly and effectively into the 21st Century**. Over the next 20 years economists estimate that inland navigation will increase by more than 35%. **The inland waterway system is a potential resource upon which we can increase the flow of military cargo**. Continued application of technology to barge operations and integration of the inland waterway system into the nation’s intermodal system makes this an area ripe for additional development. **Waterways already move important national defense resources and other supplies in large quantities for the armed forces**. As a mode of transportation, the inland waterway system is quiet, low profile, and off the public radar.

Hegemony Add-on

[\_\_\_] **Instability and war are inevitable—only a credible power projection by the US can build coalitions and deter potential military conflicts across the globe**

Wyatt Barnes, partner at Roney and Co., 1998

(*Strategic Review*, Fall)

**Only the United States could supply the indispensable degree of state power—military, political, and economic—that not only deterred the Soviet Union but emboldened our allies to stand fast.** For once, we did not let our armed forces fall into desuetude, although there were slippages that were rectified, often just in time. **It was that state power, massive and credible, that made peace and Cold War victory possible. That victory that** triumph of American strength and will, **creates a new set of threats** of equal force and greater complexity. There are the malignant trouble points: the Bosnias, the **Kosovos**, the Macedonias; and the **Iraqs**, the **Irans**, the **Afghanistans**; and the **Cambodias**, the Myanmars, the **Koreas**; the restive Timorese, the contentious Chechnians, the Disputatious **Caucasus** states. Any of them can ignite a conflagration that may spread and merge with others, as can such festering crises as **India-Pakistan and China-Taiwan. Other nations** sullenly quiescent may decide to realize their “destinies” to recover lands previously lose, while still others **may feel their security threatened by adjacent turmoil. Violence will engulf the world. The state power of the United States that won the long Cold War is still in being**, even though **its military component** has seriously attenuated. That **must be strengthened** and adjusted to deal with the new and different threats that have emerged. A continental missile defense is essential and must be urgently pursued. Chemical and biological warfare defenses must be energetically advanced. Terrorism must be dealt with relentlessly with every means. And we must cauterize the decay afflicting our forces and reverse current trends. All this is essential, but **equally imperative is the need to act proactively when some trouble spot flares that might spread. And to do that properly requires American will to act, and that will must be clearly perceived by the world, friends as well as actual and potential miscreants.** Threats to peace can arise from probable or actual aggression by a nation against another that can endanger regional or world peace, an internal upheaval that can spill over into nearby nations, exported terrorism that the nations hosting the perpetrators cannot or will not suppress, or any similar contingency. Acting against such dangers is vital, but it will be extraordinarily difficult and require resolve. It will also be expensive, in money and American lives. **Diplomatic measures should be undertaken** first, either alone, with allies, through the United Nations, or through all three channels. **Economic steps can be taken**, with safeguards to ensure effectiveness. **But** histories of such **moves to restrain dangerous behavior are discouraging because they were not backed by credible consistently applied, and decisive strong military power;** thus potentially rampant states or organizations had no real incentive to abandon their ways. The lesson is clear; **we must act militarily anywhere in the world if peaceful pressure is seen to fail.**

Harms – Waterway Infrastructure Failing Now

**[\_\_\_]**

#### [\_\_\_] Federal support for inland waterway transportation has collapsed

David Grier, U.S. Army Engineer Institute for Water Resources, 2002

(The Challenge to Modernize the U.S. Inland Waterways, <ftp://ftp.hamburg.baw.de/pub/Kfki/Bib/2002_Dredging/PDFs/40680-021-005.PDF>)

This paper examines the vital role the inland waterways play in U.S. domestic and foreign commerce. **The inland waterway system allows the competitive movement of huge quantities of liquid and dry bulk cargoes between deep water ports** and distant points of production or consumption in the nation's interior. **The federal government has taken the lead to develop and maintain our inland waterways infrastructure** through a combination of dredging, river training works, and navigation locks and dams. **But nearly half of these locks and dams now exceed their 50-year design lives. At the same time traffic has continued to grow and there is a need for larger replacement locks at many locations.** Further, as the system ages the need for maintenance increases. But federal budget constraints have postponed critical maintenance. The queue of new or replacement lock projects awaiting construction continues to grow and schedules of many projects now underway are being stretched, increasing congestion and reducing project benefits. This paper focuses on concerns for the physical integrity and the decline in funding of a critical intermodal transportation link for commercial traffic between U.S. coastal ports and inland origins and destinations.

Harms – Infrastructure Failure Leads to Food Price Spikes

**[\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_] A failure of waterway infrastructure would lead to a global spike in food prices

Dick Lee, Communications consultant, 2008

(“Lock failure on rivers would have a major impact on corn and soybean producers”, http://agebb.missouri.edu/commag/news/archives/v17n1/news9.htm)

Barges provide a lower cost mode of transportation for a wide range of commodities. By shipping the same 2005 commodity volumes to the same destinations would cost an additional $580 million by rail or $1.6 billion by truck, according to figures in the study. A 90-day lock failure from October through December of 2005 on either river would have had a $219 million to $585 million impact on corn and soybean producers alone, depending on rail rate behavior, the study indicates. These figures are based on no rail rate increase at the low end of losses to a 25% increase in rail rates at the high end. The study considers only the impact on corn and soybean movement on the upper Mississippi and Illinois rivers which accounts for about 44% of total volume transported annually through the two locks. "We looked at everything that is crossing these two locks, its origins and destinations, and did a simple cost analysis to see how much more it would cost to ship by train or truck," Meyer said. "Both locks in the study were built in 1939 and are maintained by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers." Alternative transportation rates assumptions may understate the change in cost for other transportation moves, Meyer said. The overall economic impact of a lock failure goes beyond added immediate costs for alternative transportation of grain. "If you increase the transportation cost from Iowa to the Gulf you affect the price of all the grain produced in the region-not just that flowing on the river," Meyer said. "When you shut off the river you push down prices in Iowa for corn and push prices up at the Gulf." "Lower prices in Iowa will increase demand and some producers will store, anticipating that the river will reopen," Meyer said. Time is another factor in considering the economic impact of lock failure. Shipping on the Mississippi River is much more seasonal than on the Illinois River. "Fall would be a bad time for agricultural commodities if a lock failed," Meyer noted.

Harms – Infrastructure Key to Agricultural Exports

**[\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_] Inland waterway infrastructure is critical to agricultural exports

Kruse et al., Director at the Center for Ports and waterways, 2011

(“America’s Locks & Dams: “A Ticking Time Bomb for Agriculture?”, www.unitedsoybean.org/wp-content/uploads/Americas\_Locks\_And\_Dams.pdf)

Agriculture accounted for 22% of all transported tonnage and 31% of all ton-miles in the United States in 2007.1 The surface transportation system in the U.S. is central to agriculture’s ability to compete in domestic and world markets. The rapidly deteriorating condition of the nation’s lock and dam infrastructure imperils the ability of the waterborne transportation system to provide a service that will enable U.S. agricultural producers to continue to compete. Should a catastrophic failure of lock and dam infrastructure occur, agricultural producers—and consequently the American consumer—will suffer severe economic distress. This research analyzes data and evaluates information that will illustrate this vulnerability at a micro level rather than the traditional macro level. The task of transporting agricultural commodities from the farm to first handlers and processors and ultimately to domestic and international retail markets and ports requires a highly developed, integrated transportation network, of which marine transportation is a vital component. A high percentage of these commodities pass through one or more locks on their way to market. Should a waterway be closed due to one or more lock failures, the resultant increase in cost that would be incurred in utilizing truck or rail transportation would decrease or even eliminate the cost advantage of U.S. Midwestern producers. This would be especially detrimental to export shipments. From 2005 through 2009, 87–91% of corn exported through lower Mississippi ports arrived at the ports via barge; for soybeans, the percentage was 87–89%.2

Answers to: No Impact to Food Shocks

**[\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_] Food shortages cause devastating global effects

George Plumb, Environmental Activist, 2008

(“Was Malthus just off a few decades?” 5/18, http://www.timesargus.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AI D=/20080518/FEATURES05/805180310/1014/FEATURES05)

**Once again the world's food situation is bleak**. According to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the price of wheat is more than 80 percent higher than a year ago, and corn prices are up by 25 percent. Global cereal stocks have fallen to their lowest level since 1982. Prices have gone so high that the United Nations World Food Program, which aims to feed 73 million people this year, reported it might have to reduce rations or the number of people it will help. **Food riots are happening in many countries and threaten to bring down some countries as starving people demand better from their government**. However, **this time the problem will not be so easy to solve**. There are some 75 million more people to feed each year! Consumption of meat and other high-quality foods — mainly in China and India — has boosted demand for grain for animal feed. **Poor harvests due to bad weather in this country and elsewhere have contributed. High energy prices are adding to the pressures as some arable land is converted from growing food crops to biofuel crops and making it more expensive to ship the food that is produced**. According to Lester Brown, president of the World Policy Institute, "**This troubling situation is unlike any the world has faced before. The challenge is not simply to deal with a temporary rise in grain prices, as in the past, but rather to quickly alter those trends whose cumulative effects collectively threaten the food security that is a hallmark of civilization. If food security cannot be restored quickly, social unrest and political instability will spread and the number of failing states will likely increase dramatically, threatening the very stability of civilization itself**."

Answers to: No Impact to Food Shocks

**[\_\_\_]**

#### [\_\_\_] Food spikes ensure global starvation and instability

Joachim Braun, Center for Development Research, 2010

(August 18, “Food insecurity, hunger and malnutrition: necessary policy and technology changes”, http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1871678410005546)

At their peaks in the second quarter of 2008, world prices of wheat and maize were three times higher than at the beginning of 2003, and the price of rice was five times higher. In response to high food prices, poor households had to limit their food consumption, shift to even less-balanced diets, and spend less on other goods and services that are essential for their health and welfare, such as clean water, sanitation, education and health care [7]. Food price hikes have also worsened micronutrient deficiencies, with negative consequences for people's nutrition and health, such as impaired cognitive development, lower resistance to disease and increased risks during childbirth for both mothers and children. Since children's nutrition is crucial for their physical and cognitive development and for their productivity and earnings as adults, the health and economic consequences of insufficient food and poor diets are lifelong – for the individuals as well as for society. A 2008 Lancet article shows that men who benefited from a randomized nutrition intervention when they were young children earned wages that were 50% higher than those of nonparticipants three decades later [8]. Thus, it must be assumed that even when a multiyear price shock ends, the adverse consequences for the poor and food insecure continue for decades. The global financial crisis and recession are now adding to the burden on the poor as wages are lost, many small farmers find themselves unable to pay off their debts and capital for agriculture is further limited. With food and general costs of living on the rise, people in more than 60 countries turned to the streets in protest in 2007 and 2008. IFPRI estimates that recession and reduced investment in agriculture could raise international grain prices by 30% and push 16 million more children into malnutrition in 2020 compared with continued high economic growth and maintained investments [7]. At a global scale, the decline in investments leading to cuts in agricultural supply seems to be stronger than the demand decline due to the recession. These trends might soon put again strong upward pressure on food prices combined with increased price volatility. The challenge of feeding the world has greatly increased. The recent hikes in food prices are not exceptionally high from a historical perspective but they have greatly increased the challenge of feeding the world's growing population [7]. Since the time of notoriously high food prices in the 1870s, world population has increased more than five times reaching 6.7 billion today and it is expected to reach 9 billion by 2050. To overcome existing hunger, feed an additional 2 billion people and accommodate rising demand from income growth, food production would have to be doubled by 2050.

Answers to: Inland Transportation Funded Now

**[\_\_\_]**

#### [\_\_\_] Existing financing inadequate

Institute for Water Resources, Army Corps of Engineers, 2012

(April, US Port and Inland Waterways Modernization Strategy, http://www.iwr.usace.army.mil/docs/portswaterways/Port\_and\_Inland\_Waterways\_Options\_for\_the\_Future\_Working\_Draft\_v1\_2012\_Apr\_01.pdf)

To fully meet the challenges of and realize the opportunities presented by increased use of *post-Panamax* vessels in global trade, **the existing capacity of the nation’s ports and waterways must be maintained and additional capacity must be built. Both paths require a significant financial commitment. T**he current level of USACE navigation funding is not adequate to meet the critical modernization needs of the nation and take advantage of these opportunities. **Available financial options for meeting these needs vary from an increased Federal commitment to the divestiture of the Federal financial role. There is a growing consensus that the existing budgeting process and budget levels are not adequate to meet the critical needs of future modernization.** The current process collects revenues for funding the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund (HMTF), allocating those dollars to USACE navigation programs according to Federal budget priorities and assigned budget ceilings and providing additional funding for channel deepening with revenues from the general treasury.

#### [\_\_\_] Current budget inadequate

Institute for Water Resources, Army Corps of Engineers, 2012

(April, US Port and Inland Waterways Modernization Strategy, http://www.iwr.usace.army.mil/docs/portswaterways/Port\_and\_Inland\_Waterways\_Options\_for\_the\_Future\_Working\_Draft\_v1\_2012\_Apr\_01.pdf)

The vision to maintain our existing infrastructure and to expand it where and when needed can only be achieved through a successful partnership between the Federal government, local sponsors and the navigation industry. **The Federal role in navigation maintenance and development is coming under increased scrutiny from waterway users, shippers, port authorities, environmental groups and local governments. The USACE budget has been challenged to meet both the needs to maintain the existing system and increase capacity where needed. The USACE construction budget has declined in real terms from about $2.6 billion in FY 2006 to less than $1.7 billion in FY 2012 in constant 2010 dollars.** (USACE) Only a fraction of these funds are available for navigation capacity expansion. **The current budgetary environment will not sustain the dual needs to maintain and expand the nation’s navigation capacity.**

Answers to: Other Forms of Military Transportation

**[\_\_\_]**

#### [\_\_\_] Transportation infrastructure critical to military power projection

Colonel Donald E. Jackson, United States Army, 2007

(LEVERAGING THE STRATEGIC VALUE OF THE U.S. INLAND WATERWAY SYSTEM,www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA469583)

**Transportation infrastructure supports our national security** as well as our economy. **The Defense Transportation System (DTS) is an integral part of the U.S. national transportation system**. Close coordination among a wide variety of military and federal agencies is essential to meeting national wartime or contingency transportation requirements. The U.S. Transportation Command (USTRANSCOM) provides the process for Defense Department (DOD) global transportation management. This process establishes an integrated transportation system that is used across the range of military operations, providing the most effective use of all transportation modes from origin to destination. In 2003 the Secretary of Defense designated USTRANSCOM the Distribution Process Owner (DPO). As the DPO, USTRANSCOM develops and directs the Joint Deployment and Distribution Enterprise to globally project national security capabilities. **Future distribution requirements are not limited to contingency operations in distant lands. The Defense Transportation Coordination Initiative is a distribution initiative that contributes to logistics transformation. This concept identifies use of a transportation coordinator to integrate and synchronize movement of transportation industry, streamlining the process of moving a variety of DOD cargo**. In 2005, USTRANSCOM’s Surface Deployment and Distribution Command (SDDC) synchronized 212 vessel operations and the related land movement by truck, rail, and barge in support of DOD operations worldwide, moving over 22,239,700 square feet of unit cargo. Since USTRANSCOM works with a variety of commercial assets, services, and systems, it must continually grow the partnership with industry to incorporate current technology, anticipate trends, and develop future capabilities.

Answers to: No Impact to the Loss of US Global Leadership

**[\_\_\_]**

#### [\_\_\_] Collapse of hegemony results in apolarity and war, not peace

Nial Ferguson (history professor at Harvard) 2004

(FOREIGN POLICY, July/August, p. online)

Anyone who dislikes U.S. hegemony should bear in mind that**, rather than a multipolar world of competing powers, a world with no hegemon at all may be the real alternative to U.S. primacy**. **Apolarity could turn out to be an anarchic new Dark Age, an ear of warring empires and religious fanaticism**; of endemic plunder and pillage in the world’s forgotten regions; **of economic stagnation and civilizations’ retreat into a few fortified enclaves.**

#### [\_\_\_] Only the United States can protect the world order

Colin Gray, political scientist specializing in national security policy, THE SHERIFF: AMERICA’S DEFENSE OF THE NEW WORLD ORDER, 2004, pp. 5-6

**The United States is the, indeed is the only, essential protecting power for the current world order**Again, this is not to be deterministic. Although there are no other bidders for this crown at present, it does not follow that the United States is condemned to play this role. After all, American world leadership in Paris in 1919 was succeeded post haste by a scuttle from many potential international obligations. **Americans today could elect to withdraw from the outside world, insofar as they could in political-military ways** they would hope that the civilizationa1 offense given by the soft power of their now globally beamed culture would not be found unduly provocative abroad. Whether The Great Satan, as Iranian spokespeople have delighted in calling the United States, would be allowed to hunker down in peaceful sanctuary in North America, we should doubt. Still, it could be tried. After Sep­tember 11, 2001, isolationist sentiment temporarily has lost much **We may not be much interested in terrorism, but it woulfd appear that terrorism is interested in us. For good or ill, we are what we are**. Exactly what this is has been explained in no uncertain terms by Henry Kissinger in the opening lines of his book, *Doer America Need a Foreign Policy? No* prizes are awarded for guessing that his question is strictly rhetorical. Kissinger proclaims that At the dawn of the new millennium, the United States is enjoying a preeminence unrivalled by even the greatest empires of the past. From weaponry to entrepreneurship, from science to technology, from higher education to popular culture, America exercises an unparalleled ascendancy around the globe.

Solvency – Coordination

**[\_\_\_]**

#### [\_\_\_] Freight transportation infrastructure needs to be coordinated

Colonel Donald E. Jackson, United States Army, 2007

(LEVERAGING THE STRATEGIC VALUE OF THE U.S. INLAND WATERWAY SYSTEM,www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA469583)

The capability of existing transportation infrastructure to meet a growing future demand should be cause for concern by Congress and other national policy makers. **U.S. freight transportation infrastructure is not efficiently managed, adequately funded, or effectively integrated at the national level. Our ability to efficiently move cargo from domestic origins to international destinations at the lowest cost possible ensures our economic stability and national security**. A capable and reliable freight transportation infrastructure is the necessary means to accomplish this national end state.

**[\_\_\_]**

#### [\_\_\_] Transportation is poorly integrated at the strategic level

Colonel Donald E. Jackson, United States Army, 2007

(LEVERAGING THE STRATEGIC VALUE OF THE U.S. INLAND WATERWAY SYSTEM,www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA469583)

Finally, **U.S. transportation infrastructure is ineffectively integrated at the strategic level. Today businesses depend on the interconnected transportation network to move a myriad of goods, from raw materials such as lumber, coal, and petroleum products to manufactured goods including medical supplies, furniture, household appliances, and computers**.

Solvency – Military Readiness

**[\_\_\_]**

#### [\_\_\_] Investments in transportation infrastructure critical to sustain US economic and military dominance

Colonel Donald E. Jackson, United States Army, 2007

(LEVERAGING THE STRATEGIC VALUE OF THE U.S. INLAND WATERWAY SYSTEM,www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA469583)

**The importance of a viable national transportation system to the security and economic prosperity of the United States is even more important today** than it was at the time of the Lewis and Clark Expedition. **Accessibility to world markets**, **providing quality goods at competitive pricing, and adaptability to an ever-changing environment characterizes the explosive growth of the U.S. economy over the past century**. The 21st Century, however, provides interesting challenges for which we may be ill prepared. **The era of globalization provides unique opportunities for other nations and international coalitions**, such as the European Union (EU), **to prosper and compete in international markets**, challenging the preeminent standing of the U.S. economy. Economists predict the U.S. economy will double, if not triple, between now and the year 202 Globalization reinforces the need for highly efficient connections where the U.S. and international transportation networks meet. **Feeding these connections, domestically, are a myriad of road, rail, and waterway networks ensuring American export commodities can reach their international destinations**. No single domestic transportation industry, whether trucking, rail, or waterway, can provide universal coverage for all commodities. Integrating industry capabilities is essential to ensuring cargo is delivered to port in the most efficient and cost-effect manner. Each industry plays an important role in the movement of freight, whether hauling large quantities of bulk commodities or perishables over great distances, carrying smaller packages to the main streets and back roads of America, or flying high-value merchandise to and from our trading partners abroad. The collaborative efforts of U.S. transportation industries, and the infrastructure upon which they operate, provide the lifelines of American economic prosperity. **Viable transportation infrastructure is essential to our national security, providing power projection platforms access to sea and aerial ports of embarkation capable of rapidly moving American military forces, equipment, and material anywhere in the world**. Capable and reliable transportation infrastructure is a vital national interest of the United States. **Domestic transportation infrastructure must be efficiently managed, adequately funded, and effectively integrated at the national level to serve as productive commercial conduits that support future economic growth. The United States has become one of the wealthiest nations n the world, in part, by leveraging its reliable and effective transportation infrastructure; only through further advancements in this imperative system will it maintain this status.**

Solvency – Congestion

**[\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_] This will support the transportation of goods in the United States

Wired, 2010

(July 23, “DOT To Turn Underused Waterways Into Marine Highways,” http://www.wired.com/autopia/2010/07/dot-turns-underused-waterways-into-marine-highways/)

Would such a system be possible in the United States? There may not be a choice. **With roadways** in major cities **already crammed with freight traffic** and the demand for freight ever increasing, **putting freight on the water may be the most sensible solution** for companies that need to move goods from here to there. Matsuda says **a political climate that’s focused on creating jobs and helping the environment also will support the cause. “Where there are corridors, the federal government will help focus attention and investments to get those services up and running,”** he said. “This is something that we think is going to go a long way.”

States Counterplan Answers

**[\_\_\_]**

#### [\_\_\_] The federal government must provide the necessary coordination and investment

Colonel Donald E. Jackson, United States Army, 2007

(LEVERAGING THE STRATEGIC VALUE OF THE U.S. INLAND WATERWAY SYSTEM,www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA469583)

In order to maintain our competitive edge, we must assure the strategic mobility of our economic and military elements of power. **The inland waterway system can provide a key, strategic capability that enables the current and future economic prosperity and national security of the United States. The federal government, however, must efficiently manage, adequately fund, and effectively integrate inland waterways with other modes of transportation at the national level for this to achieve success. Promotion of the inland waterway system, using an interagency and intra-governmental approach, positions this capability to provide the additional capacity necessary to meet current and future freight transportation requirements. Leveraging the strategic value of inland waterways is integral to building an effective and reliable national transportation network for the 21st Century.**

**[\_\_\_]**

#### [\_\_\_] Federal leadership necessary to solve

US Department of Transportation, 2011

(April, America’s Marine Highway Report to Congress, <http://www.marad.dot.gov/documents/MARAD_AMH_Report_to_Congress.pdf>)

**The report concludes with a section on conclusions. It cites the essential role that the private sector must play in making America’s Marine Highway successful, but notes that without strong leadership from the Federal government the nation's water assets will continue to be underutilized for freight transportation.**

States Counterplan Answers

**[\_\_\_]**

#### [\_\_\_] Federal action essential for coordination and to have Congress fulfill its Constitutional responsibility

Colonel Donald E. Jackson, United States Army, 2007

(LEVERAGING THE STRATEGIC VALUE OF THE U.S. INLAND WATERWAY SYSTEM,www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA469583)

**Transportation infrastructure requires a strategic-level approach to management, funding, and integration. National policy makers must balance the strengths and limitations of each transportation industry sector, ensuring their collective capabilities support projected U.S. economic and national security requirements**. Based upon the capabilities inherent in each of these industries, supporting infrastructure must be available, expanded, or modernized that enable them to meet current and future transportation requirements. American transportation infrastructure requires continual investment to remain a viable means of moving freight, as well as routine maintenance, periodic modernization, and expansion to maintain adequate operability. **The federal government has a Constitutional responsibility to provide adequate transportation infrastructure that supports the nation’s economy, as a means of regulating interstate commerce. While federal responsibilities for transportation infrastructure are collectively substantial, they are, however, widely disbursed and not well coordinated.6 Congress is responsible for synchronizing the efforts of industry stakeholders and government entities, making tough decisions on resource allocations that collectively meet the strategic requirements of the transportation system. This effort requires both an interagency and intra- governmental approach.**

States Counterplan Answers

**[\_\_\_]**

#### [\_\_\_] Europe proves that government support of inland water ways is effective

US Department of Transportation, 2011

(April, America’s Marine Highway Report to Congress, <http://www.marad.dot.gov/documents/MARAD_AMH_Report_to_Congress.pdf>)

**There is good precedent for effective governmental action to support short sea shipping. The European Union (EU) is faced with many of the same issues as is the United States regarding surface transportation congestion, environmental impacts of transportation systems, and energy conservation. EU leadership has recognized that greater reliance on waterborne transportation is an important means of reaching its goals regarding environmental sustainability and economic competitiveness. It therefore has an active and longstanding policy of promoting short sea shipping and has invested millions of euros to promote greater use of its coastal and inland waterways**, including:

␣Funding through the Trans-European Transport Network (TEN-T), the Marco Polo programs (designed to reduce congestion and improve the environmental performance of the intermodal transport system), the European Regional Development Fund, and State funding sources; and

␣Establishment of the Motorways of the Sea program (part of the TEN-T), the Program for the Promotion of Short Sea Shipping, and other and predecessor programs. As a result, container barge transportation has seen strong growth, with annual European traffic crossing the one million TEU level by 1991, the two million TEU level by 1996, and the three million TEU level by 2000. Estimated barge traffic in 2004 reached four million TEU. Short sea shipping (here including bulk materials as well as non-bulk) currently represents 40 percent of intra-EU exchanges in terms of ton-kilometers. **There are significant differences between freight transportation systems of Europe and the United States. Europe’s rail system is less efficient than the U.S. rail system for moving freight, and Europe’s geography has led to many of its largest industrial centers being in close proximity to water. Nonetheless, the strong growth of short sea shipping of containers in Europe highlights both the ability of short sea shipping to compete with land-based transportation modes and the potential benefits of government support to this mode. MARAD is closely monitoring this successful European example.**

Article: DOT To Turn Underused Waterways Into Marine Highways

Wired, July 23, 2010, “**DOT To Turn Underused Waterways Into Marine Highways,”** http://www.wired.com/autopia/2010/07/dot-turns-underused-waterways-into-marine-highways/

A new priority of the U.S. Department of Transportation is an age-old idea: Transport freight by ship for as long as possible. The DOT is proposing designated shipping channels known as Marine Highways, and one may be leading to a port near you.

If you’ve purchased any household goods in the United States recently, they probably took a familiar path from the factory to the store where you bought them: to North America on a massive cargo ship, from the ship to a railway, and finally from the rail yard to your local retailer by truck. In many cases, freight is carried solely by truck along interstate highways.

Unfortunately, such a system is far from efficient. It clogs our highways with multiple trucks headed in the same direction and brings pollution into our cities near freight terminals.

That’s why the Maritime Administration ([MARAD](http://www.marad.dot.gov/)) has proposed a system of marine highways where ships would transit goods within the United States. Along designated corridors, ships could provide safe, environmentally friendly and reasonably quick freight transit among a network of well-situated ports.

A New Old Idea

According to MARAD Administrator Dave Matsuda, the United States is catching up with the rest of the world when it comes to marine highways. Also known as short sea shipping, coastal trade or coastal shipping, the rivers and seas of Europe and Asia are filled with small container vessels carrying cargo within a continent.

“This is an idea that’s been around for a while,” Matsuda said. “The Europeans do it, and other folks do it. For about 10 years now people have been kicking the idea around in the maritime community. It’s to the point that it’s been joked about that the Marine Highway conference has become a cottage industry.”

When we caught up with him, Matsuda had just been sworn in as MARAD administrator. Earlier this month, he [announced an initial $7 million](http://armedservices.house.gov/pdfs/SP071410/Matsuda_Testimony071410.pdf) (.pdf) in grant funding for marine-highway projects that would primarily strengthen existing projects and proposals.

Some short sea shipping operations are already moving freight in the United States, and Matsuda wants to help them expand. “These are the experts, these are people who have started up new markets in the past,” he said. “They know the industry; they know the people and the operations.”

Matsuda is clear about engaging existing operators. “The government’s role here is really to help promote these and get them up and running,” he said. “We can talk to local transportation planners and say, ‘Hey, here are some of the federal programs that help.’ There’s a limited amount of federal dollars to put towards buying cranes or barges or fixing up a port or something that we need to have up and running.”

Some projects are economic no-brainers, such as moving overweight or hazardous materials, where the cost of obtaining road permits would be prohibitive for truck shipments. In most cases, however, in order for a project to make sense and for shippers to make money, MARAD must identify corridors with strong two-way traffic so empty ships don’t ply the waters.

A good example of such a project is a proposed [Green Trade Corridor in California](http://www.recovery.org/projectdetails.aspx?pid=ANT:11878767&gloc=Yolo%20%5bCA%5d*CNT:06113), a project funded by $30 million of [TIGER funds](http://www.wired.com/autopia/2010/02/tiger-grants/) that connects the inland agricultural areas and the Port of Oakland by a marine highway.

Currently, goods from Asia come into the port of Oakland and are trucked across the state while agricultural products are trucked in the opposite direction. “It’s a tax on commuters, and it adds to the congestion, beats up the bridges and raises the cost of maintaining infrastructure,” said Matsuda. “It’s not just getting the trucks off the road, but also putting people to work in some of these areas that are really devastated.”

A marine highway would move some of that traffic onto barges and guarantee two-way traffic for the company operating the barges.

A Rising Tide Lifts All Boats, Trains and Trucks

A project that promises to put people to work shouldn’t put others out of work. Marine highways will change rather than replace rail and truck shipments, so they seem to have gained support from groups that represent competing modes of transit.

“Marine and rail freight have co-existed since the 1830s when the rail industry began, said Holly Arthur, a representative for the Association of American Railroads. “While shipping via water can be seen as competition, it also is a significant customer segment for railroads.”

According to Arthur, intermodal transport — the movement of shipping containers by multiple methods, such as from ship to rail — represents 21 percent of rail revenue in the United States, a figure that is continuing to grow. If boat traffic increases, the rail industry stands to benefit.

Boats can’t usually pull up to a factory loading dock or back into the parking lot of your local big-box store, so trucks are safe, too. “At the end of the day, your shipment winds up at a port, so it has to go on a truck,” said Matsuda. In addition, boats tend to travel more slowly than trucks (though they usually don’t have to stop overnight for rest). Often, short sea shipping services run on a weekly schedule and, said Matsuda, “It’s hard to sell a weekly service when you’re dealing with folks who need things a little more quickly.”

In a country where the majority of freight travels along marine highways, Matsuda envisions some long-haul truckers working instead in freight yards or in regional distribution, while others remain on the roads with cargo that can’t wait for a slower-moving boat. If estimates of [70 percent growth in the freight industry](http://www.bts.gov/publications/freight_in_america/html/executive_summary.html) over the next 10 years are accurate, trucks will always be in high demand.

According to Matsuda, the U.S. DOT chose to refer to the project as Marine Highways rather than short sea shipping because the network of waterways would often be parallel to an existing interstate highway. “We wanted to draw a parallel with the interstate system, if you can draw a highway on a map, that you can draw a waterway along the map — maybe M-95 — and it’ll get you to the same place,” he said.

One kind of freight that Matsuda thinks is best suited for the water is hazardous material. “With hazardous materials, we only see an upside for getting them out of populated areas,” he said. While a lot of bulk hazmat cargo is shipped, that which fits into a container is still largely transported on packed highways. “Anything we can get off the highway is obviously a benefit, if it makes sense to do,” he said. “It’s less gas per mile, but it also helps the people on the roads.”

Better for the Environment

In addition to transporting hazardous materials outside of populated areas, a clear advantage of short sea shipping is the reduced environmental impact of moving freight on ships.

According to Carrie Denning, a researcher at the Environmental Defense Fund who coauthored the report The Good Haul: Freight Innovations for the 21st Century a shipping company that moves containers by sea between Port Manatee, Florida, and Brownsville, Texas, already saves 70,000 gallons of fuel on each one-way voyage compared to a comparable truck journey.

Those fuel savings translate into fewer emissions in population centers. “One way to reduce pollution emissions in some regions will be to substitute multiple truck trips with single barge trips via coastal shipping routes that meet robust environmental performance standards,” she said.

Even with the obvious fuel savings, Denning says that marine routes could still pose serious environmental consequences. Ports themselves are notorious for high levels of emissions from machinery used to move freight. To truly be environmentally responsible, ports along a marine highway would have to implement solutions such as [electric forklifts and yard trucks](http://www.wired.com/autopia/2010/04/electric-truck-can-haul-a-trailer-of-teslas/) — many of which are already in place at the [Port of Los Angeles](http://www.portoflosangeles.org/idx_environment.asp).

Additionally, highways would have to be designated clear of environmentally sensitive areas. “Coastal shipping is not a panacea,” she said. “Depending on the highway route, there could be serious ramifications for marine life if dredging is required, if migratory patterns are disrupted, or if additional infrastructure is needed that interferes with certain marine ecosystems.”

A centerpiece of the European short sea shipping industry is a small freighter known as a RoRo, short for “roll on, roll off.” While larger ships require cranes to lift containers onboard, RoRos pull straight up to a dock where trucks can drive onboard and unload freight containers. Because they’re smaller, they don’t require channels as deep as larger ships, and can minimize the need for dredging.

“The ship literally pulls up, lays down a ramp and the trucks drive on and off it,” said Matsuda. “From an operating standpoint, you don’t need cranes, you don’t need to pay the skilled workers — but you need people to drive the trucks on and off the ship.”

Rather than investing in the installation of cranes and other equipment at small ports, Matsuda says that RoRos could follow what he calls the “Southwest Airlines model,” after the carrier that started off flying into secondary airports. Smaller RoRos could bypass major ports and travel through shallower waterways to inland cities.

Matsuda just saw such a system in action at the Port of Rotterdam in the Netherlands. “It is just incredible to see these relatively small, long, thin, self-propelled ships that can carry 20 or 30 containers that kind of zip around in this massive port after the giant container ship has been offloaded,” he said. “They go up the rivers into Europe or around the coast to other ports.”

Would such a system be possible in the United States? There may not be a choice. With roadways in major cities already crammed with freight traffic and the demand for freight ever increasing, putting freight on the water may be the most sensible solution for companies that need to move goods from here to there. Matsuda says a political climate that’s focused on creating jobs and helping the environment also will support the cause.

“Where there are corridors, the federal government will help focus attention and investments to get those services up and running,” he said. “This is something that we think is going to go a long way.”

Article: America’s Marine Highway Corridors

**US Department of Transportation, 2010**, “America’s Marine Highway Corridors,” http://www.marad.dot.gov/ships\_shipping\_landing\_page/mhi\_home/mhi\_home.htm

On August 11, 2010, U.S. Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood identified 18 marine corridors, 8 projects, and 6 initiatives for further development as part of “America’s Marine Highway Program.”  In addition, the Maritime Administration made available $7 million for which these projects will be able to compete through a Notice of Funding Availability.  Please see the entire press release at [www.marad.dot.gov](http://www.marad.dot.gov)

The Marine Highway Program was fully implemented in April 2010 through publication of a Final Rule in the Federal Register ([http://edocket.access.gpo.gov/2010/pdf/2010-7899.pdf](http://www.marad.dot.gov/ships_shipping_landing_page/mhi_home/mhi_home.htm)).  The Secretary’s designations were made pursuant to the Final Rule, as required by the *Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007*.

Marine Highway Corridors:  These all-water routes consist of 11 Corridors, 4 Connectors and 3 Crossings that can serve as extensions of the surface transportation system.  These corridors identify routes where water transportation presents an opportunity to offer relief to landside corridors that suffer from traffic congestion, excessive air emissions or other environmental concerns and other challenges.  Corridors are generally longer, multi-state routes whereas Connectors represent shorter routes that serve as feeders to the larger Corridors.  Crossings are short routes that transit harbors or waterways and offer alternatives to much longer or less convenient land routes between points.  By designating these Marine Highway Corridors, Connectors and Crossings, Secretary LaHood is taking the first step to focus public and private efforts to use the waterways to relieve landside congestion and attain other benefits that waterborne transportation can offer in the form of reduced greenhouse gas emissions, energy savings and increased system resiliency.   Please click on this link to view the Marine Highway Corridors, Connectors and Crossings[: Click here for Marine Highway Corridor Descriptions](http://www.marad.dot.gov/documents/Marine_Highway_Corridors13_Sep_10.pdf)

Marine Highway Projects:  The Secretary has also selected eight Marine Highway Projects for designation under the program.  These projects represent new or expanded Marine Highway Services that offer promise of public benefit and long-term sustainability without future Federal operational support.  These projects will receive preferential treatment for any future federal assistance from the Department and MARAD.  The projects will help start new businesses or expand existing ones to move more freight or passengers along America’s coastlines and waterways.  The services have the potential to reduce air pollution and traffic congestion along surface corridors as well as provide jobs for skilled mariners and shipbuilders.   The projects were selected from among 35 applications from ports and local transportation planning agencies received by the Department’s Maritime Administration (MARAD).  Please click on this link to view the designated Marine Highway Projects:  [Click here for Marine Highway Project Descriptions](http://www.marad.dot.gov/documents/MarineHighway_Project_Description_Designated.pdf)

Marine Highway Grants:  Sponsors of Marine Highway Projects are eligible to compete for a share of up to $7 million in Marine Highway Grants.  Please click on the attached Notice of Funding Availability for additional information concerning Marine Highway Grants: [Click here for Guidance on applying for Marine Highway Grants](http://www.marad.dot.gov/ships_shipping_landing_page/mhi_home/mhi_home.htm)

Marine Highway Initiatives:  In addition to Projects, the Secretary has selected six applications that, while not developed to the point of proposing specific services and routes required of Project designation, they offer promise of potential in the future.  While not eligible to compete for upcoming Marine Highway Grants, these “Marine Highway Initiatives” will receive support from the Department of Transportation in the form of assistance in further developing the concepts through conduct of research, market analysis and other efforts to identify the opportunities they may present.

Article: Marad Reports to Congress About America’s Marine Highway

Maritime Executive, April 5, 2011, http://www.maritime-executive.com/article/marad-reports-to-congress-about-america-s-marine-highway

This Report to Congress is required by Sections 1121 and 1123 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (Energy Act).  Section 1121 directs the Secretary of Transportation (Secretary) to establish a short sea transportation program and designate short sea transportation projects under the program to mitigate landside congestion.  The Maritime Administration (MARAD) has implemented this short sea transportation program as the ?America‘s Marine Highway Program? (the Program). The Program is intended to expand the use of our inland, Great Lakes Saint Lawrence Seaway System, intracoastal, and coastal waterways for the transportation of freight (loaded in containers and trailers) and passengers to mitigate landside congestion, reduce greenhouse gas emissions per ton-mile of freight moved, and accomplish other objectives.

The first section of this report provides the justification for expanding the utilization of Marine Highway services.  It describes the interests of the Federal government in encouraging greater use of Marine Highways and, through the example of Europe, shows that government policy can be successful in achieving this result.  An important point of this section is that the full range of public benefits of Marine Highway services will not be realized based solely on market-driven transportation choices.

The sections immediately following the introduction explain the potential contributions of America‘s Marine Highway to the following objectives:

* Improving our nation‘s economic competitiveness while creating and sustaining jobs, including through the reduction of landside traffic congestion, the ability to add costeffective new freight and passenger transportation capacity, the reduction of wear-andtear on roads and bridges, and by providing resiliency to the surface transportation system;
* Providing an environmentally sustainable transportation system that requires less energy and reduces greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions per ton-mile of freight moved;
* Adding to the nation‘s strategic sealift resources and supporting the nation‘s shipbuilding industry
* Improving public safety and security through the safe movement of passengers and freight, including hazardous materials, and by enabling more effective transportation responses to natural and manmade disasters.
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No Inherency

**[\_\_\_]**

**[\_\_\_] Department of Transportation developing Marine Highways Now**

**Wired, 2010**

(July 23, “DOT To Turn Underused Waterways Into Marine Highways,” http://www.wired.com/autopia/2010/07/dot-turns-underused-waterways-into-marine-highways/)

A new priority of the U.S. Department of Transportation is an age-old idea: Transport freight by ship for as long as possible. **The DOT is proposing designated shipping channels known as Marine Highways**, and one may be leading to a port near you. If you’ve purchased any household goods in the United States recently, they probably took a familiar path from the factory to the store where you bought them: to North America on a massive cargo ship, from the ship to a railway, and finally from the rail yard to your local retailer by truck. In many cases, freight is carried solely by truck along interstate highways. Unfortunately, such a system is far from efficient. It clogs our highways with multiple trucks headed in the same direction and brings pollution into our cities near freight terminals. That’s why **the Maritime Administration (**[**MARAD**](http://www.marad.dot.gov/)**) has proposed a system of marine highways where ships would transit goods within the United States. Along designated corridors, ships could provide safe, environmentally friendly and reasonably quick freight transit among a network of well-situated ports.**

#### [\_\_\_] ****Marine Highway program being developed now****

**Wired, 2010**

(July 23, “DOT To Turn Underused Waterways Into Marine Highways,” http://www.wired.com/autopia/2010/07/dot-turns-underused-waterways-into-marine-highways/)

According to MARAD Administrator Dave Matsuda, **the United States is catching up with the rest of the world when it comes to marine highways**. Also known as short sea shipping, coastal trade or coastal shipping, the rivers and seas of Europe and Asia are filled with small container vessels carrying cargo within a continent. “This is an idea that’s been around for awhile,” Matsuda said. “The Europeans do it, and other folks do it. For about 10 years now people have been kicking the idea around in the maritime community. It’s to the point that it’s been joked about that the Marine Highway conference has become a cottage industry.” **When we caught up with him, Matsuda had just been sworn in as MARAD administrator. Earlier this month, he** [**announced an initial $7 million**](http://armedservices.house.gov/pdfs/SP071410/Matsuda_Testimony071410.pdf)(.pdf) **in grant funding for marine-highway projects that would primarily strengthen existing projects and proposals.**

No Inherency

**[\_\_\_]**

#### [\_\_\_] Congress supporting maritime highways now

**US Department of Transportation**, April **2011**, America’s Marine Highway Report to Congress, <http://www.marad.dot.gov/documents/MARAD_AMH_Report_to_Congress.pdf>

**Other recent legislation from Congress that will foster growth of Marine Highway services includes the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010**100 **and the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2010**. The former act authorizes a new Marine Highway Grants program; the latter act appropriates up to $7 million in funds to the new program for FY 2010. Additionally, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 created a discretionary grants program of $1.5 billion for surface transportation infrastructure. **Port projects, including projects serving Marine Highway services, were eligible to compete for these funds and received seven grant awards. The Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2010 created a follow-on discretionary grants program for surface infrastructure projects.**

Economy Add-on Answers

**[\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_] No economic gains – plan forces taxpayers to subsidize corporations

Brad Walker, Wetlands & Floodplain Director at Missouri Coalition for the Environment, 2010

(http://www.iwla.org/index.php?ht=a/GetDocumentAction/i/7807 FACT SHEET: Historic Subsidy of Inland Waterways Navigation System)

Barge Industry contributions are inadequate to properly fund the Inland Waterways Trust Fund’s projects backlog, yet **the industry wants to** restore IWTF solvency and **increase inland waterways navigation investment** primarily **by increasing the burden on all other taxpayers. The barge industry touts itself as the cheapest form of commodity transportation. Unfortunately, the equation used to derive that designation excludes over 90 percent of the costs to support the inland waterways system.** According to the National Academy of Sciences, 1 U.S. taxpayers pay 92 percent of the inland waterway system (IWS) costs of constructing, operating and maintaining barge navigation infrastructure. This is compared to virtually no taxpayer support for rail system users and only 20 percent for highway system users. The general public does receive some benefits from the current dams on the rivers, though it can be argued that **the costs, both financial and to the environment, have far exceeded** these **benefits.** The barge industry paid nothing for the original lock and dam system and do not contribute to repairing and restoring degraded riverine ecosystems, which the inland waterways navigation system is largely responsible for causing. The taxpayers have been totally responsible for these costs, and as mentioned above all of the O&M costs and 50 percent of the construction and rehabilitation costs. **When all costs are accounted for, the inland waterways system is by far the most expensive shipping system in the country.**

**Economy Add-on Answers**

**[\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_] Corps’ estimates overstate transportation benefits

Donald C. Sweeney, Center for Transportation Studies as its Associate Director and Teaching Professor of Logistics and Operations Management, 2009

(A Critique of “Final Re-Evaluation of the Recommended Plan: UMR-IWW System Navigation Study: Interim Study” Prepared for The Nicollet Island Coalition Donald C. Sweeney II, Ph.D. 9/30/2009 http://www.iwla.org/index.php?ht=a/GetDocumentAction/i/2083)

**The Corps’ estimates of NED transportation benefits likely overstate the real** NED transportation **benefits** of the recommended plan. The NED model employed by the Corps integrates empirical estimates of shippers’ responses to changes in transportation prices that were derived from surveys of shippers. However, **the** NED **model does not incorporate shippers’ responses to either increased shipping times or decreases in system reliability.** While incorporating shippers’ responses to changes in water transportation costs represents a significant improvement over older Corps of Engineers’ methodologies, **omitting shippers’ responses to changes in transit times and system reliability will likely overestimate the real NED benefits** of the recommended plan **under any future traffic growth outcome.**

Hegemony Add-on Answers

**[\_\_\_]**

#### [\_\_\_] Primacy does not prevent a global nuclear exchange or create regional stability

Nina Hachigan and Monica Sutphen, Stanford Center for International Security, 2008

(The Next American Century, p. 168-9)

In practice, **the strategy of primacy failed to deliver. While the fact of being the world’s only superpower has substantial benefits, a national security strategy based on suing and ratiaing primacy has not made America more secure. America’s military might has not been the answer to terrorism, disease, climate change, or proliferation. Iraq, Iran, and North Korea have become more dangerous in the last seven years, not less. Worse than being ineffec tive with transnational threats and smaller powers, a strategy of maintaining primacy is counterproductive when it comes to pivotal powers. If America makes primacy the main goal of its national security strategy, then why shouldn’t the pivotal powers do the same? A goal of primacy signals that sheer strength is most critical to security. American cannot trumpet its desire to dominate the world military and then question why China is modernizing its military**.

#### [\_\_\_] U.S. decline has not produced hegemonic rivalry because the U.S. is not perceived as a threat, nor do other powers want to challenge the status quo

Richard N. Haas, President, Council on Foreign Relations, 2008

(*Foreign Affairs* , May/June, <http://www.foreignaffairs.org/20080501faessay87304/richard-n-haass/the-age-of-nonpolarity.html?mode=print>)

**The fact that classic great-power rivalry has not come to pass and is unlikely to arise anytime soon is also partly a result of the United States' behavior, which has not stimulated such a response. This is not to say that** the United States under the leadership of George W. **Bush has not alienated other nations;** it surely has. **But it has not,** for the most part, **acted in a manner that has led other states to conclude that the United States constitutes a threat to their vital national interests. Doubts about the wisdom and legitimacy of U.S. foreign policy are pervasive, but this has tended to lead more to denunciations (and an absence of cooperation) than outright resistance.** **A further constraint on the emergence of great-power rivals is that many of the other major powers are dependent on the international system for their economic welfare and political stability. They do not, accordingly, want to disrupt an order that serves their national interests. Those interests are closely tied to cross-border flows of goods, services, people, energy, investment, and technology -- flows in which the United States plays a critical role. Integration into the modern world dampens great-power competition and conflict.**

No Harms – Infrastructure Not Degrading

**[\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_] New construction is unnecessary – small scale improvements extend the life of existing locks

Charles V. Stern, Analyst in Natural Resources Policy, 2012

(Inland Waterways: Recent Proposals and Issues for Congress Charles V. Stern April 12, 2012 Congressional Research Service http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R41430.pdf)

Other groups argue against significant new investments for inland waterway projects. In arguing against new locks on the Upper Mississippi River, a coalition of environmental groups noted that **while the design life of new investments is usually only 50 years, regular maintenance can extend the life of existing locks for an additional 50 years at a considerably lesser cost than that for new construction.** 53 These groups generally argue that **the costs of new lock construction greatly exceed the benefits of reduced waiting time and lock unavailability**, and point out that **issues associated with most aging inland waterways infrastructure can be overcome by improved smallscale and nonstructural improvements.** 54

No Harms – Lock Closure Impact Exaggerated

**[\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_] Shipping industry exaggerates the impact of lock closure – barge traffic is declining

Joel Hood, Chicago Tribune, 2010

(Study: Cost of closing Chicago locks exaggerated By Chicago Tribune 2/17/2010 http://www.workboat.com/newsdetail.aspx?id=4294989267)

John **Taylor, an associate professor of supply-chain management at Wayne State, and a transportation consultant told reporters** today that Illinois officials and some in **the boating and shipping industries have exaggerated the economic impact of lock closure. Many jobs would be lost**, Taylor said, **but others would be gained by the creation of new truck and rail terminals to carry freight to their final destinations.**  Michigan Attorney General Mike Cox, who has asked the U.S. Supreme Court to order Illinois to close locks to permanently separate the Great Lakes from the Mississippi River watershed, paid Taylor and Jim Roach of J.L. Roach Inc. to analyze the impact of closure. "We believe the documents submitted by the U.S. and Illinois to the Supreme Court have seriously exaggerated the transportation and economic impact associated with closures of portions of the Chicago waterway system," Taylor said. Taylor and Roach studied boat and barge traffic through the Chicago River Controlling Works outside of downtown and the O'Brien lock and dam in the Calumet River since 1994. Their **data indicated that barge and freight hauling traffic** through those two points, the primary entry points exiting Lake Michigan and into Chicago waterways, **has declined about 50 percent over 15 years.** Less than 4,300 barges traveled through those locks in 2008, carrying about 7 million tons of cargo.

[\_\_\_] No traffic increase – Army Corps projections are wrong

Charles V. Stern, Analyst in Natural Resources Policy, 2012

(Inland Waterways: Recent Proposals and Issues for Congress Charles V. Stern April 12, 2012 Congressional Research Service http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R41430.pdf)

**Although previous estimates by the Corps** and others **projected that inland waterway traffic would increase** over time, **actual traffic** on inland waterways **has** for the most part **remained flat in recent years.** 6 At the same time, overall freight tonnage for all modes of domestic freight shipping increased at an average annual rate of 1.2% from 1997 to 2007, and is expected to continue to increase. 7 **The Department of Transportation projects that freight tonnage will double over the next 25 years, with inland waterway traffic projected to increase at a rate significantly less than that projected for rail and highway shipping.** 8

No Harms – Lock Closure Impact Exaggerated

**[\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_] Shippers are used to delays

John Frittelli, Specialist in Transportation Policy, 2011

(Can Marine Highways Deliver? January 14, 2011 http://assets.opencrs.com/rpts/R41590\_20110114.pdf)

Marine highway services, with the exception of those across the Great Lakes, cater primarily to the domestic portion of international containerized freight shipments. Domestic shipments are much less likely to use marine highways because, even with highway congestion, shippers are accustomed to relatively consistent on-time performance. **Importers and exporters of containerized freight**, on the other hand, **are accustomed to delays routinely caused by weather, customs, and labor unrest here or overseas. In the context of an ocean voyage lasting two or three weeks, a one- or two-day delay is not unexpected or calamitous.** 19

No Harms – No Global Starvation

**[\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_] Agricultural exports are declining – greater demand for grain at home and other countries becoming slef sufficient

Brad Walker, Wetlands & Floodplain Director at Missouri Coalition for the Environment, 2010

(Big Price – Little Benefit, Prepared by the Nicollet Island Coalition February 2010 http://www.iwla.org/index.php?ht=a/GetDocumentAction/i/2079)

As the environmental functions of the rivers have shifted, so have the economic opportunities in agriculture in the Upper Midwest. From 1950 through the late 1970s, the Mississippi River experienced steady growth in agricultural commodities traffic moving down the river via barge. However, since 1980, Mississippi River barge traffic has fluctuated significantly and **the overall trend has been less traffic.** At one key lock at Alton, Illinois, for example, barge traffic has declined from its peak of 80.5 million tons in 1990 down to 56.3 million tons in 2008. **The causes of this transition include significant growth in** agricultural **production in other parts of the world and less demand than expected from emerging markets like China.** In addition, **the demand for biofuels and locally grown foods has skyrocketed, enabling growers to sell** agricultural **products much closer to home**

No Solvency – General

**[\_\_\_]**

#### [\_\_\_] Many barriers to marine highway programs

US Department of Transportation, 2011

(April, America’s Marine Highway Report to Congress, <http://www.marad.dot.gov/documents/MARAD_AMH_Report_to_Congress.pdf>)

**While Marine Highway services are relatively easy to** initiate at the majority of the nation’s port facilities, **highly efficient services require specialized equipment in many instances. For example, at smaller ports, specialized gantry cranes may need to be installed to efficiently load and unload marine container barges. Many moderate-sized port facilities possess adequate space to accommodate start-up Marine Highway services but may have to make certain modification**s (such as wharf rehabilitation, berth improvements, paving, fencing, and staging area development) and acquire additional shoreside equipment (such as specialized cranes, forklifts, hostlers, tractors, and top pick forklifts) for these operations. The European experience shows that the major investment costs, particularly at inland barge container terminals, consist of infrastructure (wharf construction and grounds) and equipment (cranes and internal transport vehicles). **The initial acquisition cost of port facility and cargo handling equipment can be a significant barrier to market entry for Marine Highway services.** Initially, such services often involve relatively small volumes of cargo that must bear the full costs of paying for the new port infrastructure. This high fixed cost, which must be passed on to shippers, places Marine Highway services at a competitive disadvantage relative to established land-based modes.

No Solvency – Global Starvation

**[\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_] Infrastructure can’t solve food crisis – drought is already devastating agricultre

Jack Farchy and Gregory Meyer, Financial Times, 2012

(July 19, World braced for new food crisis, http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/9989dc80-d1c5-11e1-badb-00144feabdc0.html#ixzz21YSupe9I)

**The world is facing a new food crisis as the worst US drought in more than 50 years pushes ag**ricultural **commodity prices to record highs.** Corn and soyabean prices surged to record highs on Thursday, surpassing the peaks of the 2007-08 crisis that sparked food riots in more than 30 countries. Wheat prices are not yet at record levels but have rallied more than 50 per cent in five weeks, exceeding prices reached in the wake of Russia’s 2010 export ban. **The drought in the US, which supplies nearly half the world’s exports of corn and much of its soyabeans and wheat, will reverberate well beyond its borders**, affecting consumers from Egypt to China. **“I’ve been in the business more than 30 years and this is by far and away the most serious weather issue and supply and demand problem that I have seen by a mile,” said a senior executive at a trading house.** “It’s not even comparable to 2007-08.”

[\_\_\_] Global food shortages are inevitable – the plan does not address structural factors

Frederick Tipson, Jennings Randolph Senior Fellow, 2012

(Global Food Insecurity and "Political Malnutrition," June 2012, Number 7, German Marshall Fund Connections, http://www.gmfus.org/wp-content/blogs.dir/1/files\_mf/1339595984Tipson\_GlobalFoodInsecurity\_Jun12.pdf)

Meanwhile, the political dimensions of “food insecurity” go well beyond our compassion for people in the poorest countries who are most vulnerable to famine and malnutrition. Even **during the remainder of this decade, we face** a transition from localized food shortages and insecurities toward **a more pervasive environment of global “food shocks”** that have serious political consequences even for the richer world. 3 **The combined effects of population trends, climate changes, water shortages, soil erosion or contamination, increased meat consumption, fisheries depletion, major livestock epidemics, or serious crop failures in overlapping and cascading ripple effects will strain already-vulnerable economies and political systems.** Sudden price increases or shortages could prompt volatile popular reactions, especially if citizens even in “well-fed” locations lose trust in markets and governments to assure their access to adequate food supplies.

No Solvency – Congestion

**[\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_] Can’t reduce road congestion

John Frittelli, Specialist in Transportation Policy, 2011

(Can Marine Highways Deliver? January 14, 2011 http://assets.opencrs.com/rpts/R41590\_20110114.pdf)

In addition, **a significant portion of domestic truck freight is carried in truck trailers rather than in containers that can be detached from their chassis. Barge services can carry truck trailers, but doing so is relatively inefficient, as trailers,** unlike containers, **cannot be stacked. These factors severely limit the potential universe of truck traffic that marine highways could divert from the highways. International shipments account for less than one-tenth of total truck tonnage. The vast majority of the trucks contributing to highway congestion are serving routes or carrying products for which short-sea transport is not a viable alternative**, or else are not designed to haul detachable ocean shipping containers.

[\_\_\_] Can’t solve delays – competing boats make it too difficult

Brad Walker, Wetlands & Floodplain Director at Missouri Coalition for the Environment, 2010

(Big Price – Little Benefit, Prepared by the Nicollet Island Coalition February 2010 http://www.iwla.org/index.php?ht=a/GetDocumentAction/i/2079)

Additionally, a critical element of delay estimation is how much of the delay at a lock will be directly attributable to double lockages (lock processing time) versus how much delay may be caused by the lack of an effective traffic management system (queue time). **New** 1,200-foot **locks may directly impact lock processing time, but in and of themselves do nothing to affect the number of barges on the river and whether they arrive at a given lock at the same time.** This aspect of lock delays is acknowledged within the Corps’ report, which states, “Completion of the Corps’ recommended navigation improvements are not expected to completely eliminate all delays since **a portion of delays are attributable to variability in demand** – more than one boat arriving at the same time results in delay…. **Corps data suggest that Locks 26 and 27 experience some of the largest delays despite having undergone fairly recent renovation** and having 1,200-ft. lock capacity.” 19

States Counterplan Solvency

**[\_\_\_]**

#### [\_\_\_] States can take control of inland waterways

Institute for Water Resources, 2012

(Army Corps of Engineers, April US Port and Inland Waterways Modernization Strategy, http://www.iwr.usace.army.mil/docs/portswaterways/Port\_and\_Inland\_Waterways\_Options\_for\_the\_Future\_Working\_Draft\_v1\_2012\_Apr\_01.pdf)

The Congress and its partners in the navigation industry must find ways to increase revenues for harbor deepening and inland navigation channel, lock and dam maintenance. **Options for raising revenue are only limited by our imagination. They include:**

• Deep draft ports o Continue HMTF user fee collection and implementation of a harbor deepening tax

o Increase local cost share requirements

o Increase the USACE budget ceiling for navigation

o **Dissolve the Federal role in harbor development and maintenance and transfer all responsibilities to non-Federal entities.**

Taxes/Spending DA Link

**[\_\_\_]**

#### [\_\_\_] Locks cost $150 million to $1 billion

David Grier, 2002

(*The Challenge to Modernize the U.S. Inland Waterway*s, <ftp://ftp.hamburg.baw.de/pub/Kfki/Bib/2002_Dredging/PDFs/40680-021-005.PDF>)

**A new lock is an expensive proposition, ranging from $150 million to over $1 billion,** depending on the size, type and location. Further, as the system ages the need for maintenance increases. **Federal budget constraints have postponed critical maintenance** while at the same time the queue of new or replacement lock projects awaiting construction continues to grow. Due to budget constraints, the construction schedules of many projects now underway are being stretched, increasing congestion and reducing project benefits. Other authorized projects may not be started for the foreseeable future.

Taxes/Spending DA Link

**[\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_] Plan drains the treasury – cost overruns are routine

Brad Walker, Wetlands & Floodplain Director at Missouri Coalition for the Environment, 2010

(Big Price – Little Benefit, Prepared by the Nicollet Island Coalition February 2010 http://www.iwla.org/index.php?ht=a/GetDocumentAction/i/2079)

**The Corps’ own economic analysis shows new construction** of seven 1,200-foot locks **will result in a negative return on investment. Based on two decades of flat or decreasing barge traffic, the proposed new locks will likely result in a loss of 80 cents for every dollar provided by taxpayers.** Of additional concern is the fact that **other Corps lock projects currently underway are exceeding their initial cost-estimates by double and even triple the estimated amounts.**

Oil Disadvantage Links

**[\_\_\_]**

#### [\_\_\_] Marine highways will reduce oil dependence

Ray Lahood, US Department of Transportation Secretary, April 8, 2011

(America’s Marine Highway System: Delivering Goods More Efficiently, http://fastlane.dot.gov/2011/04/americas-marine-highway-system-delivering-goods-more-efficiently-reducing-dependence-on-foreign-oil-.html)

Last week, President Obama set the goal of cutting America’s energy imports by one-third.  And he proposed that we meet this objective, in part, by reducing our transportation system’s enormous demand for oil. [**Marine highway**](http://www.marinelog.com/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=717:2011apr000061&catid=1:latest-news&Itemid=107)**s are one crucial ingredient in the President's recipe for energy independence.  They’ll help us send fewer of our hard-earned dollars overseas in a tough fiscal time.  They’ll decrease our emission of the carbon pollution that threatens our environment.  And they’ll spur economic development and support economic expansion.**

#### [\_\_\_] The use of marine highways will reduce oil dependence

Maritime Administration News, 2011

(April 5, <http://www.marad.dot.gov/news_room_landing_page/news_releases_summary-/news_release/MARAD_03-11.htm>)

“**America’s maritime transportation system is a major priority for President Obama’s administration,” said Secretary Ray LaHood.  “When we finish America’s fully-integrated, national marine highway system, our legacy will be more than routes on water.  It will be a country less dependent on foreign oil.**  It will be a 21st century means of moving people and goods. It will be a future that America is prepared to win.”

Oil Disadvantage Links

**[\_\_\_]**

#### [\_\_\_] Short sea shipping improves fuel efficiency

Wired, 2010

(July 23, “DOT To Turn Underused Waterways Into Marine Highways,” http://www.wired.com/autopia/2010/07/dot-turns-underused-waterways-into-marine-highways/)

In addition to transporting hazardous materials outside of populated areas, a clear advantage of short sea shipping is the reduced environmental impact of moving freight on ships. **According to Carrie Denning, a researcher at the Environmental Defense Fund who coauthored the report, The Good Haul: Freight Innovations for the 21st Century, a shipping company that moves containers by sea between Port Manatee, Florida, and Brownsville, Texas, already saves 70,000 gallons of fuel on each one-way voyage compared to a comparable truck journey. Those fuel savings translate into fewer emissions in population centers. “One way to reduce pollution emissions in some regions will be to substitute multiple truck trips with single barge trips via coastal shipping routes that meet robust environmental performance standards,” she said.**

**Federalism Disadvantage**
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Summary

The federalism disadvantage partially stems from the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution, which states that powers not explicitly given to the federal government are reserved for the states. The federal government possesses only those powers enumerated by the Constitution. Included among these enumerated powers are the powers to raise and coin money, the power to spend that money, the power to regulate foreign and interstate commerce, and the power to provide for the defense of the United States.

Generally speaking, the states are responsible for policy action on domestic issues, including education, welfare, health, and criminal justice where the Constitution does not provide authorization for the federal government to act. States do have some authority over environmental regulation and environmental protection.

The purpose of federalism, striking a balance between the powers of the state and the federal government, is to ensure that one branch of government, particularly the federal government, does not obtain too much power. The trick is to determine precisely *how* and *where* to strike the balance.

There are a number of reasons that federalism is arguably good. In the debate, you should be sure to extend at least one piece of evidence that makes each of the following arguments. If you win some of these arguments you may be able to turn back the affirmative case by impacting your disadvantage into their harm area.

‑ Federalism promotes public participation. Since state governments are "closer to the people," individuals are arguably more likely to participate in state government politics; they are more likely to know their representatives, to think that the issues are important, and to have a more direct stake in the outcome.

‑ Federalism alleviates social and ethnic tensions. Individual states in a federalist system are supposed to be able to make their own policy choices that diverge from the national norm. As long as those choices are allowed, individuals are more likely to have their preferences protected and live as they wish. If they are not able to make these decisions for themselves, they may decide to succeed or fight other groups whose interests and preferences they may see as mutually exclusive.

‑ Federalism encourages policy experimentation and innovation. If different states adopt different policies, each will likely adopt some policies that work and some that fail. Other states, and the national government, can learn from that experimentation. If the federal government only adopts a single policy, and it fails, there may be no alternatives on the horizon.

‑ Federalism provides opportunities for a number of individuals and groups to have power. If the states all have their own strong policy‑making apparatuses and areas of authorities, it prevents the tyrannical concentration of power in one group.

Glossary

**Federal.** The federal government is the central government in Washington, D.C.

**Federalism.** Federalism is the balance of power between the state governments and the federal government.

**Liberty.** Liberty is the idea that human beings have control over their own actions.

**Majoritarianism.** Majoritarianism is the belief that we should do what most people want even if the desires of the majority infringe on the minority.

**Subsidy.** An amount of money that is designated to support a particular project.

**Supremacy Clause.** Article VI, Section 2, of the U.S. Constitution is known as the Supremacy Clause because it provides that the "Constitution, and the Laws of the United States … shall be the supreme Law of the Land." It means that the federal government, in exercising any of the powers enumerated in the Constitution, must prevail over any conflicting or inconsistent state exercise of power.

Federalism 1NC Shell

A. Uniqueness – Obama has given authority over transportation infrastructure to the states now, enabling a strong balance of federalism

Bruce Katz, Vice President of the Metropolitan Program @ the Brookings Institute, 2012

(“Remaking Federalism to Remake the American Economy,” February 16, <http://www.brookings.edu/research/papers/2012/02/16-federalism-katz>)

On the programmatic front, President **Obama has worked to enable states** and localities **to tackle structural challenges** in integrated ways. **The administration’s Sustainable Communities Initiative**—a partnership among the Department of Transportation, Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)— **has**, for example, **given cities and metropolitan areas resources, information and tools to make sharper connections between housing, transportation and environmental resources.** On regulatory matters, President **Obama has used federal actions to set a “floor rather than a ceiling”** on a range of consumer protection, clean energy and environmental matters. **This has left room for the states to innovate** on auto emission standards in California, for example, and to seek redress for mortgage abuses through the States Attorney Generals. To date, President **Obama’s approach to economic restructuring has tended toward the more permissive, enabling end of the federalist spectrum.**

Federalism 1NC Shell

B. Link – Growth in federal power and taking over of jurisdiction undermines state power

Harvard Journal of Law and Public Policy, 2000

(Spring, p. 565-6)

The new term actually gives us a new perspective on the enumerated powers. **No power granted to Congress** - think of the Commerce Clause - **may be so construed as to preempt entirely the states' power over the people.** I employ the phrase "power over the people" for two reasons. First, this phrase emphasizes that the reserved powers of the states must somehow reflect general sovereign powers, which are powers over people. The "States qua States" cases preserve the states' power over some people - those who are state employees. **A state that may resist commandeering so as to retain only the power to exist in name possesses no meaningful powers.** Second, I refer to the states' power over "people" because the Court has overlooked "the people" in its arguments over the Tenth Amendment, and "the people's" rights are also reserved. The Tenth Amendment expresses a triangular relationship among the federal government, state governments, and the people. Although the context for Tenth Amendment litigation has involved disputes between states and the federal government, residual state authority also inures to the benefit of "the people." **In any contest between Congress and the states, a decision that favors expanded federal powers necessarily disfavors the states and the people**. When Justice Souter wrote in Alden that "the commerce power is no longer thought to be circumscribed," he meant, implicitly, that the people have reserved no powers over commerce or anything affecting it.

C. Impact – Federalism is crucial to prevent tyranny

Ernest Young, Law Professor, University of Texas, 2004

(TEXAS LAW REVIEW, November pp. 59-60)

More fundamentally, our **federalism has always been justified as a bulwark against tyranny.** Madison extolled federalism as part of the "double security" that the new Constitution would provide for the people; just as the three branches of the central government were to check one another, the state governments would check the center. As Lynn Baker and I have discussed elsewhere, Madison's discussion in Federalist 46 emphasized worst case scenarios, in which the states would have to oppose the national government militarily, and this emphasis has sometimes distracted critics of federalism from more prosaic - but also more relevant - mechanisms by which  federalism protects liberty. **Even in the Founding period, however, state autonomy buttressed individual liberty in other, less dramatic ways. States may oppose national policies not only militarily but politically, and in so doing they may serve as critical rallying points for more widespread popular opposition.** Madison and Jefferson, out of national power during the Federalist administration of John Adams, worked through the Virginia and Kentucky legislatures to oppose the Alien and Sedition Acts. The states thus, as Professor Friedman puts it, "serve as an independent means of calling forth the voice of the people." **More recently, "Some state and local governments have proven themselves formidable lobbyists and indefatigable litigants" on issues such as affirmative action, benefits for the disabled, and environmental policy**

Uniqueness – Federal Power Restrained Now

**[\_\_\_] Health care decision promotes federalism now**

Forbes, 2012

(June 29, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/daviddavenport/2012/06/29/federalisms-silver-lining-in-the-healthcare-decision/>)

But **the 193-page U.S. Supreme Court opinion on the constitutionality of the healthcare reform bill does actually leave conservatives, and especially those concerned about states’ rights and federalism, some room for encouragement**. In fact, one could argue that conservatives won all the major constitutional battles in this case but, thanks to some deft footwork by Chief Justice Roberts, still managed to lose the war.  **The big constitutional questions in this case were whether there are any limits to the federal government’s power under the Commerce Clause and the conditional spending power and, to each of those questions, a strong majority of the Court said “yes,” and moreover, held that Congress’ actions in this case exceeded those limits.**

**[\_\_\_] The Supreme Court has recently limited the federal government’s power to force the states to take action**

Forbes, 2012

(June 29, http://www.forbes.com/sites/daviddavenport/2012/06/29/federalisms-silver-lining-in-the-healthcare-decision/)

But **of even greater practical significance was the Court’s holding that the federal government had, through its conditional spending power, unconstitutionally coerced the states into bending their Medicaid programs to the preferences of Congress**.  The last major Supreme Court decision in this area, South Dakota v. Dole in 1986, addressed a state complaint that the federal government overstepped its authority when it said South Dakota would lose federal highway money if it did not raise its legal drinking age to 21.  Since the federal government has no constitutional power to set the legal drinking age, it was attempting to use financial leverage to get the states to follow its policy.  The Court held that Congress could deploy its spending power in this way, but that there was a limit, when the financial inducement was “so coercive as to pass the point at which pressure turns into compulsion.”  Not surprisingly, no case has found such a limit to have been reached in the 26 years since. **Today, the Court said the limit on the federal spending power had been improperly crossed by Congress in the healthcare reform bill.  Rather than the “relatively mild inducement” the Court found when five percent of South Dakota’s highway funds were at risk, today’s Court said that losing all of a state’s Medicaid funding was more like “a gun to the head.”  The Court noted that Medicaid spending accounts for over 20% of the average state’s total budget, whereas 5% of South Dakota’s highway funding was less than one half of one percent of its total budget at the time.  So we now know there is some limit beyond which the federal government may not go in withholding state funding to incentivize (bribe?) a state to do Washington’s bidding**.

Uniqueness – Federal Role in Transportation Decreasing

**[\_\_\_] States are taking the lead currently in the absence of federal support for transportation**

Scott Thomasson, President, NewBuild Strategies LLC, 2012

(Council on Foreign Relations, Encouraging U.S. Infrastructure Investment

April 2012, http://www.cfr.org/infrastructure/encouraging-us-infrastructure-investment/p27771)

**States are already looking at new ways to finance infrastructure as federal funding becomes uncertain and their own budgets are strained. More states rely on PPPs to share the costs and risks of new projects**, and they are finding new sources of nontax revenues to fund investments, like tolling and higher utility rates. But at the same time, federal regulations and tax laws often prevent states from taking advantage of creative methods to finance projects. **Federal programs designed to facilitate innovative state financing are underfunded, backlogged, or saddled with dysfunctional application processes**. Many of these obstacles can be removed by adjusting regulations and tax rules to empower states to use the tools already available to them, and by better managing federal credit programs that have become so popular with states and private investors. In cases where modest reforms can make more financing solutions possible, good ideas should not be held hostage to "grand bargains" on big legislation like the highway bill or the failed 2010 energy bill. Congress should take up smaller proposals that stand a chance of passing both houses this year—incremental steps that can unlock billions of dollars in additional investments without large federal costs. Any proposals hoping to win Republican support in the House need to have a limited impact on the federal deficit and focus on reducing, rather than expanding, federal regulations and bureaucracy. Some progress can also be achieved by circumventing Congress entirely with executive branch action.

Answers to: No Threshold

**[\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_] Small policy decisions are the greatest threat to federalism

Cynthia **Lebow,** Associate Dir @ the RAND Institute  **1997**

(Cynthia C., U. Tennessee Law Review, Spring, p. n162)

If Congress may do this, presumably it has the power to pre-empt state-court rules of civil procedure and judicial review in classes of cases found to affect commerce. This would be the type of gradual encroachment hypothesized by Professor Tribe: **"Of course, no one expects Congress to obliterate the states, at least in one fell swoop. If there is any danger, it lies in the tyranny of small decisions in the prospect that Congress will nibble away at state sovereignty, bit by bit, until someday essentially nothing is left but a gutted shell**."

Answers to: No Threshold

**[\_\_\_]**

**[\_\_\_] After the Supreme Court’s health care ruling, now is a key time and transportation infrastructure funding will be a defining issue**

Dylan Scott, Staff writer for GOVERNING Magazine, 2012

(Health Ruling Sets Up Potential Fallout for Federalism, June 29, http://www.governing.com/blogs/fedwatch/gov-supreme-court-ruling-potential-fallout-for-federalism.html)

**What does this mean for other federal-state programs**? Federal education funding, for example, is based on states meeting certain student achievement goals. Likewise**, states must meet federal safety requirements to receive some infrastructure and transportation funding. Does the Court's decision change the federal-state relationship and lay the grounds to challenge future attempts by Congress to set conditions for federal funding to states? “I think that’s the million-dollar question, and it might**,” said Lisa Soronen, executive director of the State and Local Legal Center, during a discussion on the ruling’s implications Friday. “**But only time will tell.”**

Link – Transportation

[\_\_\_\_] Despite the federal highway act, states should play a larger role in public infrastructure to deter pork barrel spending.

Richard Nathan Co-director of the Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government 2005

(“There will always be a New Federalism.” For the American Enterprise Institute. Dec. 14 http:// federalismproject.org/depository/NathanRoundtablePaper.pdf AD 07/06/09)

Rediscovery by Liberals The paradox is that federalism is being rediscovered by liberals. Rep. Barney Frank (D. Mass) recently was compared to states’ righter and former U.S. Senator Strom Thurmond when Frank argued that the states (with Massachusetts out front) should be the arbiters of gay marriage. 2 Barney Frank is not alone. **Other liberals see the states, particularly states with liberal leaders, as the appropriate governments to deal with many program issues.** • Protecting Medicaid ― The federal government has tried several strategies to slow the growth of the Medicaid program, which aids the elderly, the disabled, and poor families. But since the program has a broad constituency of recipient groups (not just the poor) and multiple provider interests, states have fought hard (and so far pretty much successfully) to shield Medicaid from Washington’s retrenchment efforts. • Cleaning Up the Environment ― This is a policy area in which many states are ahead of the curve compared to the federal government, as shown by the nine-state Northeastern accord to freeze power plant emissions and similar regional efforts underway in California, Washington, and Oregon. 3 • Equalizing School Aid ― Hard-charging activists in many states are pulling every lever ― courts, the executive, and legislative ― to distribute school aid in ways that give more aid to poor core-city and rural communities and provide more aid overall. • **Providing Public Infrastructure ― Although the federal highway act is a big factor in the transportation field, activists at the state level generally see states as their best avenue for rehabilitating, maintaining, and constructing new roads, schools, parks, and other public facilities. Some of this is old-fashioned pork barreling**, but that doesn’t diminish its importance in providing facilities for services advocated by the supporters of public education, libraries, economic development, the arts, recreation, parks, etc.

[\_\_\_\_] States have power over transportation infrastructure now

Bruce Katz, Vice President of the Metropolitan Program @ the Brookings Institute, 2012

(“Remaking Federalism to Remake the American Economy,” February 16, <http://www.brookings.edu/research/papers/2012/02/16-federalism-katz>)

**Our federal republic diffuses power among different layers of government and across disparate sectors of society. States are the key constitutional partners, because they have broad powers over such market-shaping policy areas as infrastructure**, innovation, energy, education and skills training.

Link – Transportation

[\_\_\_\_] Empirically, states have control over transportation and domestic issues. The plan is a form of coercive federalism in which the federal government does not consult with the states.

Raymond **Scheppach,** Ph.D. Executive Director, National Governors Association, **2006**

(Raymond C. Will the 2008 election improve state-federal relations?; The next president faces a crucial choice in how he'll get along - not just with foreign governments - but with leaders at home in the 50 states. Stateline.org. July 9 Lexis)

**Federalism scholars often point to two recent periods in which federalism was defined very differently. Between 1980 and 1996, there was "cooperative" federalism,** an era ushered in by the Reagan administration and marked by a genuine partnership between states and the federal government. President Reagan engaged in discussions and negotiations with the nation's governors over a huge swap proposed for domestic **programs in which the federal government would take responsibility for all Medicaid and states would take responsibility for transportation and other domestic issues.** Although this dialogue did not lead to any major legislative changes, both sides embraced a real federal-state partnership. Cooperative federalism continued through the early years of the Clinton administration, which saw passage of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act in 1995, and welfare reform in 1996. Both the Republicans in Congress and the Democratic president worked cooperatively with governors to enact these two bills. Welfare reform not only turned an individual entitlement program into a block grant, but it also gave states substantial authority to tailor the program to the needs of their citizens. **From the mid-1990s through the present, we have been in a period of "coercive federalism," where the federal government more often just tells the states what to do. It does not ask for advice or enter into serious negotiation with the states.**

[\_\_\_\_] Federal transit subsidies are wasteful and undermine state action - jurisdiction should remain devolved to states and local governments.

Randal O’Toole CATO Institute Senior Fellow 2006

(Randal.. “A Desire Named Streetcar: How Federal Subsidies Encourage Wasteful Local Transit Systems.” Policy Analysis – CATO Institute. Jan. 5 <http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=5345>)

Prior to 1964, when Congress began subsidizing transit, the industry was mostly private. Since then, the industry **has been almost entirely taken over by state and local governments. Today more than three of every four dollars spent on transit come from taxpayers, not transit riders. The effectiveness of local transit systems is undermined by federal subsidies, which encourage the construction of highly visible and expensive services such as light-rail trains to suburban areas despite the chronically low number of riders on those routes. Federal subsidies to transit advocacy groups and misguided environmental and labor regulations also encourage a large investment of taxpayer money in wasteful transit systems. The ideal solution would be to devolve transit and other transportation funding entirely to state and local governments.** Short of that, Congress should reform the federal transportation funding system to minimize the adverse incentives it creates.

Link – Federal Support/Block Grants

[\_\_\_\_] Federal support to the states undermines federalism

Darien Shanske, Associate Professor of Law, University of California, Winter 2012

(Virginia Tax Review HOW LESS CAN BE MORE: USING THE FEDERAL INCOME TAX TO STABILIZE STATE AND LOCAL FINANCE, p. 423)

Yet there are still deeper issues to be considered. First, **the federal financing subsidy undermines truly competitive federalism because the central government is putting its thumb on the scale in favor of certain activities - specifically, borrowing. Furthermore, this subsidy allows sub-national governments to avoid internalizing the full cost of their borrowing because the borrowing is subsidized by the national government, and so this subsidy is particularly suspec**t.

[\_\_\_\_] Federal subsidies to the states undermine interstate competition

John O. McGinnis and Ilya Somin, Research Professor, Northwestern Law School, and Assistant Professor of Law, George Mason University School of Law, 2004

(NORTHWESTERN LAW REVIEW, Fall, pp. 117-8)

**Federal subsidies to the states undermine interstate competition** in two major ways. **First, to the extent that horizontal competition is motivated by a desire to increase state tax revenue by attracting migrants or preventing emigration, the existence of an alternative source of revenue necessarily diminishes state incentives to compete.** In addition to serving as a substitute source of state revenue, federal grants can sometimes undermine interstate competition more directly by enabling the states to establish a cartel by acceding to a common federal grant condition. The federal government in this scenario acts as the cartel manager, punishing defecting states by withdrawing their funding. For example, states seeking to avoid tax competition can create a cartel by the adoption of a federal policy that denies grants to states with tax rates below a certain level. The federal government can often crush vertical competition simply by paying the states not to compete with it. Federal grants to states are a particularly effective tool for restricting competition because, unlike in the case of preemptive mandates, state governments are actually likely to support them due to their desire to acquire additional federal funds. **Finally, federal grants to state governments can undermine diversity by attaching conditions that force dissenting states to conform to the preferences of the majority. Both liberal and conservative interest groups can use such conditions to impose their preferences on recalcitrant minority states.**

Link – Domestic Action

[\_\_\_\_] Domestic issues are reserved for the states

Ellis Katz, 1997

(AMERICAN FEDERALISM: PAST, PRESENT, AND FUTURE, p. http://usinfo.state.gov/journals/itdhr/0497/ijde/katz.htm)

**The powers granted to the federal government are relatively few in number and deal mainly with foreign and military affairs and national economic issues, such as the free flow of commerce across state lines. Most domestic policy issues were left to the states to resolve in keeping with their own histories, needs and cultures.**

Answers to: Federal-State Power Not Zero Sum

**[\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_] Federal exercise of power reduces state power

John Yoo, law professor, 1997

(SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA LAW REVIEW, p. 1352)

It is important to note that Justice Kennedy did not differentiate between laws that regulated states qua states and those that regulated private parties in areas that might be thought to lie within state power. **Following Chief Justice Rehnquist's majority opinion, Justice Kennedy's concurrence treated the exercise of any federal power as a diminution of the power of the states and hence a reduction of state sovereignty**

[\_\_\_\_] Expansion of federal power reduces states’ rights

Rex Lee, Fmr Solicitor General, 1996

(Rex, Brigham Young U. Law Review, p. 369)

Thus, though the state circle of power is larger than that of the federal government, federal power is supreme and preempts state power within the area covered by the smaller circle. **If the circle of federal power is expanded**, as shown by the broken line, **the nonpreempted portion of the state’s power circle – and therefore the effective area in which the states may govern – is correspondingly diminished.**

Impact – Tyranny

#### [\_\_\_\_] Strong federalism is necessary to protect against the concentration of power and prevent tyranny

James Gardner, Professor of Law, State University of New York, 2003

(GEORGETOWN LAW JOURNAL, June, p. 1007-8)

"The accumulation of all powers . . . in the same hands," wrote Madison "may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny." To protect liberty, then, power must be divided. Federalism serves this guiding principle of American constitutional design by parceling out government powers among different levels of government. Federalism, it must be borne in mind, is a creation of the national Constitution, not state constitutions. It is not the result of a fortuitous series of agreements reached one by one by the separate peoples of the original thirteen states; on the contrary, federalism represents the deliberate decision of a single national polity to divide governmental power for the purpose of protecting the liberty of all. **Federalism protects liberty by giving the state and national levels of government substantial powers sufficient to allow each to monitor and check the abuses of the other. n14 As with the horizontal separation of powers that divides governmental power into legislative, executive, and judicial branches, each level of government in this vertically fragmented system is given the power and incentive to struggle against the other: "Ambition," as Madison put it, "must be made to counteract ambition."** nThe result is a compound federal republic in which power is deeply fragmented, reducing as far as possible by structural means the likelihood that a tyrannical measure of power can be accumulated in a single set of hands:  In a single republic, all the power surrendered by the people, is submitted to the administration of a single government; and the usurpations are guarded against by a division of the government into distinct and separate departments. In the compound republic of America, the power surrendered by the people, is first divided between two distinct governments, and then the portion allotted to each, subdivided among distinct and separate departments. Hence a double security arises to the rights of the people. The different governments will control each other; at the same time that each will be controled by itself.

Impact – Tyranny

#### [\_\_\_\_] Federalism promotes diversity and stops tyranny

HASTINGS LAW JOURNAL, 2002

(January, pp. 439‑40)

**Federalism is often claimed to serve many diverse values. It "increases opportunity for citizen involvement in democratic processes," will better satisfy citizen preferences by catering to tastes at a state level, provides citizens with the option of moving to a state with public policies perceived to be more congenial, enables states to experiment with innovative public policies, preserves a government structure that inhibits a potentially tyrannical concentration of power in the central government,** insures the continuance of discrete political and social communities, and ensures clear political accountability for government actors in each of the central and state governments. Federalism is not, of course, an unqualified boon.

#### [\_\_\_\_] Federalism is important to preserve liberty and prevent the concentration of power

HASTINGS LAW JOURNAL, 2002

(January, pp. 433‑4)

I have a different perspective. **Federalism** is not a dysfunctional anachronism, a nostalgic symbol of a pre‑industrial America. Rather, when properly viewed and applied, it **is crucial to preservation of individual liberty and a valuable device to preserve a healthy balance of power among governmental institutions. The institutional benefits of federalism are not simply preservation of state autonomy as a counter to federal power but also operate less directly to preserve the scheme of separated powers within the federal government.**

#### [\_\_\_\_] Decentralized government maximizes individual freedom

Dalton Cross, Law Professor, Texas, 2000

(HARVARD JOURNAL OF LAW & PUBLIC POLICY, Fall, p. 165)

Government can be made more responsive to the popular will by keeping the policy-making unit closer to the people. **As a matter of simple arithmetic, the smaller the policy-making unit, the fewer the number of people who will be discontented by any policy choice. Individual freedom means leaving policy choices with the individual; if a choice must be removed from the individual by government, individual freedom is served to the extent that it is removed no farther than necessary.**

Impact – Liberty

**[\_\_\_] Every violation of liberty must be rejected at all costs**

Sylvester **Petro,** Professor of Law at Wake Forest **1974**

(University of Toledo Law Review Spring, pg. np)

However, one may still insist, echoing Ernest Hemingway—“I believe in only one thing: liberty”. And it is always well to bear in mind David Hume’s observation: “**It is seldom that liberty of any kind is lost all at once.” Thus, it is unacceptable to say that the invasion of one aspect of freedom is of no import because there have been invasions of so many other aspects**. **That road leads to chaos, tyranny, despotism and the end of all human aspiration**. Ask Solzhenistyn. Ask Milovan Djilas. In sum, if one believes in freedom as a supreme value and the proper ordering principle for any society aiming to maximize spiritual and material welfare, then **every invasion of freedom must be emphatically identified and resisted with undying spirit**.

**[\_\_\_] And liberty outweighs the affirmative’s impacts - makes all evil’s possible**

Daniel Callahan, Fellow at the Institute of Society and Ethics, 1973

(The Tyranny of Survival, Pages 91-93)

There seems to be no imaginable evil which some group is not willing to inflict on another for the sake of survival, no rights, liberties or dignities which it is not ready to suppress. It is easy, of course, to recognize the danger when survival is falsely and manipulatively invoked. Dictators never talk about their aggressions, but only about the need to defend the fatherland, to save it from destruction at the hands of its enemies. But my point goes deeper than that. It is directed even at legitimate concern for survival, when that concern is allowed to reach an intensity which would ignore, suppress or destroy other fundamental human rights and values. **The potential tyranny of survival as a value is** that it is **capable**, if not treated sanely, **of wiping out all other values. Survival can become an obsession and a disease, provoking a destructive singlemindedness that will stop at nothing**. We come here to the fundamental moral dilemma. If, both biologically and psychologically, the need for survival is basic to man, and **if survival is the precondition for any and all human achievements**, and if no other rights make much sense without the premise of a right to life - then **how will it be possible to honor and act upon the need for survival without, in the process, destroying everything in human beings which makes them worthy of survival**. To put it more strongly, **if the price of survival is human degradation, then there is no moral reason why an effort should be make to ensure that survival. It would be the Pyrrhic victory to end all Pyrrhic victories**.

Answers to: State Power Harms Minority Rights

**[\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_] Federalism encourages political accountability, which protects minority rights

Neil Siefel, Associate Professor of Law and Political Science at Duke University School of Law, 2008

(“INTERNATIONAL DELEGATIONS AND THE VALUES OF FEDERALISM”, Law and Contemporary Problems, Winter)

Second, democratic self-government is supposed to be facilitated when there exists a robust space for participatory politics at levels closer to the people who are governed. 21 **Federalism**, observed Justice O’Connor for the Court in Gregory, “**increases opportunity for citizen involvement in democratic processes**.” 22 On this point, she referenced Alexis de Tocqueville, who “understood well that **participation in local government is a cornerstone of American democracy**.” 23 Third, **political responsiveness and accountability are believed to be encouraged when states compete for mobile citizens who can vote with both their hands and their feet**. 24 Justice O’Connor wrote for the Gregory Court that **federalism “makes government more responsive by putting the States in competition for a mobile citizenry**.” 25 Responsiveness and accountability are distinguishable but related. One way to ensure responsiveness is not through exit but through voice 26 —that is, voting politicians out of office or pressuring them. This is often what is meant by accountability.

Answers to: State Power Decreases Efficiency

**[\_\_\_]**

**[\_\_\_] State power is crucial to effective policy solutions**

Joseph J. Foy, Ph.D. at the University of Notre Dame, 1996

(“Applying the New Federalism of 1996: Governors and Welfare Reform”, Notre Dame, p.2-3, http://citation.allacademic.com//meta/p\_mla\_apa\_research\_citation/0/8/3/5/0/pages83501/p83501-2.php)

With the passage of The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA) in 1996, America experienced an emergence of the “new federalist” policies that began during the presidency of Richard Nixon and blossomed under Ronald Regan. Defined primarily by its emphasis on “devolving” federal influence over social policies to the states, the new **federalism** of the mid-1990s **gave state governments more freedom to decide how to manage and implement social programs while simultaneously increasing pressure on state officials to make those programs work.** An obvious effect of this move in power was the pushing of states to the forefront of the debates surrounding social policies. **Rather than continuing to sing backup to the federal government’s lead, the states now had a greater role in determining the course of some of the most long- standing controversies in modern-American political history.** 1 **The devolution of authority from the federal government to the states** not only opened a door for state governments to have a greater say in policy choices, it also offered “students of politics a unique opportunity to pinpoint the determinants of state- level policy choices – a case in which the fifty states responded virtually simultaneously to a single policy mandate.” 2 This rare occurrence in which the American states were opened up as a laboratory for policy analysis on the same set of policy choices within the same time period offers a chance to see not only the impact federal policy has across the states, but it **enables a look into the specific political activities of state governments in determining policy outcomes.**

Article: Remaking Federalism to Remake the American Economy

**Bruce Katz**, Vice President Metropolitan Program, Brookings, February 16, **2012**, “Remaking Federalism to Remake the American Economy,” <http://www.brookings.edu/research/papers/2012/02/16-federalism-katz>

At the most basic level, the U.S. needs *more jobs*— 12.1 million by one estimate—to recover the jobs lost during the downturn and keep pace with population growth and labor market dynamics. Beyond pure job growth, the U.S. needs *better jobs*, to grow wages and incomes for lower- and middle-class workers and reverse the troubling decades-long rise in inequality.

To achieve these twin goals, the U.S. needs to restructure the economy from one focused inward and characterized by excessive consumption and debt, to one globally engaged and driven by production and innovation. It must do so while contending with a new cadre of global competitors that aim to best the United States in the next industrial revolution and while leveraging the distinctive assets and advantages of different parts of the country, particularly the major cities and metropolitan areas that are the engines of national prosperity.   
  
This is the tallest of economic orders and it is well beyond the scope of exclusive federal solutions, the traditional focus of presidential candidates in both political parties. Rather, the next President must look beyond Washington and enlist states and metropolitan areas as active co-partners in the restructuring of the national economy.   
  
Remaking the economy, in essence, requires a remaking of federalism so that governments at all levels “collaborate to compete” and work closely with each other and the private and civic sectors to burnish American competitiveness in the new global economic order.   
  
The time for remaking federalism could not be more propitious. With Washington mired in partisan gridlock, the states and metropolitan areas are once again playing their traditional roles as “laboratories of democracy” and centers of economic and policy innovation. An enormous opportunity exists for the next president to mobilize these federalist partners in a focused campaign for national economic renewal.   
  
Given global competition, the next president should adopt a vision of collaborative federalism in which:

* the federal government *leads where it must* and sets a robust platform for productive and innovative growth via a few transformative investments and interventions;
* states and metropolitan areas *innovate where they should* to design and implement bottom-up economic strategies that fully align with their distinctive competitive assets and advantages; and
* a refreshed set of *federalist institutions* maximize results by accelerating the replication of innovations across the federal, state and metropolitan levels.

**Federalism Disadvantage Affirmative**
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Not Unique – Federal Power Growing

**[\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_] Non-unique – Recent Supreme Court decisions have gutted federalism

Richard Peltz-Steele, professor of law at UMass Law School Dartmouth, 2012

(Dismantling Federalism Is A Shortcut With A Very Steep Price, 7/08, http://www.forbes.com/sites/realspin/2012/07/08/dismantling-federalism-is-a-shortcut-with-a-very-steep-price/print/)

**Recent decisions from the Supreme Court delivered a one-two punch to American federalism**.  While media focus on the political impact of the immigration and healthcare decisions on the elections**, our constitutional system is reeling** from a blow of greater proportion. In the first high-profile decision, Arizona substantially lost its battle to maintain a state immigration enforcement system.  The dispute arose from the gap between what the feds say and what they do, specifically the failure to police immigration to the satisfaction of Arizona taxpayers. The decision in Arizona v. United States was mostly about federal preemption of state law.  And preemption law is notoriously fuzzy: “eye of the beholder” unfortunately characterizes the Court’s approach.  The majority saw the Arizona case as an instance of Congress so thoroughly “occupying the field” that no room remained for state law.  Justice Thomas, in a concise dissent, reasoned that Congress had not precluded state law such as Arizona’s, which merely echoes federal law. Whatever one thinks of Justice Scalia’s dissent, he got the facts right.  The difference between majority and dissenter perceptions turns in part on whether the President’s inaction in enforcing federal immigration law has preemptive significance.  And certainly, as Scalia wrote, the Framers would have abhorred this result; the states always have cherished their borders.  One columnist wryly noted that the Framers would not have signed a constitution abolishing slavery.  True, but that deficiency of our Constitution was addressed through amendment.  No amendment yet has erased state borders. Preemption always poses a fuzzy question, but the Court’s ruling against Arizona takes a bite out of state power.  Expansive federal inaction was read to displace a traditionally sound exercise of state police power that only sought to complement federal law—as written.  **The states now seem more than ever at the mercy of the federal government and its deep pockets to decide what is and is not the province of the state electorate**. So what local policy decisions will next take up residence between Capitol Hill and K Street?  Healthcare, it seems.  **In NFIB v. Sebelius**, the Court substantially upheld the national healthcare initiative advanced by the President, including the controversial individual mandate. The Court majority rejected the mandate as an exercise of Commerce Clause power.  But leaving academic jaws agape, the majority capitalized on a marginal, throw-it-at-the-wall-and-see-if-it-sticks Government argument that the penalty for failure to comply with the mandate was not a penalty at all—rather, a tax within the power of the Taxing Clause (as well as the Sixteenth Amendment, a further flimsy stretch). **The majority’s use of the Taxing Clause dealt another blow to federalism.**

Not Unique – Federal Power Growing

**[\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_] Federal intrusion on the states now

Peter Harkness, founder and publisher emeritus of GOVERNING, 2012

(January, “What Brand of Federalism is Next?”, <http://www.governing.com/columns/potomac-chronicle/gov-col-what-brand-of-federalism-is-next.html>)

In this atmosphere, **the Obama administration has pursued a very unique mixture of collaborative and coercive strategies in dealing with states and localities, making it hard to define just what kind of federalism we’re seeing. The health-care, education and financial regulation reform bills, the climate change proposal and the massive financial stimulus bill all represented an aggressive use of federal power, some of it unprecedented and some pre-empting state regulations**.

Not Unique – Federal Transportation Influence Growing

**[\_\_\_]**

**[\_\_\_] Growing federal role in transportation policy now and states like it**

Robert Jay Dilgerm, Senior Specialist in American National Government at the Congressional Research Service, 2011

(January 10, 2011, “Federalism Issues in Surface Transportation Policy: Past and Present,” <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R40431.pdf>)

American federalism, which shapes the roles, responsibilities, and interactions among and between the federal government, the states, and local governments, is continuously evolving, adapting to changes in American society and American political institutions. **The nature of federalism relationships in surface transportation policy has also evolved over time, with the federal government’s role becoming increasingly influential, especially since the Federal-Aid to Highway Act** of 1956 **which authorized the interstate highway system**. **In recent years, state and local government officials, through their public interest groups** (especially the National Governors Association, National Conference of State Legislatures, National Association of Counties, National League of Cities, U.S. Conference of Mayors, and American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials) **have lobbied for increased federal assistance for surface transportation grants and increased flexibility in the use of those funds.**

No Link – Supremacy Clause

**[\_\_\_]**

#### [\_\_\_] No link – under the Supremacy Clause, federal law is preeminent

Erwin Chemerinsky, law professor at Duke, 2004

(BROOKLYN LAW REVIEW, Summer pp. 1316-7)

Article VI of the Constitution contains the Supremacy Clause, which provides that the Constitution, and laws and treaties made pursuant to it, are the supreme law of the land**. When a state law conflicts with federal law, the federal law controls and the state law bows under the principle of federal supremacy. As the Supreme Court declared: "Under the Supremacy Clause, from which our pre-emption doctrine is derived, any state law, however clearly within a State's acknowledged power, which interferes with or is contrary to federal law, must yield**." In Gade v. National Solid Waste Management Association, the Court summarized the tests for preemption: Pre-emption may be either expressed or implied, and is compelled whether Congress' command is explicitly stated in the statute's language or implicitly contained in its structure and purpose. Absent explicit pre-emptive language, we have recognized at least two types of implied pre-emption: field pre-emption, where the scheme of federal regulation is so pervasive as to make reasonable the inference that Congress left no room for the States to supplement it, and conflict pre-emption, where compliance with both federal and state regulations is a physical impossibility, or where state law stands as an obstacle to the accomplishment and execution of the full purposes and objectives of Congress.

No Link – Grants

**[\_\_\_]**

**[\_\_\_] The plan will be voluntary grants given to the states that want them – doesn’t mandate anything**

Washington Post 2012

([Ashley Halsey III](http://www.washingtonpost.com/ashley-halsey-iii/2011/05/26/AGriQzBH_page.html), July 23, Transit agencies get $787 million in federal grants, http://www.washingtonpost.com/local/trafficandcommuting/transit-agencies-get-787-million-in-federal-grants/2012/07/23/gJQAVfs84W\_print.html)

**From Alaska to Florida**, from Hawaii to Maine, **the Obama administration** on Monday **spread $787 million in grants to help repair and restore the nation’s transit systems**. With $150 million [already committed](http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/dr-gridlock/post/senate-committee-approves-money-for-metro/2011/09/21/gIQA0g5zlK_blog.html) for [that purpose](http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/dr-gridlock/post/senate-committee-approves-money-for-metro/2011/09/21/gIQA0g5zlK_blog.html)to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, the D.C. region was left out of the new round of funding, other than a $1.5 million grant to improve bus stations, shelters and real-time information. Baltimore received $40 million to replace a 65-year-old bus barn and Ocean City will get $2 million to replace aging buses. Virginia’s share of the federal largess is $2 million for paratransit vans in Hampton Roads and an additional $1 million for statewide transit management. **Federal Transit Administrator Peter Rogoff said his agency received 836 applications for the money, requesting $4 billion**. **He called**[the grants](http://www.fta.dot.gov/about/12322_14745.html)**a downpayment toward meeting the need for transit restoration and repair that has been deferred by transit systems in an era of tight budgets.**

No Internal Link – Not Zero Sum

**[\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_] No threshold – The federal government is nowhere near expanding power enough to threaten state governments

Ernest Young, Law Professor, University of Texas, 2003

(TEXAS LAW REVIEW, May, p. 1607)

One of the privileges of being a junior faculty member is that senior colleagues often feel obligated to read one's rough drafts. **On many occasions when I have written about federalism - from a stance considerably more sympathetic to the States than Judge Noonan's - my colleagues have responded with the following comment: "Relax. The States retain vast reserves of autonomy and authority over any number of important areas. It will be a long time, if ever, before the national government can expand its authority far enough to really endanger the federal balance. Don't make it sound like you think the sky is falling."**

[\_\_\_] No internal link – federalism is a concept, not a distribution of power – it’s not zero sum

Bradley Bobertz,Environmental Law Professor, 2003

(PACE ENVIRONMENTAL LAW REVIEW, pp. 88-9)

Let us begin by demystifying the word "federalism." **Federalism, itself, simply refers to any system of power-sharing in which authority is distributed between what is typically a larger political unit, such as the United States, and what are typically smaller political subdivisions, such as the states, which are a part of, but at least partially independent from, the larger body**. The European Union and its constituent nations are an example of federalism, as were the Articles of Confederation that the Constitution supplanted. **Federalism, in other words, is a structural notion that has no meaning independent of its particularizing details. Under any given system of federalism, the larger political body can have a great deal more power than its political subunits, as is the case in some European nations, or the subunits can wield comparatively more power than the larger political unit, as was the case under the Confederate Constitution during the American Civil War.** In normal usage, then, the term "federalism" is agnostic as to how power is distributed. "Federalists" of the founding generation favored a strong national government in relation to the states, while the modern Federalist Society appears to favor the diminishment of national power vis-a-vis the states

Strong Federal Government Good – Liberty

**[\_\_\_]**

#### [\_\_\_] Turn – A Strong national government is critical to protect liberty

James Gardner, Professor of Law, State University of New York, 2003

(GEORGETOWN LAW JOURNAL, June p. 1010-11)

Thus, although federalism contemplates the division of power to protect "liberty," I shall treat this conventional use of the word as a kind of synecdoche that names only one part of the broader notion of achieving, or creating the conditions that enable citizens to achieve, a substantively desirable way of life**. Under this broad definition of liberty, the national government of the United States contributes to and protects the liberty of American citizens in at least three distinct ways: (1) by using its affirmative powers in pursuit of the good, (2) by practicing self-restraint, and (3) by restraining state governments from impairing the ability of citizens to achieve the good. First and foremost, the national government protects liberty by using its affirmatively granted powers for the good of the citizenry.** This conception of governmental power is broad enough to embrace any conception of the state, from a minimalist, night-watchman state to the contemporary European-style social welfare state. Whatever version of the state a society chooses to adopt, a government must exist and must possess certain powers that enable the polity collectively to achieve the goals that it sets for itself. Under the U.S. Constitution, the national government has many powers that fit this description. **The commerce power, spending power, and various military powers have all been used many times to achieve through direct action by the national government objectives that the American polity has collectively decided will make it better off. The commerce power alone, for example, has given us environmental regulation; social, health, and welfare programs; most of the administrative state; and even much of our civil rights legislation, to name only a few of its principal uses.**

Strong Federal Government Good – Liberty

**[\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_] And changing times demand a national response – problems are now national, not local

Evan Caminker, Law Professor, University of Michigan, 2001

(ANNALS OF THE AMERICAN ACADEMY OF POLITICAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCE, March, p. 88‑9)

Madison was right; over the course of two centuries, we have become a unified nation with primarily national rather than state affiliations and loyalties. **The prevailing early sentiment that states were better guardians of individual liberty was substantially repudiated in the Civil War era, with the opposite sentiment being reflected in the Reconstruction Amendments' broad grants of congressional power to enforce individual rights against states. The prevailing early sentiment that states were primary and better repositories of the general police power was substantially repudiated in the New Deal era, when Congress acquired concurrent authority to exercise a good deal of the modern police powers. Indeed, the domestic issues most prominently addressed by national politicians today include education, crime, medical care, and welfare‑‑the staples of the states' traditional police powers. Finally, modern developments in transportation and communication technologies have enabled a physical mobility and communicative connectedness that, by and large, lead us to perceive ourselves as national citizens first and state citizens second.**

Strong Federal Government Good – Tyranny

**[\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_] Turn – federal power is necessary to check state power

James Gardner, Professor of Law, State University of New York, 2003

(GEORGETOWN LAW JOURNAL, June p. 1010-11)

The multiplicity of power centers in the American scheme can create the impression that the system is chaotic--a pure, Hobbesian war of all against all without any purpose other than the accumulation of power. This is not the case--or at least need not be the case. In the Framers' view, what unifies the dispersion of governmental power is the people, for the entire system is designed to assure as far as possible that their wishes be done and their liberties left intact. “**The Federal and State Governments," Madison observes, "are in fact but different agents and trustees of the people, instituted with different powers, and designated for different purposes." Federalism is thus more than a passive institutionalization of social conflict; it is a dynamic system that is designed to be manipulated by the people to produce results they desire. Hamilton put this point clearly: In a confederacy the people, without exaggeration, may be said to be entirely the masters of their own fate. Power being almost always the rival of power; the General Government will at all times stand ready to check the usurpations of the state governments; and these will have the same disposition towards the General Government.** The people, by throwing themselves into either scale, will infallibly make it preponderate. If their rights are invaded by either, they can make use of the other, as the instrument of redress.

Strong Federal Government Good – Minority Rights

**[\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_] Federalism destroys individual rights and democracy

Mitchell Crusto, Associate Professor, Loyola University New Orleans, 2000

(16 Ga. St. U.L. Rev. 517, SPRING)

The essence of the federalism paradox is that **the Court's new pro-state government orientation purports to protect state governments from an overbearing central government; but, ironically, it does not purport to protect the people from overbearing state governments. The federalism paradox refers to the inevitable tension between majority rule and protection of minority and individual rights. Federalism that promotes states' rights arguably promotes democracy, which is by definition majority rule. However, majority rule can lead to oppression of minority interests and individual rights. Many of those rights are constitutionally protected. Hence, federalism encroaches upon constitutionally-protected rights.**

[\_\_\_] Qualified sources conclude our way

Mitchell Crusto, Associate Professor, Loyola University New Orleans, 2000

(16 Ga. St. U.L. Rev. 517, SPRING)

Critiquing the Court's new federalism doctrine, one celebrated liberal constitutional scholar, **Harvard law professor Laurence Tribe, raises concerns that the Supreme Court's "new" federalism unduly victimizes the oppressed**. 77 Another noted liberal constitutional scholar, **Georgetown professor Mark Tushnet, identified the importance of a federal system that preserves or enhances value- pluralism over one that merely administers power**. 78 Hence, **many important constitutional scholars recognize that the federalism paradox must be addressed in order to develop an effective federalism doctrine, one that does not derogate individual and minority rights**.

Strong Federal Government Good – Efficiency

**[\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_] Federalism leads to ineffective responses to a variety of crucial problems

Stephen M. Griffen, Professor in Constitutional Law, Tulane School, 2007

(St. Johns Journal of Legal Commentary Spring- “Symposium: Federalism Past, Federalism Future: A Constitutional Law Symposium: Stop Federalism Before It Kills Again: Reflections On Hurricane Katrina, 2007)

And so **it is still the case that when natural disasters strike, the divided power of the federal structure presents a coordination problem**. The kind of coordination that had to occur to avoid the Katrina disaster requires long-term planning before the event. **The American constitutional system makes taking intergovernmental action difficult and complex**. The process of coordinating governments can take years. In many ways, the government was just at the beginning of that process at the time of Katrina, [n48](http://www.lexisnexis.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?tokenKey=rsh-20.623515.1689064805&target=results_DocumentContent&reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1215280977638&returnToKey=20_T4099813154&parent=docview" \l "n48#n48) although we are now four years distant from the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 that set the latest round of disaster coordination in motion. Suppose, however, that we don't have the luxury of taking the time to satisfy every official with a veto. This is the key point of tension between what contemporary governance demands and what the Constitution permits. The kind of limited change that occurred in 1927 can take us only so far. **What Hurricane Katrina showed was that even after decades of experience with natural disasters, the federal and state governments were still uncoordinated and unprepared.** The reasons they were unprepared go to the heart of the constitutional order. **Unless we learn some lessons, Katrina will happen again. It may be a massive earthquake, an influenza pandemic, a terrorist attack, or even another hurricane, but the same ill-coordinated response will indeed happen again unless some attention is paid to the constitutional and institutional lessons of Katrina. We need to "stop** **federalism" before it kills again**. That is, we need to stop our customary thinking about what federalism requires in order to prevent another horrific loss of life and property.

No Impact – Tyranny

**[\_\_\_]**

#### [\_\_\_] The mere existence of the states prevents the impacts

Evan Caminker, Law Professor, University of Michigan, 2001

(ANNALS OF THE AMERICAN ACADEMY OF POLITICAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCE, March, p. 88‑9)

The allocation of significant regulatory authority to the states within a federal system is frequently defended as serving the following structural values: enhancing the responsiveness of government to the specific interests of members of a heterogeneous society, both by decentralizing decision making and by generating competition for a mobile citizenry; enabling states to act as laboratories experimenting with diverse solutions to economic and social problems; and stimulating the development of democratic skills and attitudes by increasing citizen participation in self‑governance. **Moreover, the mere existence of states as independent institutions serves as a structural check against the risk that Congress will either assert power that does not lawfully belong to it or wield the power it does lawfully enjoy too frequently or indiscriminately. As observed by Alexander Hamilton, The State legislatures . . . will constantly have their attention awake to the conduct of the national rulers, and will be ready enough if anything improper appears, to sound the alarm to the people, and not only to be the VOICE, but, if necessary, the ARM of their discontent.**

No Impact – Tyranny

**[\_\_\_]**

#### [\_\_\_] Public pressure prevents the impact

Ilya Somin, Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Government, Harvard University, 2001

(GEORGETOWN LAW JOURNAL, January, p. 485)

The problem of transparency that Justice O'Connor detected in the case of federal commandeering is much more serious in the case of federal subsidies to state governments. **State officials faced with commandeering statutes and other unfunded mandates from the federal government have an obvious incentive to publicize their complaints and use their lobbying power to mobilize opposition. Indeed, such opposition has resulted in numerous state‑government‑initiated lawsuits to curtail such mandates and even in the passage of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995, a federal statute intended to curb them. Although this activity is unlikely to completely negate deeply rooted voter ignorance, it may at the very least diminish it to some degree.**

**Taxes Bad Disadvantage**
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Summary

This disadvantage argues that if the federal government spends more money on infrastructure that the government will raise certain taxes to pay for the increase in expenditures. These taxes don’t necessary have to be taxes on personal income but could be taxes on items like gasoline or carbon.

Tax increases could undermine economy because when people are taxed they have less money to spend to purchase goods. They also have less money purchase goods if their taxes are higher. When taxes are higher businesses have less money to invest and to higher workers. Workers themselves may have less of incentive to work because the government will collect more and more taxes from their paychecks. All of this reduced spending by businesses and consumers will reduce economic activity, threatening the economy.

Glossary

Consumer. A consumer is an individual person who purchases a product.

Draconian. Draconian means extreme.

Fuel tax. A fuel tax is a tax on gasoline or other motor fuels such as diesel.

Stimulus. When the government spends a lot of money it is considered to be a stimulus because that expenditure of money means that more money is available in the economy to buy goods and stimulate economic activity.

Taxes. A tax is the percentage of a person’s income or price of a good that is paid to the government.

Taxes Bad Disadvantage Shell

A. Uniqueness -- No tax increases now

New York Times, 2012

(May 11, “House Approves $310 Billion in Budget Cuts,” http://www.nytimes.com/2012/05/11/us/house-approves-310-billion-in-cuts.html?\_r=1)

**Democrats said Republicans had become captives to a pledge never to raise taxes, foisting on Congress a draconian plan that “asks more from those who have less and less from those who have more**,” as Representative Steny H. Hoyer of Maryland, the No. 2 House Democrat, put it.

B. Link -- Infrastructure spending is paid for out of general tax revenues. Since there is no more money in the coffers, the plan would result in a tax increase

[Edward **Glaeser**](http://topics.bloomberg.com/edward-glaeser/), an economics professor at [Harvard University](http://topics.bloomberg.com/harvard-university/), 2012

(Bloomberg, February 14, “Spending Won’t Fix What Ails US Infrastructure,” <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-02-14/spending-won-t-fix-what-ails-u-s-transport-commentary-by-edward-glaeser.html>)

**The stimulus delivered a dollop of highway spending provided with general tax dollars, and the** [**Congressional Budget Office**](http://www.cbo.gov/ftpdocs/126xx/doc12699/01-31-2012_Outlook.pdf) **projects that the Trust Fund will be broke by 2014. Yet Congress is now promoting a vast new** [**road spending bill**](http://www.cbo.gov/ftpdocs/127xx/doc12754/hr7.pdf). **The budget the president presented yesterday supports paying for infrastructure with “current user-financed mechanisms**,” **but also proposes tapping “part of the savings from ending the war in** [**Iraq**](http://topics.bloomberg.com/iraq/) and winding down operations in Afghanistan,” **which just means using general** [**tax revenue**](http://topics.bloomberg.com/tax-revenue/) **to pay for highways.**

Taxes Bad Disadvantage Shell

C. Impact -- Tax increases will slow growth and cause unemployment

William W. Beach, Director of the Center for Data Analysis (CDA) at The Heritage Foundation, 2010

(September 20, 2010, “Obama Tax Hikes: The Economic and Fiscal Effects,” http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2010/09/obama-tax-hikes-the-economic-and-fiscal-effects)

**Center for Data Analysis economists estimated the likely economic and fiscal effects of the Obama tax plan by introducing it into a model of the U.S. economy that leading government agencies and Fortune 500 companies use to produce economic forecasts**. This economic model, which covers FY 2011 to FY 2020, produced results that are displayed in Appendix 2 of this Report**. The Obama tax plan would result in:**

**• Slower economic growth:** Inflation-adjusted gross domestic product (GDP) would fall by a total of $1.1 trillion between FY 2011 and FY 2020. GDP in 2018 would fall by $145 billion alone. The growth rate of the economy would be slower for the entire 10-year period.

**• Fewer jobs: Slower economic growth would result in less job creation. Employment would fall by an average of 693,000 per year over this period**

* **238,000 fewer jobs in the critical economic recovery year of 2011;**
* In one year alone, 2016, job losses top 876,000.

**• More unemployed Americans: Slower growth in employment translates to a higher unemployment rate, which would rise more each year during the 10-year period than it would without the Obama tax hikes.**

**In other words, for Americans who are unemployed now, their prospects of employment would worsen under the Obama tax plan.**

Uniqueness – No Tax Increases Now

[\_\_\_\_]

[\_\_\_\_] The increase would be unique – no tax increases now

William W. Beach, Director of the Center for Data Analysis at The Heritage Foundation, **2010**

(September 20, “Obama Tax Hikes: The Economic and Fiscal Effects,” http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2010/09/obama-tax-hikes-the-economic-and-fiscal-effects)

If Congress enacts the Obama tax hike, it will have changed the course of long-standing tax policy. With the exception of the recently enacted Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA), **no Congress has voted to raise significant sums of new tax revenues since 1996. Indeed, the fundamental tax policy of this country until now has been to reduce tax burdens. This policy has largely been driven by a bipartisan understanding that lower tax rates support stronger economic growth. Certainly, that view animated the debates over the 2001 and 2003 tax legislation, each of which resulted in lower, though temporary, tax rates and tax liabilities.**

Link – Transportation Infrastructure Investment Increases Taxes

**[\_\_\_\_]**

#### [\_\_\_\_] Transportation infrastructure spending paid for with taxes

Transportation Finance.org, 2012

(“Financing,” <http://www.transportation-finance.org/funding_financing/financing/>)

**Traditionally, transportation infrastructure has been financed primarily through a combination of state and local taxes and fees and-for major projects-Federal grants funded by national motor fuels taxes.** These resources are typically combined to fund projects on a "pay-as-you-go" basis, meaning that projects have often been built in phases or increments as funds become available over a period of years

#### [\_\_\_\_] New infrastructure will be paid for with higher gas taxes

Dr. Jean Rodrigue, Hofstra University, 2012

(“The Financing of Transportation Infrastructure,” <http://people.hofstra.edu/geotrans/eng/ch7en/appl7en/ch7a2en.html>)

**Several transport infrastructures are subsidized by revenues from other streams since their operating costs cannot be compensated by existing revenue. For instance,** [**public transport systems are subsidized**](http://people.hofstra.edu/geotrans/eng/ch6en/conc6en/revenueustransit.html) **in part by revenues coming from fuel taxes or tolls**.

Answers to: Pay for the Plan Another Way

#### [\_\_\_\_\_] No money now for new transportation – New programs would require more taxes

Robert Poole, director of transportation at Reason Foundation, **20**11

(“Advocates Calling for More Transportation Spending Need to See the Big Budget Picture,” Reason, <http://reason.org/news/printer/advocates-calling-for-more-transpor>)

What this changed context means for transportation is the subject of this column. The grandiose dreams sketched out only three years ago by the Policy & Revenue Commission for a massively expanded federal role, and echoed in 2009 by Rep. Jim Oberstar (D-MN, who lost his seat in the 2010 elections), have become irrelevant - despite still being reflected in President Barack Obama’s original 2012 budget proposal to more than double the size of the program. Economist Robert Samuelson put his finger on the problem in a recent column in the Washington Post, “Big Government on the Brink.” We have created what he calls a “suicidal government,” by which he means that “government has promised more than it can realistically deliver and, as a result, it repeatedly disappoints by providing less than people expect.” And as a result, he writes, “The system can no longer make choices, especially unpleasant choices, for the good of the nation as a whole.” Rep. Paul Ryan’s (R-WI) plan to reduce federal spending over the next decade down to 20% of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) was attacked as a radical fantasy when first introduced, but in a few short weeks it so changed the debate that the president submitted a replacement for his original 2012 budget plan, with the new version looking more like Ryan’s plan over the next few years (even though aiming only to get down to 22% of GDP in the out years). The Gang of Six in the Senate, like President Obama’s deficit reduction commission from last fall, is talking about eliminating countless sacred-cow “tax-expenditures” as part of wide-ranging tax simplification. There is even serious talk about scrapping tax-exempt municipal bonds. Yet as I read the missives put forth by every major transportation group, I see calls for larger programs and greater federal spending, as if none of this larger context exists. But the fact is, the federal transportation program that has grown tremendously since creation of the Highway Trust Fund in 1956, and is due for radical surgery. Business-as-usual in transportation—as in every other federal program—is no longer an option. In the short-term (i.e., the current reauthorization bill), there will be no federal fuel tax increase and the program will be sized to what existing highway user taxes bring in. Period. Bills to increase tax rates must originate in the House, and not even the White House is proposing an increase. There is no general fund money available to supplement what gas taxes bring in. Consequently, we need to learn to live with this new reality

Tax Increases Hurt the Economy

[\_\_\_\_]

#### [\_\_\_\_] Tax increase will cause substantial economic harm

William W. Beach, Director of the Center for Data Analysis at The Heritage Foundation, **2010**

(September 20, “Obama Tax Hikes: The Economic and Fiscal Effects,” http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2010/09/obama-tax-hikes-the-economic-and-fiscal-effects)

Bad economic news is mirrored by several other key economic indicators:

* Business investment would fall every year of the 10-year period by an average of $33 billion below the level it would be without the tax hikes;
* Investment in residences would also fall by an average of $13 billion each year;
* Personal savings would decrease by $38 billion in 2011 alone, and savings by Americans would continue below baseline for each of the following four years;
* Total disposable lost income after subtracting inflation would equal $726 billion for the 10-year period; and
* Lost consumer spending after inflation would equal $706 billion over this time period.

In short, **the economic harm is significant and widespread. Individuals and households throughout the income distribution will bear the brunt of the economic slowdown, resulting in fewer employment opportunities, lower wages, lost consumption, and lower savings. Congress needs to understand that it will raise additional revenues on the backs of those citizens it often works to help through income redistribution programs.**

#### [\_\_\_\_] Tax increase will result in lower economic output

William W. Beach, Director of the Center for Data Analysis at The Heritage Foundation, **2010**

(September 20, “Obama Tax Hikes: The Economic and Fiscal Effects,” http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2010/09/obama-tax-hikes-the-economic-and-fiscal-effects)

*Lower Economic Output.* **GDP will be, on average, $111 billion lower over the 2011 to 2020 forecast horizon. The projected slowdown in the U.S. economy will result largely from significantly reduced incentives to save and invest in productive capital and technology through higher capital gains and dividend taxes. The productive capacity of the economy is also lowered by the disincentive for high-income individuals to supply their labor due to the higher marginal tax rates on income.**

Tax Increases Hurt the Economy

[\_\_\_\_]

**[\_\_\_\_] Taxing capital causes stagnation**

William W. Beach, Director of the Center for Data Analysis at The Heritage Foundation, **2010**

(September 20, “Obama Tax Hikes: The Economic and Fiscal Effects,” http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2010/09/obama-tax-hikes-the-economic-and-fiscal-effects)

Arguably, many high-income individuals earn their income from capital income rather than labor income. However, **at the macro (aggregate) level, the marginal effects of tax rates also affect individuals on the cusp of moving into the high-income brackets. Therefore, it is not only current high-income individuals who are discouraged from supplying their labor, but also those who, through a little more labor supply, would find themselves in the high-income bracket. Economic stagnation frequently results from just this “unseen” event: Someone somewhere simply does not work harder or more cleverly because of high taxation; and the result hurts everyone through slower economic growth**.

Tax Increases Cause Unemployment

[\_\_\_\_]

#### [\_\_\_\_] Higher taxes reduce employment

William W. Beach, Director of the Center for Data Analysis at The Heritage Foundation, **2010**

(September 20, “Obama Tax Hikes: The Economic and Fiscal Effects,” http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2010/09/obama-tax-hikes-the-economic-and-fiscal-effects)

*Reduced Employment.* Total employment would decrease by an average of 693,000 jobs over the 2011 to 2020 forecast horizon. Annual job losses would peak at 876,000 in 2016, and would continue to fall, albeit at a slower pace, through 2020. This forecast path would delay any sort of recovery in the labor market. The employment losses are caused by the direct and indirect effects of the higher tax rates on labor and capital. **The direct effect happens at the margins where individuals choose to supply less labor due to the higher marginal tax rate. This is a relatively small effect when compared to the indirect effects that are set in motion by the changes in decisions to invest and grow the productive capacity of the economy. The higher capital income tax and the increased disincentives for saving and investment will likely force business owners to operate below potential and decrease their (planned and actual) investment in new equipment. A slowdown (or even continued pullback) in real business investment will lead to decreased levels of economic output that, in turn, will cause wages and salaries to be lower than they otherwise could have been, or cause employment levels to be lower. Capital gains also represent the additional value that entrepreneurs create when they implement new technologies, find better ways to make or deliver products and services, or introduce a better product or service to the market.** Often these entrepreneurs will start a new company. Higher capital gains taxes discourage potential entrepreneurs who must already overcome the riskiness of the endeavor (i.e., the possibility of earning little or no return), borrowing, or other financing costs of the endeavor, as well as myriad other tangible and intangible constraints when deciding whether to become an entrepreneur

Tax Increases Cause Unemployment

[\_\_\_\_]

#### [\_\_\_\_] Increased taxes depress growth, jobs and GDP

Rea Hederman, Jr., Assistant Director, Center for Data Analysis and Research Fellow and Alfredo Goyburu, 2004

(“An Increase in the Gas Tax Would Hurt Consumers and Slow the Economy,” 3-18, Heritage Foundation, <http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2004/03/an-increase-in-the-gas-tax-would-hurt-consumers-and-slow-the-economy>)

Some leaders in Congress want to increase the federal tax on gasoline by 5.45 cents per gallon, for the first year, and then index it to inflation. They would use the revenue from this tax increase to finance additional spending on highways and other transportation projects, which they say will benefit the economy. Macroeconomic analysis performed by the Center for Data Analysis at the Heritage Foundation, however, shows that increasing the gas tax would depress economic activity and the incomes of millions of Americans. It would also raise significantly less revenue than its proponents project. The President should be commended for his firm stand against raising the federal gasoline tax, and Congress would do well to abandon proposals to increase the gas tax and instead focus on spending highway dollars more efficiently, ideally by turning them back to the states.[1] The Real Cost of the Gas Tax Analysts in the Center for Data Analysis (CDA) estimated the economic and fiscal effects of a higher gas tax using a well-known econometric model of the U.S. economy.[2] The model allows analysts to vary the gas tax and simulate the effects of higher spending on infrastructure construction, if adequate details about that construction are available. Because such details were not available, CDA analysts instead used the additional revenues from the higher gas tax to pay down national debt, which is an alternative way of infusing government spending into a segment of the economy that is tightly aligned with investment decisions. [3]This macroeconomic analysis found that: Personal savings would average $8 billion less per year from 2005 to 2014. $82 billion of the $131 billion increase in federal revenues over 10 years would be financed out of foregone or lower personal savings. Gross Domestic Product would decline by $6.5 billion per year, in real terms, from 2005 to 2014. In other words, this $131 billion in government revenues would shrink the economy by $65.5 billion. There would be, on average, 37,000 fewer job opportunities each year. That works out to one lost job for every $351,000 in new taxes, which is equal to 11 years of work at average yearly wages.[4] Total federal revenues would fall short of gas tax proponent's projections by $3.7 billion. Family disposable income would be, on average, $2.5 billion less per year, in real terms. That's equivalent to the cost of sending 532,600 students to college each year. [5] Congressman Don Young (R-AK) proposed an increase of the federal gas tax from 18.4 cents per gallon to 23.85 cents per gallon in the first year as part of the 2004 highway bill. While this twenty-nine percent tax increase has not generated major support, Congress should not bring the gas tax increase back as a policy proposal. While raising the gas tax would increase government revenues, it would only do so at the expense of economic growth, jobs, and family income.

Tax Increases Cause a Recession

[\_\_\_\_]

#### [\_\_\_\_] Maintaining low tax rates critical to stop an economic downturn

Bloomberg, 2010

(August 17, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2010-08-17/tax-cuts-are-only-way-to-economic-growth-commentary-by-david-blanchflower.html)

**If we don’t act fast, a plunge into depression is a growing risk in** both **the U.S**. and the U.K. Quantitative easing will probably have to be started again this year in both countries. **The** so-called **Bush tax cuts, which are scheduled to expire at the end of the year, should be extended as soon as possible**. In the U.K., the draconian public-spending cuts alongside the increase in value-added tax planned for the end of the year should both be scrapped. Now is the time to cut taxes, not increase them. Payroll tax holidays are the way to go.

**U.S.** [**unemployment**](http://www.bloomberg.com/apps/quote?ticker=USURTOT:IND) **remains worryingly high at 9.5 percent and initial jobless claims are up again. Banks are still not lending, especially to small businesses** and even though mortgage rates are at historic lows, **house prices show no signs of recovering. Consumer confidence is down and spending is slowing.** The recently announced trade figures were ghastly. U.S. exports in June were $150.5 billion compared with $200.3 billion of imports, which resulted in a goods-and-services deficit of $49.9 billion, up from $42 billion in May.

Talk of exit strategies for the Federal Reserve that we heard earlier in the year has now disappeared; the Federal Open Market Committee at its meeting last week confirmed that the recovery was slowing and downgraded its growth outlook. Incentives to Hire The announcement that the Fed will recycle the proceeds of maturing mortgage-backed securities into new purchases of long- dated Treasuries is welcome. But banks aren’t lending and firms need incentives to hire, so the Fed move isn’t enough, especially since quantitative easing will take time to work. **It’s time for tax cuts, which have the added advantage that they work quickly. Firms respond to incentives.**

Tax Increases Collapse Investor Confidence

[\_\_\_\_]

[\_\_\_\_] Higher taxes collapse economic supports

Investor's Business Daily, 2010

(November 16, p. online)

The more you let a person or business keep of the fruits of their labor, the more they will labor**. The greater the chance of profit, the likelier investors and entrepreneurs will take risks. But if you let the top tax rate rise to nearly 40%**, a burden exceeding that of medieval serfs, **the economic wheels fall off.** It's a myth that the Bush tax cuts cost us jobs and revenues and led to the current crisis. As Julie Borowski of Freedom Works points out, citing Treasury Department data, **the Bush-era tax cuts increased production and innovation, which led to the rich paying a larger share of tax**es. Borowski says that if the Bush tax rates are extended, the top 1% of income earners will pay 37% of taxes with the current 35% marginal tax rate. Under Obama's proposal, these individuals will pay only 31% of taxes with the proposed 39.6% marginal tax rate. So Axelrod and Obama have it exactly backward. Their plan would result in the rich paying a lesser percentage of total taxes. The way to soak the rich is to lower their tax rates. The way to expand revenues is to expand the tax base, not rates. It's been said that if you control the language, you control the debate. The debate has been whether the Bush tax cuts should be extended for the "wealthy" or just the middle class or a combination of the two. The debate shouldn't be about "cuts" at all, but about maintaining current tax rates that have been in existence for nearly a decade. And it shouldn't be about the "wealthy," but about the successful, the risk takers, entrepreneurs and small businessmen who create the jobs the middle class, suffering from long-term near double-digit unemployment, sorely need. **As taxes rise, people and businesses tend to engage in behavior that will reduce their tax burden. A rising tax burden and the added costs of hiring additional employees leads businesses not to expand or to think twice about adding extra workers. Investors put their money elsewhere.**

[\_\_\_\_] Tax increase will crush investor confidence in the economy

Fred Thompson, former US Senator, 2010

(August 23, http://www.texasgopvote.com/blog/congress-must-renew-bush-tax-cuts-08143)

On Dec. 31, 2010, almost every working American will be hit with a massive, across-the-board tax increase on their income and investments.

On this date, the Bush tax cuts, enacted in 2001 and 2003, completely expire.

**We must urge Congress and the president to renew the Bush tax cuts early, before they expire and before investors lose confidence in the U.S. economy.**

The automatic tax increase will begin on Jan. 1, 2011, and could have catastrophic consequences for the economy.

Tax Increases Collapse Investor Confidence

[\_\_\_\_]

[\_\_\_\_] And investor confidence is critical to the economy

National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility ’10

(4/27/10, “National Commission on Fiscal Responsibility Holds Its Inaugural Meeting,”, lexisnexis)

Moreover, other things being equal, increased federal debt implies higher taxes in the future to cover the associated interest costs -- **higher taxes that may create disincentives to work, save, hire and invest**. High levels of debt also decrease the ability of policy-makers to respond to future economic and financial shocks. And, indeed, **a loss of investor confidence in the ability of the government to achieve fiscal sustainability can itself be a source of significant economic and financial instability,** as we have seen in a number of countries in recent decades.

Answers To: No Impact On Small Business

[\_\_\_\_]

[\_\_\_\_] Higher tax rates have a big impact on small businesses

JD Foster, Heritage Foundation, 2010

(States News Service, August 26, p. online)

MYTH: Small businesses would be only marginally affected by higher taxes rates.

FACT: **Successful, growing, hiring small businesses are especially targeted by higher tax rates.**

Another popular myth offered to sustain the Obama tax hikes is that higher tax rates would fall on too few small businesses to matter. While less than 2 percent of tax returns reporting small-business income would be subject to the higher tax rates Obama proposes, there is much more to the story.

**Millions of American taxpayers earn a few bucks on the side. Sometimes the extra income is from a lucrative hobby; sometimes the work is more serious**. Millions of these sideliners are honest enough to report their earnings as small-business income. But they are not small businesses in the traditional sense. They have no employees. They have no fixed place of business. They do not offer services widely.

True small businesses have employees. They invest in machinery. They offer goods and services widely. **And the successful ones earn significant sums to compensate for the risks of running the business and to earn a return on capital invested, typically plowing those earnings back into the business so it can expand further by investing more money and hiring more workers. And because they earn significant sums, successful small businesses earn the bulk of small business income. So, while only a small portion of taxpayers reporting small-business income would face Obama's higher rates, those facing the higher rates are the successful and expanding small businesses that create new jobs the economy needs to grow. According to a survey by the National Association of Independent Business, the businesses most likely to face Obama's higher rates are those employing between 20 and 250 workers. Raising rates on successful small businesses is a big part of the reason why the Obama tax hikes would hurt the economy.**

**Taxes Disadvantage Answers**
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Glossary

Consumer. A consumer is an individual person who purchases a product.

Draconian. Draconian means extreme.

Fuel tax. A fuel tax is a tax on gasoline or other motor fuels such as diesel.

Stimulus. When the government spends a lot of money it is considered to be a stimulus because that expenditure of money means that more money is available in the economy to buy goods and stimulate economic activity.

Taxes. A tax is the percentage of a person’s income or price of a good that is paid to the government.

Uniqueness – Tax Increases Now

[\_\_\_\_\_] Obama raising taxes

Jon Healey, Los Angeles Times, 2012

(President Obama's Mondale-esque call for higher taxes By Jon Healey July 9, 2012, 5:27 p.m. http://www.latimes.com/news/opinion/opinion-la/la-ol-president-obama-tax-hikes-wealthy-20120709,0,3604168.story)

Republicans like to talk about President **Obama** as if he were Jimmy Carter, but sometimes he **sounds** more **like** Carter's erstwhile vice president, Walter **Mondale -- the guy who promised voters** in 1984 that **he would raise their taxes if** he were **elected. Obama** doesn't put his fiscal plan in those terms, naturally. Instead, he **talks about raising taxes on Americans who make more than $250,000** (for couples; for individuals, the cutoff is $200,000), while maintaining the current rates on everybody else. The president revisited that topic Monday, calling on Congress to renew the Bush-era tax cuts for middle- and lower-income Americans for another year while postponing the decision on "the wealthy" until after the election. The point was to remind voters that presumptive GOP nominee Mitt Romney isn't the only one calling for tax cuts. Obama also was trying to defend himself against a meme advanced by the GOP and its conservative allies that the president was leading the country toward "one of the biggest tax increases in history" -- the expiration in January of the Bush-era tax cuts, the temporary reduction in payroll taxes and an assortment of other pending changes in tax law. VIDEO: Obama says election will decide economic fate His proposal would eliminate about $1.2 trillion in tax increases over 10 years. Yet **because it would allow some** of the **Bush-era breaks to lapse, it would result in a tax increase of about $700 billion compared with current law.** That's the revenue projected from not renewing the Bush-era cuts for the top two tax brackets, a level reached by less than 2% of those who file income tax returns.

[\_\_\_\_\_] Tax hike coming – cuts will expire

David Sampson, former deputy secretary of the U.S. Department of Commerce and as assistant secretary of Commerce for Economic Development, 2012

(America's Upcoming Economic Train Wrecks: Tax Hikes, Budget Cuts, April 24, 2012, http://www.usnews.com/opinion/blogs/economic-intelligence/2012/04/24/americas-upcoming-economic-train-wrecks-tax-hikes-budget-cuts)

Couple that with the expiration of the Bush-era tax rates. **All of the current tax rates on personal income, capital gains and dividends, and estates are set to expire on December 31**, 2012. **This means every American taxpayer and business is facing an automatic tax increase on New Year's Day**, unless Congress acts to extend the current rates.

Uniqueness – Tax Increases Now

#### [\_\_\_\_\_] Obama pushing a tax increase

Wall Street Journal, 2012

(July 8, “Democrats and the Tax Cliff,” http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304898704577482481625506736.html?mod=googlenews\_wsj)

**President Obama has staked his re-election on the promise to raise taxes on anyone making more than $200,000 a year**, but it's going to be fascinating to see if he can hold other Democrats through Election Day. **June marked the third month in a row of lousy job creation, and the economy is growing slowly even as the January 2013 tax cliff grows closer by the day.** Already, as many as six Democratic Senators are hedging their bets as the economy looks worse. That list includes Joe Manchin of West Virginia, Jon Tester of Montana, Claire McCaskill of Missouri, Bill Nelson of Florida, Ben Nelson of Nebraska and Jim Webb of Virginia.

#### [\_\_\_\_\_] Tax rates will rise in the future

Wall Street Journal, 2012

(July 8, “Democrats and the Tax Cliff,” http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304898704577482481625506736.html?mod=googlenews\_wsj)

**No doubt other Congressional Democrats from battleground states also feel jittery over the White House "Taxmageddon" strategy for** 2013 but aren't ready to publicly cross the White House. Last month Bill Clinton suggested a delay in raising the tax rates, before recanting amid a media uproar.  **If Congress doesn't act to change the law, tax rates on income, capital gains, dividends and estates are all scheduled to rise in January.**

No Link – Won’t Increase Taxes Because of the Plan

[\_\_\_\_\_] Even if a tax increase would have been normal in the past, the new political climate means they wouldn’t pay for the plan in that way

Dan Primack, Senior Editor at Fortune, 2011

(2/17, Fortune/CNN Finance <http://finance.fortune.cnn.com/2011/02/17/why-obama-cant-save-infrastructure/)

Increases in transportation infrastructure spending traditionally have been paid for via gas tax increases, but today's GOP orthodoxy is to oppose all new revenue generators (even if this particular one originated with Ronald Reagan). This isn't to say that Republicans don't believe the civil engineers – it's just that they consider their version of fiscal discipline to be more vital. In other words, America's infrastructure needs are stuck in a holding pattern.

[\_\_\_\_\_] Raising taxes is just too controversial, policymakers will choose different ways to pay for the plan

Ellen Dannin, Fannie Weiss Distinguished Faculty Scholar and Professor of Law, Penn State Dickinson School of Law, **20**11

(“Crumbling Infrastructure, Crumbling Democracy: Infrastructure Privatization Contracts and Their Effects on State and Local Governance ,” NORTHWESTERN JOURNAL OF LAW AND SOCIAL POLICY, <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1776350>)

Public officials may say that there are no alternatives because of public resistance to taxes. They see privatization as providing improved infrastructure while not raising taxes and as **allowing the blame for unpopular decisions,** such as imposing or raising tolls or fees, to be shifted to a private contractor. Chicago officials, for example, contended that “it would have been impossible for the City to have both kept the parking-meter system and raised the rates to the same extent as the lease, because there was not sufficient political will to do so . . . .”121 The Chicago Inspector General found these claims to be untrue in the case of privatizing Chicago’s parking meters;122 however, a study of Kansas policymakers concluded that the public is unlikely to support tolls to the extent it sees tolls as taxes.123 73 Although opinion on the issue of the public’s acceptance of raising taxes is mixed, the public has loudly opposed increased tolls and fees. That opposition does not mean the public approves of public subsidies to privatize infrastructure. Rather, that acceptance is more likely the result of the public’s lack of information. In any case, fear of citizen resistance to and retaliation for raising taxes is an important factor in decisions to privatize infrastructure.124 “Given that the option of raising taxes to fund an increasing number of transportation projects remains politically **radioactive,** policymakers continue to pursue a range of alternate funding mechanisms and P3s are a critical trend here.”125

Tax Increases Good for the Economy – Budget Deficits

[\_\_\_\_\_] Taxes key to address debt problem

Michael Linden, Director for Tax and Budget Policy at American Progress, 2012

(Seth Hanlon, Director of Fiscal Reform for CAP's Doing What Works project, and Jordan Eizenga is a Policy Analyst with the Economic Policy team at American Progress., Ten Charts that Prove the United States Is a Low-Tax Country, June 10, 2011 http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2011/06/low\_tax.html)

The United States is a low-tax country. That’s true for individuals and for corporations, and it’s true whether you compare us to other countries or the America of the past. No matter how you slice it the conclusion is the same. **Conservatives like to claim** that our **budget deficits are purely a “spending problem.”** Said Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-KY): “We don’t have this problem because we tax too little. We have it because we spent too much.” It’s a popular talking point, but it simply isn’t true. **Deficits do not stem from spending levels alone.** They are the product of a mismatch between spending and revenue. And when revenue is as low as ours is, you end up with big deficits. Here are 10 charts demonstrating the simple, clear truth that **federal taxes in the U**nited **S**tates are very low. Recently, President Obama met with a group of House Republicans to discuss the federal budget and the national debt. During the course of that meeting, the president noted, correctly, that taxes **today are even lower than they were under** President Ronald **Reagan**. This fact was met with “a lot of ‘eye-rolling’” from the Republicans. They didn’t believe him. This anecdote suggests that perhaps the reason conservatives think we don’t have a revenue problem is because they don’t know the facts. Taxes today are lower than they were under President Reagan. They’re lower today than they’ve been in 60 years. And they’re lower than they are in most developed countries. **We** do **have a debt problem coming down the road. That debt problem is the result of an aging population, rising health care costs, and, yes, revenue levels that are too low.**

Tax Increases Good for the Economy – Budget Deficits

[\_\_\_\_\_] Taxes are necessary for deficit reduction

Timothy Noah, Senior Editor at the New Republic, 2012

(The New Republic: Raise Taxes On The Middle Class, July 16, 2012 http://www.npr.org/2012/07/16/156835192/the-new-republic-raise-taxes-on-the-middle-class)

Eventually, though, **income tax rates need to return across the board to the Clinton-era levels. "I don't want to raise taxes on the middle class," Obama says. But if he doesn't, he can forget about achieving meaningful deficit reduction.** Taxes need to rise for the rich — and I'd argue they should rise a lot higher than to a top marginal rate of 39.6 percent. (I'd create three additional brackets for incomes above $1 million, $10 million, and $20 million, and have the marginal tax rate rise gradually from 39.6 percent to 70 percent, which is what it was when Ronald Reagan came into office.) But once it's established that the rich will pay their fair share, taxes on the middle class ought to rise, too. It would be political suicide for Obama to say any of this right now, because voters think taxes are already too high. But **federal tax rates are not too high at all; they're at historic lows. A new C**ongressional **B**udget **O**ffice **report, which examines the impact of all federal taxes** (including the progressive income tax and the ever-rising regressive payroll tax) **says the average effective tax rate for all households** (i.e., the percentage of total income, including federal benefits, that a household pays in all federal taxes) **was 17.4 percent** as of 2009, the last year for which data are available. **That's the lowest effective tax rate recorded** since 1979, and if the IRS had effective tax rate data going further back it would be the lowest since a lot earlier than that. (Effective taxes were comparatively high in 1979.) Since 1979, the average effective tax rate has fallen for all five income quintiles (i.e., the lowest, second-lowest, middle, second-highest, and highest 20 percent). For the middle quintile, which represents the dead center of the middle class, average effective tax rates dropped from 18.9 percent in 1979 to 11.1 percent in 2009.

Tax Increases Good for the Economy – History Proves

[\_\_\_\_\_] Tax increase would benefit the economy – Clinton era

Robert Reich, Chancellor's Professor of Public Policy at the University of California at Berkeley, was Secretary of Labor in the Clinton administration, 2012

(The Truth About Obama's Tax Proposal (and the Lies the Regressives Are Telling About It), 7/10, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/robert-reich/obama-tax-proposal\_b\_1661908.html)

A third lie is Obama's proposal will "increase uncertainly and further retard investment and job creation," as the Journal puts it. Don't believe it. **The real reason businesses aren't creating more jobs is American consumers** -- whose purchases constitute 70 percent of U.S. economic activity -- **don't have the money to buy more, and** they **can no longer borrow as before. Businesses won't invest and hire without consumers. Even as executive pay keeps rising, the median wage keeps dropping -- largely because businesses keep whacking payrolls. The only people who'd have to pay substantially more taxes under Obama's proposal are those earning far in excess of $250,000 -- and they aren't small businesses.** They're the fattest of corpulent felines. **Their spending will not be affected if their official tax rate rises from** the Bush **35** percent **to** the Bill Clinton **39.6 percent.** In fact, most of these people's income is unearned -- capital gains and dividends that are now taxed at only 15 percent. If the Bush tax cuts expire on schedule, the capital gains rate would return to the same 20 percent it was under Bill Clinton (the Affordable Care Act would add a 3.8 percent surcharge). Funny, **I don't remember the economy suffering under** Bill **Clinton's taxes**. I was in Clinton's cabinet, so perhaps my memory is self-serving. But I seem to recall that **the economy generated 22 million net new jobs** during those years, **unemployment fell dramatically, almost everyone's income grew, poverty dropped, and the economy soared.** In fact, it was the strongest and best economy we've had in anyone's memory. In sum: Don't fall for these big lies -- Obama wants to extend the Bush tax cut "only for some people," small businesses will be badly hit, businesses won't hire because of uncertainty this proposal would create, or the Clinton-era tax levels crippled the economy, **A ton of corporate and billionaire money is behind these lies** and others like them, as well as formidable mouthpieces of the regressive right such as Rupert Murdoch's Wall Street Journal editorial page.

Answers to: Tax Increases Hurts the Economy

[\_\_\_\_]

#### [\_\_\_\_] Allowing a tax increase won’t hurt the economy

CBS News, 2012

(“Will Tax Hikes Hurt Economic Growth,” February 2, http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-505123\_162-57369933/will-tax-hikes-hurt-economic-growth/

As this issue heats up, **you will hear again and again that tax increases, particularly on the wealthy, will depress economic growth. However, as I** [**detailed in a previous article**](http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-505123_162-39741024/did-the-bush-tax-cuts-lead-to-economic-growth/)**, there's very little evidence that tax changes of the magnitudes and types being considered will have a significant impact on economic activity: Economic theory helps us to determine which types of taxes are best in terms of efficiency, but the equity of taxes -- who pays them and whether it's fair -- also matters**. Questions of equity must be resolved in the political arena, economics cannot help here, and equity is one of the factors that determines whether a tax is feasible. If allowing the Bush tax cuts to expire for the wealthy is the only acceptably equitable way to raise taxes in this political environment, then there is little evidence that this will be harmful. The cost of allowing these tax cuts to expire is low, and there is much to be gained in terms of reducing our long-term budget problem.

Answers to: Tax Increases Hurt Small Businesses

[\_\_\_\_]

[\_\_\_\_] No impact on small businesses

Alexander Eichler, business reporter at The Huffington Post, 2012

(High Taxes On The Rich Not A Problem For Small Business: Report The Huffington Post, Posted: 07/20/2012 http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/07/20/small-business-rich-taxes\_n\_1690823.html?ncid=edlinkusaolp00000003)

Gary Korkes, owner of Oakwood Market in Detroit. A left-leaning think-tank has called into question claims by conservatives that tax hikes on the rich would affect large amounts of small business owners. Analysts are looking askance at a claim that raising taxes on the rich would spell doom for America's small business owners. According to a policy brief from the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, a left-leaning think tank, if Congress were to let the Bush-era tax cuts expire for the wealthiest Americans, it would probably leave most small businesses unharmed. (Hat tip to The Washington Post.) That's a conclusion that runs counter to what many conservative politicians have said, among them Mitt Romney, the GOP nominee for president. Last summer, when Berkshire Hathaway CEO Warren Buffett first made his call to tax American millionaires at a higher rate than current U.S. tax policy dictates, Romney argued that such a tax hike would put an additional burden on small businesses, since some of them file taxes as individuals. However, the CFPB **analysts, citing Treasury Department data, said** that **a tax increase on the rich would only affect about 2.5 percent of all small business owners.** (A separate estimate from the Joint Center on Taxation said that the number of affected small businesses would be closer to 3.5 percent.) Moreover, **the historical record suggests that higher tax rates might actually be good for small business payrolls. The authors offer data showing that the pace of small business job growth was twice as fast under** President Bill **Clinton, who raised taxes, as it was under** President George W. **Bush**, who cut them during his first year in office.

Answers to: Tax Increases Hurt Small Businesses

[\_\_\_\_]

[\_\_\_\_] No tax impact on small businesses

Glenn Kessler, Washington Post, 2012

(How ‘massive’ is Obama’s tax cut/tax increase? Posted by Glenn Kessler at 06:00 AM ET, 07/10/2012 http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/fact-checker/post/how-massive-is-obamas-tax-cuttax-increase/2012/07/09/gJQAhbLGZW\_blog.html)

**As for the statements about Obama raising taxes on “job creators,”** we have written before that **Republicans tend to exaggerate this effect.** The Joint Committee on Taxation has determined that **only 3 percent of all “small businesses” would be affected by Obama’s proposal,** a point the president noted on Monday. However, that 3 percent does account for 50 percent of the estimated $1 trillion in business income reported in 2011. Still, there are limitations with this data because the number of tax returns filed by “flow-through entities” — such as law firms — has soared in recent years. We have also previously noted that a recent Treasury Department study, using a broad definition and a narrow definition of small businesses, found that 11 percent or 8 percent of the returns, respectively, showing income of more than $200,000 had some small business income. Under the broad definition, these businesses represented 64 percent of small business income; under the more narrow definition, such firms had 57 percent of small business income. But **Romney’s assertion that taxes affect business hiring decisions is simplistic.** When we have written about this issue before, **small business owners specifically rejected the idea that higher taxes would “kill jobs.” They noted that income that is used for business expenses — such as employee wages — are fully deductible. “I invested more in my business, especially as tax day drew near, because the alternative was giving a big slice of the money to Uncle Sam,” one small business owner said.**
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**Summary**

One significant problem with reducing the consumption of fossil fuels (coal and oil) that lead to environmental harm is that doing often involves reductions in the use of oil.    This is problematic because the economies of many different countries throughout the world depend on money they make from selling oil abroad.  Substantial reductions in the consumption of oil could threaten these economies, which could increase the risks of instability and war in particular regions.

This disadvantage argues that if the United States reduces its demand for oil by increasing efficiency in transportation infrastructure that this will lower the demand for oil and hence the price of oil. The price of oil is likely to fall if demand for oil falls because of the law of supply and demand which says that as the demand for an item increases so will the price because sellers can sell the item to only those who can afford to pay the highest price.

If the price of oil declines, Russia will make less money on oil exports and its economy will be threatened because its economy is dependent on oil exports. If Russia’s economy declines, there will likely be instability and war because people will begin to fight over very limited resources.

**Glossary**

**Vocabulary**

**Acceleration.** Acceleration is to go faster. If your car accelerates, it goes faster.

**Brent**. Another name for oil

**Commodity**. A commodity is a raw material or agricultural produce that can be bought or sold.

**Depletion**. Depletion is the gradual running out of an item.

**Diversification**. Diversification is the idea that a person or company should not be completely dependent on the sale of a single product.

**Emerging markets**. Emerging markets are places in the world where the economy has started growing well enough that they have become places where companies can sell a substantial number of consumer products.

**Ethnicity.** Ethnicity refers how a person identifies themselves based on a common heritage with others.

**Eurozone**. The Eurozone is an economic and monetary union of 16 European countries.

**Fossil Fuels**. Fossil fuels are fuels that are naturally derived from decaying fossils in the earth. Fossil fuels include coal, oil, and natural gas.

**Moscow**. Moscow is the capitol of Russia.

**Oil dependence**. Oil dependence refers to the idea that a country needs to import its oil in order to have enough to meet the domestic demand for oil.

**Pension.**  A pension is a monthly payment that you get from a company or the government after you retire if you have worked there for a number of years.

**Proliferation.** Proliferation refers to the spread of nuclear weapons

**Rouble/Ruble**. Russia’s currency/money

**Glossary**

**Acronyms**

**BRIC Countries.** Brazil/Russia/India/China

**CBWs.** Chemical and Biological Weapons

**EIA.** Energy Information Agency

**EUROX.** Eastern European Fund.

**GDP**. Gross Domestic Product. The GDP is a country’s total economic output over the course of a year.

**IMF**. International Monetary Fund. The IMF monitors the global economy and works to provide support for it when necessary.

**OPEC.** Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries

**People**

**Mevdedev**. President of Russia  
  
**Putin (Vladimir).** Prime Minister of Russia.  
  
**Yeltsin (Boris).** Former President of Russia.

**Russian Oil Disadvantage 1NC**

**A. Uniqueness – Oil prices are high now which is boosting the Russian economy**

Kenneth **Rapoza,** Contributor to Forbes covering Brazil, Russia, India & China, **2012**

(1/28/12, http://www.forbes.com/sites/kenrapoza/2012/01/28/high-oil-prices-bode-well-for-russian-government/)

**High oil prices mean more cash flowing into the Russian government**. The **country is dependent on energy exports to keep its budget surplus in tact. Oil futures cracked $100 a barrel this week**, before settling at $99.56 for the May contract for WTI crude. Still, **prices like that bode well for Russia’s public coffers.**  International Monetary Fund’s Moscow representative, Odd Per Brekk, said in an interview with Russian newswire Ria Novosti that **high oil prices actually opened a “window of opportunity” for the country to take measures to strengthen and protect its economy from the ongoing problems facing Europe, it’s biggest oil and gas customer**. To take full advantage of this opportunity, Brekk said, **the Russian government must undertake a complete economic transformation** – keeping inflation at 3%-5%, **cutting budget expenses, improving the financial sector and reducing its dependence on commodities materials.** One way to do it is to use their oil wealth as a means to justify reform. Current geopolitical events are supporting high oil prices, mainly problems in Libya and Syria, and a new oil embargo against Iran. Ria Novosti also noted in its report that Iraq was contributing to high oil prices as well. As U.S. troops head home, some oil firms are looking at the security risks there and wondering if it is worth maintaining current projects. Russia’s government is expecting that the Iran oil embargo will contribute to a 10%-15% rise in oil prices, including the possibility of Iran closing the Strait of Hormuz, an important oil route in the Middle East.

**B. Links**

1. **(note) Read evidence or explanation as to how plan decreases oil consumption**
2. **A decrease in oil consumption in the United States will drop the price of oil globally**

Amy Myers **Jaffe**, Wallace S. Wilson Fellow for Energy Studie at Rice University, **2008**

(“The Impending Oil Shock: An Exchange,” Survival: Global Politics and Strategy, 50:4, 61-82, http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00396330802329048)

**Given the large scale of US purchases,** incremental **US acquisitions of oil affect its overall international market price**. Stated another way, the cost of each marginal barrel is higher than the price paid for that barrel, since this additional purchase affects the costs of all oil consumed. From the perspective of the United States, this constitutes an externality.6 On the other hand, the fact that the United States faces a rising supply curve for oil gives it monopsony power. **To the extent that America**, or a group of consuming countries on a comparable scale, **takes concrete actions to reduce** the size **of its purchases, it can lower the** market **price of oil. This can happen by** accident (as, in the past, through economic recessions) or by **sound public policy**, which is the preferable path and the one Elhefnawy advocates.

**Russian Oil Disadvantage 1NC**

**C. Internal Link – Decreasing oil prices will collapse the Russian economy**

Ben **Baden,** Reporter at U.S. News & World Report, **2011**

(“Russia Stocks Soar on Rising Oil Prices,”4-5, http://money.usnews.com/money/personal-finance/mutual-funds/articles/2011/04/05/russia-stocks-soar-on-rising-oil-prices)

**"[Russia is] truly one of the major global beneficiaries of higher gas prices,"** **says John Derrick, director of research at U.S. Global Investors**. While higher oil prices are a cause for concern in the United States**, they are providing a lift for resource-rich Russia, the world's largest producer of oil** and second-largest producer of natural gas as well as the largest non-OPEC exporter of oil. Vlad Milev, manager of the Metzler/Payden European Emerging Markets Fund (symbol MPYMX), says **the country's entire economy is reaping the benefits. The Russian government takes a portion of oil revenues and distributes them throughout the economy,** Milev says, **which creates a trickle-down effect for other Russian businesses and consumers.** "So that gives a boost to the economy as well," he says. So far this year, emerging markets have struggled to keep up with developed nations like the United States for a number of reasons, most notably unrest in the Middle East and higher inflation concerns. Year-to-date through March 28, the MSCI Emerging Markets Index lost about 1 percent, according to Bloomberg. (The S&P 500, on the other hand, gained about 5 percent over the same time period.) Of the four BRIC markets, Russia is leading the way. The MICEX Index, which is made up of 30 Russian stocks from 10 sectors of the economy, has returned 15 percent so far this year. The next-best BRIC performer is China, with a 5 percent gain for the Shanghai Composite Index. Brazil's Bovespa Index was down 2 percent as of March 28, and India's Sensex Index lost 10 percent over the same period of time. Russia has also gotten a boost from the ruble, which has gained about 7 percent against the U.S. dollar so far this year. Derrick calls the ruble a "commodity currency" because it generally benefits from higher commodity prices. "Roughly half the return [so far this year] has been currency related," says Derrick, who also helps manage the U.S. Global Investors Eastern European Fund (EUROX). "**The dynamics are pretty favorable for the ruble."** The largest Russia-focused exchange-traded fund, Market Vectors Russia (RSX), has had a tremendous run of as late. In 2009 alone, the fund gained a whopping 139 percent. But because of a 74 percent loss during 2008's downturn, the fund has lost an annualized 3 percent over the past three years. Over the past year, the ETF has returned about 21 percent. It's been a wild ride for investors in Russia-focused funds, but **experts say with higher commodity prices on the horizon, the outlook is fairly positive for Russian stocks.** "A lot of people ignore Russia to their peril," says Christian Magoon, CEO of asset management consultant firm Magoon Capital.

**Russian Oil Disadvantage 1NC**

**D. Impact – Russian economic decline causes war**

Sheldon **Figer,** author and blogger for the Huffington Post, **2009**

(“Russian Economy Faces Disastrous Free Fall Contraction” http://www.globaleconomiccrisis.com/blog/archives/356)

**In Russia** historically, **economic health and political stability are intertwined to a degree that is rarely encountered in other major** industrialized **economies**. It was the economic stagnation of the former Soviet Union that led to its political downfall. Similarly, **Medvedev and Putin**, both intimately acquainted with their nation’s history, **are unquestionably alarmed at the prospect that Russia’s economic crisis will endanger the nation’s political stability**, achieved at great cost after years of chaos following the demise of the Soviet Union. Already, strikes and protests are occurring among rank and file workers facing unemployment or non-payment of their salaries. Recent polling demonstrates that the once supreme popularity ratings of Putin and Medvedev are eroding rapidly. Beyond the political elites are the financial oligarchs, who have been forced to deleverage, even unloading their yachts and executive jets in a desperate attempt to raise cash. **Should the Russian economy deteriorate** to the point where economic collapse is not out of the question, **the impact will go far beyond the obvious accelerant such an outcome would be for the Global Economic Crisis**. There is a geopolitical dimension that is even more relevant then the economic context. Despite its economic vulnerabilities and perceived decline from superpower status**, Russia remains one of only two nations on earth with a nuclear arsenal of sufficient scope and capability to destroy the world** as we know it. For that reason, it is not only President Medvedev and Prime Minister Putin who will be lying awake at nights over the prospect that **a national economic crisis can transform itself into a virulent and destabilizing** social and political **upheaval.** It just may be possible that U.S. President Barack Obama’s national security team has already briefed him about the consequences of a major economic meltdown in Russia for the peace of the world. After all, the most recent national intelligence estimates put out by the U.S. intelligence community have already concluded that the Global Economic Crisis represents the greatest national security threat to the United States, due to its facilitating political instability in the world. **During the years** Boris **Yeltsin ruled** Russia, **security forces** responsible for **guarding the** nation’s **nuclear arsenal went without pay** for months at a time, **leading to fears that** desperate **personnel would** illicitly **sell nuclear weapons to terrorist organizations. If the current economic crisis in Russia were to deteriorate much further, how secure would the Russian nuclear arsenal remain**?

**Uniqueness – Russian Economy High**

**[\_\_\_\_]**

**[\_\_\_\_] Russian economy good now – funding from oil sector key to maintain growth**

[Antonia **Oprita**](http://www.cnbc.com/id/15837548/cid/130727), a Deputy News Editor for CNBC.com, **2012**

(6/21/12. http://www.cnbc.com/id/47870418)

As participants gather in the Russian city of St. Petersburg for the St. Petersburg International Economic Forum, their debates will focus on minimizing the effects of the debt crisis that is still raging through the euro zone. However, Russia itself is more sheltered from the crisis this time than it was during the global downturn in 2008 and 2009. Its prospects are brighter than those of many other economies, despite fears that the return of Vladimir Putin to the presidency will slow the pace of structural reforms and falling oil prices could hurt the country's budget. “I think currently **Russia is in a very good situation,**" Anton Struchenevsky, senior economist at Troika Dialog in Moscow, told CNBC.com. "**The exchange rate policy is more flexible than in 2008/2009, and it helps Russia to absorb external shocks.**" The ruble fell 12 percent against the dollar in May, the biggest drop since January 2009, but in June it recouped most of the losses and is nearly flat year-to-date. "Having lurched given the crisis in the euro zone, [the ruble] has pretty much recovered all its losses," Liam Halligan, chief economist at Prosperity Capital RF in Moscow, told CNBC.com. "**The Russian state has a very strong balance sheet**," Halligan added, pointing out that Russia "hasn't printed any money." **Half of the revenues to Russia's budget come from the oil and gas sector**, **and taxation in that area depends heavily on the oil price** on international markets. **When prices decline, the Russian budget gets less revenue in dollar terms**.

**Uniqueness – Russian Economy High**

**[\_\_\_\_]**

**[\_\_\_\_] Russian economy good enough to avoid meltdown now**

Mark **Admonis**, MA from Oxford, **2012**

(5/25, http://www.forbes.com/sites/markadomanis/2012/05/24/russias-economy-is-still-growing-and-why-this-matters/)

I agree that there are serious and growing tensions between Putin’s electoral base (“real Russians” if we apply the hackneyed formulation so often used in American politics) and the oligarchs who dominate the highest levels of the “vertical of power.” I even agree with the article’s contention that these tensions are, at a basic level, irreconcilable: the sorts of policies that boost the oligarchs harm the working class and the sorts of politics which benefit the working class harm the oligarchs. **But is the economic pie actually shrinking? No, it’s clearly not shrinking. Indeed it’s not only growing, it’s growing more quickly than in most of Russia’s neighbors**. This all might seem like a minor technicality or an unduly legalistic reading of a simple blog post, but as I’ve tried to explain above it’s actually of the utmost importance. **Russia’s political stability is predicated on a growing economy, and the economy is currently growing at a healthy (if not overwhelming) clip.** This is not to say that Russia’s economy will grow forever or that it won’t be adversely impacted by the increasingly chaotic and dangerous crisis in the Eurozone, it’s simply to say that, at the moment, the system is not being forced to deal with a shrinking economic pie. **The current pace of growth seems sufficient to preserve the broad continuity of the current political arrangement. This will not always be the case, but if I were forced to wager I would say that the Kremlin will muddle through for at least another few years.**

**Uniqueness – Russian Economy High**

**[\_\_\_\_]**

**[\_\_\_\_] Russia’s currency is strong now**

**Business Week, 2012**

(June 1, <http://www.businessweek.com/ap/2012-06/D9V47V580.htm>)

Moscow-based investment bank Renaissance Capital last week warned of the upcoming depreciation of the ruble, but noted that **the Russian currency so far looked better than many other currencies from emerging economies which were also battered by an uncertain outlook for the eurozone.**

**[\_\_\_\_] Russian economic growth is strong**

**Associated Press, 2011**

(February 22,http://www.businessweek.com/ap/financialnews/D9L4GPGO0.htm)

**Russia's finance minister says the country's economy grew more than expected over the past year and that the government is undertaking initiatives to accelerate growth further**. Alexei Kudrin says **the economy grew 4 percent in 2010, better than the anticipated 3.8 percent**. Speaking at the Russia Forum, a gathering of business leaders often described as the Russian equivalent of the World Economic Forum in Davos, Kudrin said Tuesday that growth could have been higher if Russia had not suffered severe heat and drought last year that affected food prices and grain exports. He says **Russia is aiming for annual growth of 7 to 8 percent in the next few years and aims to reach that goal by reducing government ownership in key sectors and by slashing bureaucracy.**

**Link – Generic Infrastructure Investment**

**[\_\_\_\_] A modernization of our transportation infrastructure would dramatically decrease US oil demand**

John **Podesta et al,** President and CEO of the Center for American Progress, **2011**

(Carl Pope, Chairman of Sierra Club, Gene Carpinski, President of the League of Conservation Voters, March 2011, “Cleaner Cars, Less Foreign Oil,” http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2011/03/pdf/oilsavingsagenda.pdf)

Millions of **Americans are locked into using their cars because of limited transportation choices.** Their communities lack affordable, convenient buses; subways; or other means of transit. Some communities lack safe biking and walking areas. Workers must spend hours in congested driving nightmares. People must drive a car to get a gallon of milk where housing is separated from services and amenities. Seniors face the loss of their freedom when they are no longer able to drive a car. Businesses are also constrained by limited choices, which have real economic costs. Shipping goods is more expensive because current railroad bottlenecks force them onto trucks, which increases oil dependence and pollution. More truck freight adds to highway congestion and road wear and tear. Too much of our freight moves on trucks because we have invested too little in our rail system. Infrastructure and planning improvements are necessary to provide genuine transportation alternatives for both passengers and freight. Fortunately, public transit is popular among those Americans who have reasonable access to it. Public transportation experienced a significant increase in use over the past 15 years. According to the American Public Transit Association: From 1995 through 2009, public transportation ridership increased by 31 percent—a growth rate higher than the 15 percent increase in U.S. population and higher than the 21 percent growth in the use of the nation’s highways over the same period. **Buses, subways, streetcars, and other forms of transit dramatically reduce oil use. The American Public Transit Association determined that Riding public transportation is a significant way to cut passenger transportation energy use. … transit reduces annual fuel use by the equivalent of 4.2 billion gallons of gasoline.** This is about 100 million barrels of oil saved annually. Outlays for new and improved transit networks can also help speed our economic recovery. There is $4 in economic return for every $1 of investment. Every $1 billion provided for transit creates 36,000 jobs. Fix roads, bridges, and trains, and unclog transportation bottlenecks While we must increase our investment in transportation infrastructure, we must avoid wasting it. Boondoggles and pork-barrel earmarks have added to our present congestion. We must not build highways we don’t need. We must ensure the ones we have are in good repair. New capacity should be added strategically to increase the overall flexibility of the transportation system rather than simply adding lanes and increasing gridlock. America’s ports, for example, represent major bottlenecks in getting feed stocks to factories and goods to consumers. **Shipping freight by railroad is three times more oil efficient compared to using trucks.** Yet our outdated rail system suffers from bottlenecks that make it less attractive for businesses. For instance, the News Hour found that “Chicago has been a freight rail hub for the past 150 years, but an outdated layout often makes it a bottleneck for the country’s shipping network.” And demand for rail shipment is projected to nearly double over the next 25 years. Yet the American Society of Civil Engineers projects a 20 percent shortfall in rail investment over this time.

**Link – Generic Public Transportation**

**[\_\_\_\_] Public transportation investment would quickly and drastically decrease US oil demand**

**American Public Transportation Association, 2009**

(Spring 2009, “Changing the Way America Moves: Creating a More Robust Economy, a Smaller Carbon Footprint, And Energy Independence,” http://www.apta.com/resources/reportsandpublications/Documents/america\_moves\_09.pdf)

At a time when America must create more jobs, reduce its dependence on foreign oil, and become more carbon efficient, public **transportation can make a significant contribution quickly** and cost-effectively. Public transportation already saves 4.2 billion gallons of fuel and 37 million metric tons of carbon emissions per year, while supporting 1.7 million jobs. This paper shows that **with an investment of 1.6 percent of the U.S. GDP per year, public transportation could** support 7.4 million jobs and, by 2020, could **save the country 15.2 billion gallons of fuel annually—almost as much as we currently import from the Persian Gulf**. This investment would also cut 141.9 million metric tons of carbon emissions per year—about 8 percent of the total carbon emissions from the U.S. transportation sector.

**Link – Generic Public Transportation**

[\_\_\_\_] **Investment like the plan will drastically decrease oil demand – transportation is the key sector**

**American Public Transportation Association, 2009**

(Spring 2009, “Changing the Way America Moves: Creating a More Robust Economy, a Smaller Carbon Footprint, And Energy Independence,” http://www.apta.com/resources/reportsandpublications/Documents/america\_moves\_09.pdf)

We have squandered opportunities to take bold steps before. In 1973, with the OPEC oil embargo, America had a wake-up call about how fragile its oil dependent economy really is and how reliant the nation is on foreign oil. Many sectors of the economy learned the lesson and became less reliant on oil. Not the transportation sector. The investment in energy intensive highway and aviation systems and the woeful underfunding of public transportation and rail systems continued. As a result, since 1973, Americans are traveling 250 percent more miles per capita each year vii and using over 36 percent more oil for transportation purposes. viii Net oil imports as a share of U.S. oil consumption went from 35.8 percent in 1975 to 58.2 percent in 2007 ix From 1970 to 2007, VMT growth has greatly outpaced population growth, 168percent to 48percent respectively. x . If we had decided to invest significantly more in public transportation services in 1973 and each year since, sustaining a 5.5 percent annual ridership increase from that point onward, we would be saving as much as 4.6 times more fuel with public transportation than we are today (19.1 billion gallons of fuel per year) and 4.8 times more carbon emissions (178 million tons per year). Tens of millions more Americans would be given a true choice in travel and commuting. A new wake-up call Today, as we use vastly more energy resources than we have at any other time in history, we are getting another wake-up call—this time not only about our economic fragility and our limited energy resources, but also about the dire situation of our environment and the survival of our planet as we know it. **Transportation is one of the largest and still growing factors of our huge dependence on fossil fuel** and with that, foreign oil. Ninety-five percent of all highway transportation is oil-dependent (the rest relying on natural gas, electricity and renewables). **Sixty eight percent of the oil consumed in this country is from transportation** (up from 52.3 percent in 1973) **and automobiles and light trucks were responsible for over 61 percent of all transportation energy use in 2006.** In fact, U**.S. transportation petroleum use is equivalent to almost 185 percent of U.S. petroleum production** xi . At the same time, fossil fuel will inevitably become a scarcer resource and gas prices will continue to climb. We need to make big changes now to ensure Americans have viable mobility options for the future. 8 The path to energy independence is a long one and addressing **oil consumption by the transportation sector is key.** With a predicted increase in population of over 30 percent by 2050 xii , travel demand will only continue to increase.

**Link – High US Demand Key to High Oil Prices**

**[\_\_\_\_]**

**[\_\_\_\_] High demand in the transportation sector is keeping prices high**

Robert **Puentes**, Fellow and Director, Metropolitan Infrastructure Initiative Brookings Institution, **2008**

(9-9-08, “Strengthening the Ability of Public Transportation to Reduce Our Dependence on Foreign Oil,” Congressional Testimony, [www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/testimony/2008/9/09%2520transportation%2520puentes/0909\_transportation\_puentes.pdf](http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/testimony/2008/9/09%20transportation%20puentes/0909_transportation_puentes.pdf))

The **U.S. transportation** system today **consumes 70 percent of the nation's oil and is almost entirely dependent upon petroleum**-based fuels.2 **This demand is contributing,** in part, **to the global rise in the price of oil** and the major hit on Americans' pocketbooks. Yet we do not come close to producing the oil we consume and that figure is declining over time, decreasing 17.0 percent since 2000.3 **Only one-quarter of the** crude **oil consumed** in the U.S. **is domestically produced.** Twice as much is imported and the majority of that from countries considered to be in danger of "state failure" based on a range of social, economic, and political factors.4 In addition, the transportation sector is responsible for one-third of the nation's carbon emissions and the U.S. continues to rank first among major world economies in per-capita carbon dioxide emissions, roughly double the rate of the United Kingdom and Germany.5 A recent Brookings study found that the density of land use patterns in metropolitan areas and transit availability play an important role in determining energy consumption, travel behavior and carbon emissions in our major economic centers.6 With the right policies in place, denser, walkable, and transit-friendly communities can help reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and therefore help create more affordable and energy-efficient travel options for Americans.

**Link – High US Demand Key to High Oil Prices**

**[\_\_\_\_]**

**[\_\_\_\_] US demand is key to global prices**

Chris **Kahn,** AP Energy Writer, **2012**

(July 18, “Oil price climbs above $90 on stronger US demand,” http://finance.yahoo.com/news/oil-price-climbs-above-90-152245296.html)

NEW YORK (AP) -- **The price of oil on Wednesday briefly hit $90 per barrel for the first time since May after the government said U.S. oil demand is on the rise**. The Energy Information Administration reported that **average oil demand increased last week in the U.S. for the third week in a row. Oil** demand had been down most of the year, when compared with 2011, as manufacturing activity slowed and drivers cut back on travel. "W**e keep talking about the slow economy, but the market is seeing some improved oil demand today,"** said Phil Flynn, an analyst at Price Futures Group. **Benchmark U.S. crude rose by 65 cents to end the day at $89.87 per barrel in New York. It hit $90.04 per barrel earlier in the day, the highest since May 30**. Brent crude, which sets the price for oil imported into the U.S., rose by $1.16 to end at $105.16 per barrel in London. EIA's weekly petroleum report also noted a surprise drop in gasoline supplies last week as refineries pulled back on production. Oil supplies also fell, though the drop was less than what analysts expected. Meanwhile, **China's** biggest companies warned of sharp drops in profits this year. That country's economy is still growing at a much faster clip than Western nations, including the U.S., but Premier Wen Jiabao has warned that the pa**ce of growth will be unstable. China is the second-largest oil consumer in the world behind the U.S.**, and a slowdown in its economy could cut world oil demand.

[\_\_\_\_] **US demand key to global prices**

**Xinhua News 2012**

(Xinhua Global NewsJuly 19, 2012, “Oil Prices Climb for 6th Day on Rising US Demand,” http://www.hispanicbusiness.com/2012/7/19/oil\_prices\_climb\_for\_6th\_day.htm)

**U.S. oil prices extended the winning streak to the sixth straight day on Wednesday after the latest report showed energy demand in the United States was growing**. According to the Energy Information Administration, **U.S. average oil demand increased for the third week in a row. U.S. crude oil inventories fell by 809,000 barrels last week while gasoline inventories dropped by 1.82 million barrels, contrary to forecasts.**

**Link – High US Demand Key to High Oil Prices**

**[\_\_\_\_]**

**[\_\_\_\_] US demand controls global oil prices**

David **Bird,** Staff Writer for The Wall Street Journal, **2010**

(December 27, “Oil, at $91-Plus, Feeling U.S. Demand,” http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703548604576038063610849574.html)

**Crude-oil futures prices, at a two-year high above $91 a barrel, are finding support from** a surprising source: **U.S. oil demand**. Three weeks ago, **U.S. forecasters said December oil demand would dip from a year ago.** **That would have been par for the course for the world's biggest oil consumer this year, after gasoline consumption underwhelmed over the summer** and oil and fuel supplies reached a 27-year high in September. **The combination of struggling demand and an oil glut had kept prices nearly flat this year** even as most other commodity markets soared. But in the latest three weeks, **consumption is topping the year-earlier level by nearly one million barrels a day. Demand in the four-week period** ended Dec. 17 **averaged nearly 19.7 million barrels a day, the highest level since Feb.** 20, **2009**, according to the U.S. Energy Information Administration. Back then, gains were fueled by the oil price collapse to $40 a barrel, from the summer 2008 record high near $150 a barrel. J**anuary crude futures ended last week at a two-year high of $91.51 a barrel, up 13% in the last month**. Encouraging U.S. economic data spurred prices higher on Thursday, particularly a drop in new jobless claims. U.S. oil inventories have also dropped over 5% in the last three weeks of government data. **Strong demand could prove to be a mirage, but if sustained, it may provide the grounds for a run on the $100-a-barrel mark. Improving U.S. demand would add to dynamic growth in emerging economies like China, and further draw down excess supplies.**

**High Prices Key to Russian Economy**

**[\_\_\_\_]**

**[\_\_\_\_] High oil prices are critical to keeping Russian budget balanced**

Andrew E. **Kramer and** David M. **Herszenhorn,** foreign policy contributor to the New York Times and political journalist for the New York Times, **2012**

(New York Times, 6/23, http://www.nytimes.com/2012/06/24/world/europe/former-russian-finance-minister-warns-of-recession.html?\_r=1)

Mr. Putin, in an apparent reference to the West, said heads of state must show “effective leadership and a responsible course of action” to halt the euro zone sovereign debt crisis. “That means a balanced-budget policy, control over state debt and fiscal discipline,” he said. “Rampant financial speculation and political populism are equally dangerous.” But Mr. Kudrin said Mr. Putin might need to rethink some of his own populism and renege on spending promises. Otherwise, Mr. Kudrin said, **Russia’s budget could become too vulnerable to a downturn in global oil prices.** During this year’s presidential campaign, Mr. **Putin announced higher wages, better maternity leave benefits and greatly expanded military spending in the coming decade**. “We need to look again at all programs being launched or expanded,” Mr. Kudrin said. “Even our current expenditures will be difficult to meet.” **To balance even this year’s more modest budget, Russia needs oil prices for European export of $117 a barrel or higher**; the price on Friday was $90.37. **Russia’s economy suffers when oil prices decline**. The Kremlin, Mr. Kudrin said, should brace itself for an extended oil price slump to $60 per barrel or lower.

**High Prices Key to Russian Economy**

**[\_\_\_\_] A drop in oil prices would be devastating for the Russian economy – causes budget deficit and a decline in their credit rating**

Andrew E. **Kramer,** foreign policy contributor to the New York Times, **2012**

(3/17, Putin’s Big Promises Need Fueling By Higher Oil Prices, <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/17/business/global/vladimir-putins-big-promises-need-fueling-by-high-oil-prices.html?_r=1>)

His apparent aim was to shore up support from the rest of Russia: poorer and rural parts of the country, and from state workers and the elderly. The repercussions of his campaign promises, and an earlier commitment on military spending, could be felt for years to come, giving price swings in oil a bigger role than ever on the Russian economy. **Taxes on oil and natural gas sales provide half of Russia’s government revenue. Each increase in the Russian budget equivalent to 1 percent of the gross domestic product requires a rise in the price of oil of about $10 a barrel on global markets** — which is how Citigroup arrived at the $150-a-barrel figure for meeting the new obligations Mr. Putin has taken on. Analysts worry that, even if the government can fulfill its promises, too little will remain for a [sovereign wealth fund](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/s/sovereign_wealth_funds/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier) that is intended as a shock absorber for the Russian economy and the ruble exchange rate during an oil price slump. Russia needed to use that buffer as recently as 2008, during the financial crisis. “The concern is simple,” **Kingsmill Bond, the chief strategist at Citigroup in Russia**, **said** in a telephone interview. “**If the oil price that Russia requires to balance its budget is higher, the systemic risks that the market faces are also higher**.” The bank estimated that Mr. Putin’s promises of higher wages and pensions, not counting the military outlays, add up to additional spending equal to 1.5 percent of Russia’s gross domestic product. That comes on top of an earlier pledge to spend an additional 3 percent of gross domestic product a year re-arming the military. In all, the new commitments would add up to about $98 billion a year, Citigroup estimates. The spillover from the Arab Spring and the specter of an Israeli attack on Iran’s nuclear development plants are propping up oil prices now. But over the long term, economic stagnation in Europe could help bring them down. Even before the election, Russia’s government spending was up, helping reinforce Mr. Putin’s message that he was the best candidate to deliver prosperity and stability. In January, the Russian military ministry, for example, doubled salaries in the nation’s million-person army. It was ostensibly a long-planned move. But coming just two months before the presidential vote, the political message was clear. Also smoothing the path for Mr. Putin’s victory was a national cap on utility rates that helped keep inflation at the lowest level in Russia’s post-Soviet history for January and February, at a 3.7 percent annual pace. “Putin made large spending commitments,” **the Fitch rating agency said** in a statement released the day after the election. “The current high price of oil cushions Russia’s public finances,” Fitch said. “But **in the absence of fiscal tightening that significantly cuts the non-oil and gas fiscal deficit, a severe and sustained drop in the oil price would have a damaging impact on the Russian economy and public finances and would likely lead to a downgrade” of the nation’s credit rating.** As Mr. Putin’s spending promises started to be introduced in January, Fitch altered Russia’s outlook to stable, from positive.

**Answers to: No Threshold**

**[\_\_\_\_]**

**[\_\_\_\_] Prices are high now —only a $3/barrel margin of error for Russia**

Fareed **Zakaria,** a Washington Post columnist, and a New York Times bestselling author, **2012**

(Editor-at-Large of TIME Magazine, CNN, “Why oil prices will stay high,” 1-15, http://globalpublicsquare.blogs.cnn.com/2012/01/15/zakaria-why-oil-prices-will-stay-high/)

**Russia now needs oil at $110 a barrel to manage its finances.** For Iraq, the number is $100. **Even Saudi Arabia now needs oil to trade around $80** a barrel just to balance its budgets. The numbers are also high for Algeria, Qatar, and Oman. **Only a decade ago Saudi Arabia was able to balance its budget with oil prices averaging around $25 a barrel**. So now it is in these countries' interest to keep oil prices high, which they do by curtailing supply in one way or the other. **This is** **perhaps the most lasting impact of the year of global protest: High oil prices**. So, the bottom line is **an oil crash seems unlikely. Even though the engines of global growth are sputtering, be prepared for** a period of **expensive commutes**. Maybe it's time to trade in your Escalade for a Prius.

**Russian Economy Laundry List Impact**

**[\_\_\_\_]**

**[\_\_\_\_] Russian weakness causes nuclear war, nuclear proliferation, disease, terrorism, CBW use, world economic collapse, and US intervention**

Oliga **Oliker and** Tanya **Charlick-Paley**, RAND Corporation Project Air Force, **2002**

(“Assessing Russia’s Decline,” www.rand.org/pubs/monograph\_reports/MR1442/)

The preceding chapters have illustrated the ways in which **Russia’s decline** affects that country and **may evolve into challenges and dangers that extend well beyond its borders.** The political factors of decline may make Russia a less stable international actor and other factors may increase the risk of internal unrest. Together and separately**, they increase the risk of conflict and the potential scope of other imaginable disasters. The trends of regionalization, particularly the disparate rates of economic growth among regions, combined with the politicization of regional economic and military interests, will be important to watch. The potential for locale, or possibly ethnicity, to serve as a rallying point for internal conflict is low at present, but these factors have the potential to feed into precisely the cycle of instability that political scientists have identified as making states in transition to democracy more likely to become involved in war. These factors also increase the potential for domestic turmoil, which further increases the risk of international conflict, for instance if Moscow seeks to united a divided nation and/or demonstrate globally that its waning power remains something to be reckoned with. Given Russia’s conventional weakness, an increased risk of conflict carries with it an increased risk of nuclear weapons use, and Russia’s demographic situation increases the potential for a major epidemic with possible implications for Europe and perhaps beyond. The dangers posed by Russia’s civilian and military nuclear weapons complex, aside from the threat of nuclear weapons use, create a real risk of proliferation of weapons or weapons materials to terrorist groups, as well as perpetuating an increasing risk of accident at one of Russia’s nuclear power plants** or other facilities. These elements touch upon key security interests, thus raising serious concerns for the United States**. A declining Russia increases the likelihood of conflict—internal or otherwise**—and the general deterioration that Russia has in common with “failing” states raises serious questions about its capacity to respond to an emerging crisis. **A crisis in large, populous, and nuclear-armed Russia can easily affect the interests of the United States and its allies. In response to such a scenario, the United States**, whether alone or as part of a larger coalition, **could be asked to send military forces to the area in and around Russia.** This chapter will explore a handful of scenarios that could call for U.S. involvement. **A wide range of crisis scenarios can be reasonably extrapolated from the trends implicit in Russia’s decline**.

**Russian Economy Laundry List Impact**

**[\_\_\_\_]**

**[\_\_\_\_] Wars will spread throughout the region**

Oliga **Oliker and** Tanya **Charlick-Paley**, RAND Corporation Project Air Force, **2002**

(“Assessing Russia’s Decline,” www.rand.org/pubs/monograph\_reports/MR1442/)

A notional list includes: **Authorized or unauthorized belligerent actions by Russia troops in trouble-prone Russian regions or in neighboring states could lead to armed conflict. Border clashes with China** in the Russian Far East **or between Russia and Ukraine, the Baltic states, Kazakhstan, or another neighbor could escalate into interstate combat. Nuclear-armed terrorists based in Russia or using weapons or materials diverted from Russian facilities could threaten Russia, Europe, Asia, or the United States.**

**[\_\_\_\_] A Russian civil war would involve the use of nuclear and biological weapons**

Oliga **Oliker and** Tanya **Charlick-Paley**, RAND Corporation Project Air Force, **2002**

(“Assessing Russia’s Decline,” www.rand.org/pubs/monograph\_reports/MR1442/)

**Civil war in Russia could involve fighting near storage sties for nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons and agents, risking large-scale contamination and humanitarian disaster. A nuclear accident at a power plant or facility could endanger life and health in Russia and neighboring states**. A chemical accident at a plant or nuclear or nuclear-related facility could endanger life and health in Rusisa and neighboring states**. Ethnic pogrom in south Russia could force refugees into Georgia, Azerbaijan, Armenia, and/or Ukraine. Economic and ethnic conflicts in Caucasus could erupt into armed clashes, which would endanger oil and gas pipelines** in the region. A massive ecological disaster such as an earthquake, famine, or epidemic could spawn refugees and spread illness and death across borders. **An increasingly criminalized Russian economy could create a safe haven for crime or even terrorist-linked groups. From this base, criminals, drug traders, and terrorists could threaten the people and economies of Europe, Asia, and the United States. Accelerated Russian weapons and technology sales or unauthorized diversion could foster the proliferation of weapons and weapon materials to rogue states and nonstate terrorist actors, increasing the risk of nuclear war.**

**Answers to: High Prices Discourage Russian Economic Reform**

**[\_\_\_\_]**

**[\_\_\_\_] Russia uses high oil revenues to invest in economic diversification—this will drive growth now.**

**The Guardian** (UK), January 25, **2008**. “Russia investment fund seeks $4 bln/year from 2011,” <http://www.guardian.co.uk/feedarticle?id=7256415>.

**Russia, flush with windfall oil revenues, runs a strong budget surplus but has substantially loosened its fiscal policy to accommodate pension and wage hikes as well as infrastructure and industrial investment needs.** The fund, which aims to introduce a concept of private-public partnership in Russia, has so far approved 20 projects worth 1 trillion roubles with the share of state budget financing at about 30 percent**. The budget investment fund is one of several vehicles created in Russia in recent years aimed at channelling oil wealth into improving infrastructure, diversifying the economy and boosting economic growth**. Cash assigned to the Development Bank and other state-run institutions has so far only been used to support banking sector liquidity. **Analysts see government spending as key for maintaining high growth rates in 2008.**

**Answers to: High Prices Discourage Russian Economic Reform**

**[\_\_\_\_]** **High oil prices are key – shifting the economy now collapses Russia**

Clifford G. **Gaddy,** former Visiting Professor of Economics, Johns Hopkins University, **2011**

(6/21, http://en.rian.ru/valdai\_op/20110616/164645377.html)

It is true that **the Russian economy is backward**, **and** that **oil plays a role** in that backwardness. **But oil is not the root cause**. **The causes** of Russia’s backwardness **lie in its inherited production structure**. The physical structure of the real economy (that is, the industries, plants, their location, work forces, equipment, products, and the production chains in which they participate) is predominantly the same as in the Soviet era. The problem is that it is precisely the oil wealth (the so-called oil rent) that is used to support and perpetuate the inefficient structure. For the sake of social and political stability, a large share of Russia’s oil and gas rents is distributed to the production enterprises that employ the inherited physical and human capital. The production and supply chains in that part of the economy are in effect “rent distribution chains.” **A serious attempt to convert Russia’s economy** into something resembling a modern Western economy **would require dismantling this rent distribution system**. **This would be** both **highly destabilizing, and costly in terms of** current **welfare**. Current efforts for “diversification” do not challenge the rent distribution system. On the contrary, the kinds of investment envisioned in those efforts will preserve and reinforce the rent distribution chains, and hence make Russia more dependent on oil rents. Even under optimal conditions for investment, **any dream of creating a “non-oil” Russia that could perform as well as today’s commodity-based economy is unrealistic**. The proportion of GDP that would have to be invested in non-oil sectors is impossibly high. Granted, some new firms, and even entire sectors, may grow on the outside of the oil and gas sectors and the rent distribution chains they support. But **the development of the new sectors will be difficult, slow, and costly**. Even if successful, the net value they generate will be too small relative to oil and gas to change the overall profile of the economy. Thus, while it is fashionable to talk of “diversification” of the Russian economy away from oil and gas, this is the least likely outcome for the country’s economic future. If Russia continues on the current course of pseudo-reform (which merely reinforces the old structures), **oil and gas rents will remain important because they will be critical to support the inherently inefficient parts of the economy.** On the other hand, if Russia were to somehow launch a genuine reform aimed at dismantling the old structures, the only realistic way to sustain success would be to focus on developing the commodity sectors. Russia could obtain higher growth if the oil and gas sectors were truly modern. Most important, oil, gas, and other commodity companies need to be freed from the requirement to participate in the various informal schemes to share their rents with enterprises in the backward sectors inherited from the Soviet system. Certainly, there are issues with oil. It is a highly volatile source of wealth. But there are ways to hedge those risks. A bigger problem is that oil will eventually lose its special status as an energy source and therefore much of its value. But that time is far off. It will not happen suddenly. In the meantime, sensible policies can deal with the problems. Otherwise, the approach should be to generate the maximum value possible from the oil and protect that value through prudent fiscal policies. **Russia should not, can not, and will not significantly reduce the role of oil and gas in its economy in the foreseeable future. It will only harm itself by ill-advised and futile efforts to try.**

**Answers to: High Prices Fuel Russian Aggression**

**[\_\_\_\_]**

**[\_\_\_\_] Russia too weak politically to constitute a threat**

R. Craig **Nation,** Professor of Strategy, U.S. Army War College, **2007**

(Russian Security Strategy Under Vladimir Putin, November,http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/PUB829.pdf)

At the same time**, it is** **important not to exaggerate Russian capacity. Despite its impressive revival, the Russian Federation remains a troubled and potentially fragile polity whose ambition may well come to exceed its grasp**. Blocking Russian imperial revival is a foundation of U.S. Eurasian policy, but it is important to think systematically about the consequences of success. What kind of Eurasian regional order will emerge in the absence of Russia as “ordering” force? What other U.S. interests are at play in this vast world region, and what kind of policies can most effectively secure them? The concept of Eurasia is used in an inconsistent way within U.S. policy circles. The U.S. State Department maintains a Bureau of European and Eurasian Affairs parallel with a Bureau of Central and South Asian Affairs. The U.S. Defense Department’s European Command Area of Responsibility includes “Eurasia” as a constituent part, parallel with a Central Command including former Soviet Central Asia. In both of these configurations, Europe, the greater Middle East, and Inner Asia are set apart—the substance of what is referred to as Eurasia amounts to little more than the Russian Federation and a handful of its weaker neighbors. Western analysts have consistently sought to assert that Eurasianism poses a false choice for contemporary Russia, whose post-communist destiny is still seen to lie in association with a wider West.18 If 6 we could realize the old Cold War vision of a unified security community stretching from Vancouver to Vladivostok, this perception might be a fair one. Unfortunately, it has become clear that the Russian Federation cannot and will not be assimilated into the Euro-Atlantic community. Russia’s relations with Europe are troubled, and an EU in the grip of enlargement fatigue is not about to contemplate overtures to Muscovy. The case for including Russia as a full member of the new North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) can be compelling, but it is also unrealistic. In fact, what is described as ”Eurasia” in much of U.S. foreign policy analysis equates to a kind of limbo to which Russia has been willfully consigned as a consequence of what might be construed as a policy of exclusion. This limited vision does not correspond to the new strategic realities of the Eurasian region in an age of globalization, where the exclusion of important national players will not be an option. Nor does it correspond to the changing character of Eurasia itself, and the kind of strategic issues that it poses. The new Eurasia is a geographical complex that includes the Russian Federation as an important actor, but is no longer defined either by the geopolitical fault lines of the Cold War or the weight of a reemerging Russian imperial tradition**. Russia’s aspiration to reassert itself as a force in the region may have some prospect of success, but attempts at dominion are bound to fail.**

**Answers to: High Prices Fuel Russian Aggression**

**[\_\_\_\_]**

**[\_\_\_\_] Russia is not an imperialist aggressor**

[Dmitri **Trenin**](http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/author/dmitri_trenin/), Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Moscow Center, **2006**

(Foreign Affairs, July/August, Russia Leaves the West, <http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2006/07/russia_leaves_the_west.html>,)

**On the other hand, Russia today is not, and is not likely to become, a second Soviet Union. It is not a revanchist and imperialist aggressor bent on reabsorbing its former provinces. It is not a rogue state, nor a natural ally of those states that may be called rogues**. A Sino-Russian alliance against the United States could only occur as a result of exceptionally shortsighted and foolish policies on Washington's part. **Today's Russia may not be pro-Western, but neither is it anti-Western.**

**[\_\_\_\_] Putin is not a threat to the West**

Jeffrey **Mankoff,** postdoctoral fellow at the John M. Olin Institute for Strategic Studies at Harvard University, **2007**

(Washington Quarterly, Summer, http://www.twq.com/07spring/docs/07spring\_mankoff.pdf)

Underpinning this policy is not a desire to actively confront the West collectively or the United States individually. Given the realities of contemporary Russian politics, **Putin is about as pro-Western a leader as Russia can be expected to have. One of the more popular explanations for Litvinenko’s assassination in the Russian press suggests that disaffected members of the security services orchestrated it to discredit Putin’s relatively nonconfrontational approach toward the West. If that is indeed the case, the West has less to worry about from the success of Putin’s consolidation of power in the Kremlin than from his inability to bring the security services to heel.**

**Article: Russia Stocks Rise to Week High as Oil Rallies**

Bloomberg, June 6, 2012, “**Russia Stocks Rise To Week High as Oil Rallies**, Utilities Jump,” http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-06-06/russia-stocks-fluctuate-on-crude-oil-gains-europe-debt-woes.html

Russian stocks rose to one-week high as oil, the country’s chief export earner, climbed a third day and power stocks led gains.

The [Micex Index (INDEXCF)](http://www.bloomberg.com/quote/INDEXCF:IND) gained 1.3 percent to 1,313.21 by the close in Moscow, the highest level since May 29 after earlier sliding as much as 0.6 percent. The benchmark gauge tumbled 11 percent last month, the most since September. OAO Gazprom Neft, the oil arm of Russia’s biggest company by value, added 2 percent. Power utilities OAO MRSK Holding and Federal Grid Co. added more than 8.4 percent and OAO Mobile TeleSystems rose 4.1 percent.

Oil rose as much as 2.4 percent in [New York](http://topics.bloomberg.com/new-york/) as crude inventory shrank. [European Central Bank](http://topics.bloomberg.com/european-central-bank/) President [Mario Draghi](http://topics.bloomberg.com/mario-draghi/) said officials stand ready to act as the euro region’s growth outlook worsens. The European Central Bank held its main refinancing rate at 1 percent.

The “oil price rebound is supporting both stocks and the ruble, giving an additional boost to banks,” Alex Kantarovich, head of research at JPMorgan Chase & Co., said by e-mail.

OAO Sberbank, the country’s largest lender, advanced for a second day, adding 3.2 percent to 80.64 rubles. VTB Bank rose 1.9 percent to 5.3 kopeks, the highest level since May 30. Russia’s second-biggest lender climbed for a third day after Chief Executive Officer [Andrei Kostin](http://topics.bloomberg.com/andrei-kostin/) said the central bank will step up efforts to halt a slide in the ruble and as the currency advanced.

Russia received almost 50 percent of budget revenue from oil and gas sales last year. The Micex will be open for trading June 9 and closed June 11-12 for public holidays.

The Micex-RTS began trading futures on benchmark equity indexes for [Brazil](http://topics.bloomberg.com/brazil/), [India](http://topics.bloomberg.com/india/), [China](http://topics.bloomberg.com/china/) and [South Africa](http://topics.bloomberg.com/south-africa/) today, after the four other members of the BRICS Exchanges Alliance started trading the contracts in March.

The total volume of shares traded on the benchmark exchange today was 42.1 billion, according to the exchange’s website. Yesterday’s total volume was 32.2 billion shares, according to Bloomberg data.

[Trading volumes](http://www.bloomberg.com/quote/INDEXCF:IND) on the Micex declined last week, with 221.4 billion shares changing hands, down from 306.8 billion a week earlier, according to Bloomberg data.

Stocks retreated earlier as Spanish industrial production unexpectedly fell the most in more than two years in April as the fourth-largest economy in [Europe](http://topics.bloomberg.com/europe/)’s single currency union sank deeper into recession.

“The situations in Greece and Spain remain the main concerns, with the latter rapidly turning into the more dangerous,” Peter Szopo, the head of research at [Alfa Bank](http://topics.bloomberg.com/alfa-bank/) in Moscow, said in an e-mailed note.

Russia-dedicated equity funds posted redemptions for the seventh week in eight, registering a net outflow of $8.2 million in the week ended May 30, according to EPFR Global. Developing- nation equity funds registered outflows of more than $1 billion for the fourth consecutive week, the longest streak since the third quarter of 2011.

The MSCI [Emerging Markets](http://topics.bloomberg.com/emerging-markets/) Index rose 1.8 percent to 902.02 today, the most since Jan. 26. The MSCI BRIC Index of shares traded in India, Brazil, Russia and China, fell 1.6 percent.

Russian stocks trade at 4.8 times [estimated earnings](http://www.bloomberg.com/quote/INDEXCF:IND), having lost 6.4 percent this year. That compares with a 1.6 percent drop for the [MSCI Emerging-Market Index (MXEF)](http://www.bloomberg.com/quote/MXEF:IND), which trades at 9.3 times projected earnings.

**Russian Oil Disadvantage Answers**
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Glossary

Vocabulary

**Acceleration.** Acceleration is to go faster. If your car accelerates, it goes faster.

**Brent**. Another name for oil

**Commodity**. A commodity is a raw material or agricultural produce that can be bought or sold.

**Depletion**. Depletion is the gradual running out of an item.

**Diversification**. Diversification is the idea that a person or company should not be completely dependent on the sale of a single product.

**Emerging markets**. Emerging markets are places in the world where the economy has started growing well enough that they have become places where companies can sell a substantial number of consumer products.

**Ethnicity.** Ethnicity refers how a person identifies themselves based on a common heritage with others.

**Eurozone**. The Eurozone is an economic and monetary union of 16 European countries.

**Fossil Fuels**. Fossil fuels are fuels that are naturally derived from decaying fossils in the earth. Fossil fuels include coal, oil, and natural gas.

**Moscow**. Moscow is the capitol of Russia.

**Oil dependence**. Oil dependence refers to the idea that a country needs to import its oil in order to have enough to meet the domestic demand for oil.

**Pension.**  A pension is a monthly payment that you get from a company or the government after you retire if you have worked there for a number of years.

**Proliferation.** Proliferation refers to the spread of nuclear weapons

**Rouble/Ruble**. Russia’s currency/money

Glossary

Acronyms

**BRIC Countries.** Brazil/Russia/India/China

**CBWs.** Chemical and Biological Weapons

**EIA.** Energy Information Agency

**EUROX.** Eastern European Fund.

**GDP**. Gross Domestic Product. The GDP is a country’s total economic output over the course of a year.

**IMF**. International Monetary Fund. The IMF monitors the global economy and works to provide support for it when necessary.

**OPEC.** Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries

**People**

**Mevdedev**. President of Russia  
  
**Putin (Vladimir).** Prime Minister of Russia.  
  
**Yeltsin (Boris).** Former President of Russia.

Non-Unique – Russian Economy Declining Now

**[\_\_\_\_]**

#### [\_\_\_\_] Russian oil prices declining now

Euro News, 2012

(June 1, <http://www.euronews.com/2012/06/01/rouble-tumbles-further-on-oil-price-slide/>)

**The rouble has continued to drop in value**, hitting a three year low against the dollar as it slid more than five percent in a week. **The Russian currency has been pulled down by the recent big slump in oil prices** on which the country’s economy depends. Increased demand for dollars by one Moscow bank was also cited by traders as a reason for the rouble’s fall.

#### [\_\_\_\_] Oil prices and the value of the Russian currency are declining now

New York Times, 2012

(June 4, http://latitude.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/06/04/while-the-ruble-slumps/ )

[**The Russian currency is in free fall**](http://www.businessweek.com/ap/2012-06/D9V4A8MG2.htm)**.** **With** [**the price of oil tumbling**](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304821304577440980055078646.html?mod=googlenews_wsj)**, the ruble has lost nearly 10 percent of its value against the dollar over the last two weeks and will likely lose more. Considering that Russia imports the bulk of its food and consumer goods, that amounts to a nearly 10 percent loss in buying power for its citizens.**

Non-Unique – Russian Economy Declining Now

[\_\_\_\_] Russian economy tanking – investment and current oil prices

Nathan Vardi, Forbes Staff Writer, 2012

(6/4, http://www.forbes.com/sites/nathanvardi/2012/06/04/the-market-is-signaling-the-end-of-vladimir-putin/)

When Vladimir Putin was re-elected in early March to his third term as president of Russia, many saw it as the inauguration of a 21rst-century czar who would continue to rule for a long time. But **financial markets are signaling something else completely, punishing Russia for Putin’s re-election and sending a strong message that investors will no longer tolerate Putin’s way of doing business**. Financial markets are making a clear statement to Putin: Not this time. Since Putin was re-elected in early March, the Russian Trading System Index of Russian stocks has fallen by nearly 30%. During that same period, **the ruble has been devalued by 15% against the U.S. dollar**, sinking to its lowest level since the depths of the global financial crisis in 2009. **Investors are simply stampeding out of Russia**, which has seen $42 billion in capital outflows in the first four months of 2012. Last week even BP said it wanted out of Russia, indicating it was ready to walk away from its nine-year Russian joint venture, TNK-BP, the largest foreign investment in Russia’s oil industry. BP announced it would pursue a sale of its ownership in TNK-BP even though it represents one-quarter of BP’s reserves. The June Market Disaster Nathan Vardi Nathan Vardi Forbes Staff With oil prices collapsing to an eight-month low, Putin is also losing his most important crutch, the one that allowed him to take credit for the increasing living standards of many Russians. “You can see that step by step the market is losing confidence in Putin,” a macro hedge fund manager told me recently. “**At this level of crude, the Russian budget is a disaster.**”

[\_\_\_\_] Structural factors make Russian economic decline likely

Forbes 2012

(7/22/2012, Russia: Pass Or Play?, http://www.forbes.com/sites/kenrapoza/2012/07/22/russia-pass-or-play/)

Yet, **Russia** is not known as being a shareholder friendly place.  It **ranks as one of the most corrupt emerging markets in the world,** on par with countries in Africa, **and the worst out of the big four emerging markets. Demographics are not favorable either.** **It’s a middle aged society that’s not growing in population**, on balance. **It’s not very immigrant friendly either**, **so** the hordes of **people** from poorer Commonwealth of Independent States countries, think places like the “stans” — Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan — **are not immigrating** in any significant numbers to Russia **to make up for a stable to declining population.**

No Internal Link – Oil Decline Won’t Hurt Russia’s Economy

**[\_\_\_\_]**

#### [\_\_\_\_] Oil price decline will not destroy the Russian economy because Russia has reserves

RT Online, 2012

(June 4, http://rt.com/business/news/russia-oil-down-reserves-940/)

**Russia is capable of promptly reacting to any changes in oil prices**, as well as any shocks from the euro zone, **trumpeted President** Vladimir **Putin. But** experts say the length of the crisis will have a lot to do with how much effect it will have. **The effect of falling oil prices would be limited, with just contributions to Russia’s Reserve Fund suffering**, the President told a press conference after the Russia-EU summit held close to St. Petersburg on Monday. "This year, we calculated the revenue part of the budget on the basis of $100/bbl, and the price was later increased to $115/bbl. Everything beyond $100/bbl will go to the reserve fund. That is**, if the price is below $115/bbl we will have less revenue going to the reserve fund,"** he specified.

No Internal Link – Oil Decline Won’t Hurt Russia’s Economy

**[\_\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_\_] High prices don’t transfer into the real economy

Lidia **Kelly** , Reporter @ Reuters, 2011

(Russia's economy struggles for sustainable growth, May 18th, http://ibnlive.in.com/generalnewsfeed/news/russias-economy-struggles-for-sustainable-growth/691643.html)

**Russia's economy is struggling to attain sustainable growth despite the surge in prices for its oil** exports, data showed on Wednesday, pointing to another tough decision on official interest rates later this month. Industry output grew at its slowest rate in 18 months in April, while producer prices rose more than forecast and weekly consumer inflation, stuck at 0.1 percent, underlines the conflicting pressures on the central bank. Pledging to keep full-year inflation below 7.5 percent ahead of presidential elections in March 2012, the central bank is expected to continue tightening monetary policy -- but a sluggish economy will complicate its decision-making on how to control prices and manage rouble appreciation driven by high oil prices. Investors have been scrutinizing data for clues on the central bank's move after the regulator unexpectedly raised all key rates last month, including the benchmark refinancing rate. The latest data, including Monday's figures showing gross domestic product growing a weaker than expected 4.1 percent year-on-year despite surging oil prices, suggests that emerging Europe's largest economy is struggling. "**We would have expected that given the high oil prices something of this would transfer to the real economy, but the big story is inflation**, which is eating into the real income of consumers," **said** David Oxley, **an emerging markets economist at Capital Economics** in London. Crude has held above $100 per barrel for a third month in a row -- more than $30 above what had been initially assumed in the 2011 budget -- ensuring fresh cash inflows into the economy and propping up Russia's trade and current account surplus. The Economy Ministry said late last month that it was relying on industry to put the economy onto a sustainable path to 4.2 percent gross domestic product growth this year. "Manufacturing sectors of the industry will be the drivers of economic growth in 2011, with growth dynamics of 7.5 percent," the ministry said in a document describing economic scenarios. But while manufacturing grew 5.3 percent year-on-year in April, it was down 3.6 percent on the month, Wednesday's data from the Federal Statistics Service showed. Extraction of raw materials, including oil and gas, was also down on the month, after a period when rising crude prices encouraged production. "Industry in Russia strongly reacts to changes in external demand, but **high oil prices are not enough any more** and from the point of view of internal growth, expectations about growth in the second quarter come, first of all, from construction," said Natalya Orlova, an economist at Alfa-Bank. Construction was one of main drivers of Russia's stellar performance in the second half of the last decade, before the 2008 crisis brought a halt to virtually all projects. Oxley at Capital Economics said the upshot is that growth will likely pick up in the second half, with pre-election spending taking hold and the spike in inflation fading to take some of the pressure off the central bank. "We would not say it's terminal yet for Russia," he said. "In the run up to next year's elections it is a matter of time before consumer spending picks up."

No Internal Link – Oil Decline Won’t Hurt Russia’s Economy

**[\_\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_\_] Lack of economy reform also hurting the economy

Euro News, 2012

(June 1, <http://www.euronews.com/2012/06/01/rouble-tumbles-further-on-oil-price-slide/>)

T**he central bank played down the situation and said this was “absolutely normal volatility**”. Deputy Chairman Sergei Shvetsov added: “It’s pretty OK with us.” **Economists say the rouble’s fall also stems from disappointment among domestic and foreign investors in Russia at the lack of any drive toward political and economic reform since this year’s election**s.

Internal Link Turn – High Oil Prices Discourage Russian Economic Reform

**[\_\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_\_] High oil prices cause collapse of the economy because they discourage economic reforms

Catherine **Belton** and Neil Buckley, Writers @ the Financial Times, 2011

(*Russia in dilemma over Arab unrest*, March 15th, http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/7dd04742-4f29-11e0-9038-00144feab49a.html#axzz1Mwr6tydD)

But **high oil prices have downsides**. **The oil windfall could restore Russia’s pre-crisis complacency, tempting it to backtrack on much needed reforms such as tackling corruption and reducing the state’s role in the economy**. If the government uses the oil windfall to fund further pension and wage rises – with parliamentary elections looming in December, and a presidential poll next March – the economy will be left even more dependent on the oil price. “Already we are hearing less about the privatization program,” says a senior western banker in Moscow, referring to the $32bn state sell-off programme the government unveiled last year, partly to help shrink the deficit. **The broader recovery in resource prices has also seen a resurgence of the oligarchs**, bringing back the good times for Moscow’s restaurants, Porsche dealerships and real estate brokers. Forbes magazine said last week the number of Russian dollar billionaires bounced back from 62 to 101 last year, with Moscow home to 79 of them. Some analysts suggest the true number of billionaires could be even higher. Meanwhile, **the wealth gap between the richest and poorest is widening**. Against the backdrop of Middle East uprisings, a **combination of top-level complacency, corruption and conspicuous consumption is potentially risky**. Experts suggest conditions in Russia are very different from the Middle East. Poverty is far less extreme, its leadership has not been in power for decades; its population is passive and ageing. Polls suggest support for President Dmitry Medvedev and Vladimir Putin, prime minister, remains at about 70 per cent.

Internal Link Turn – High Oil Prices Discourage Russian Economic Reform

**[\_\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_\_] High prices result in economic stagnation and civil disorder

Aleh Tsyvinski and Sergei Guriev, Professor of economics at Yale University, Director of the New Economic School in Moscow, 2010

(July – August, Russia's "Resource Curse": How High Oil Prices Are Stunting Reforms, http://www.oilandgaseurasia.com/articles/p/123/article/1273/)

**Can Russia escape the "resource curse” implied by high oil prices, or will it succumb to what we call a "70-80” scenario?** That is the question confronting Russians today, and we fear that their fate will be the latter: if oil prices remain at $70-80 per barrel, **Russia is likely to relive** key features of the Brezhnev era of the 1970s and 1980s ― with **a stagnating economy** and 70-80 percent approval ratings for its political leaders. The resource curse means, of course, that **Russian elites will prefer to postpone restructuring the economy and modernizing the country’s political and economic institutions**. This will undermine economic performance, making it very unlikely that Russia will catch up with the advanced economies in the next 10-15 years, as officials promise. **Fast and sustainable** economic **growth requires the rule of law**, accountable, meritocratic, and non-corrupt bureaucrats, protection of property rights, contract enforcement, and competitive markets. Such institutions are difficult to build in every society. In Russia, the task is especially problematic, because the ruling elite’s interests run counter to undertaking it. In post-crisis Russia, the resource curse is reinforced by two factors. First, massive renationalization since 2004 has left state-owned companies once again controlling the commanding heights of the economy. These firms have no interest in developing modern institutions that protect private property and promote the rule of law. Second, Russia’s high degree of economic inequality sustains the majority’s preference for redistribution rather than private entrepreneurship. Russia’s leaders acknowledge the need for modernization, and pay it frequent lip-service, as is evidenced by President Dmitri Medvedev’s manifesto "Go, Russia!” But **the incentives to escape the resource trap are weakened by the overwhelming importance of the resource rents to the wider political elite**. **When the economy was near collapse** during the recent crisis, **we thought that the government would recognize the need to push ahead with radical reforms that would eventually lead to a** diverse, de-centralized, and **fast-growing economy**. But, while stimulus policies were mostly effective in dealing with the immediate crisis, they did not address the long-term issues that impede growth. Still, the government continues to tout plans to boost the economy. Vertical industrial policy, horizontal industrial policy, investment in education ― all have been tried in the last 10 years. Yet Russia’s public institutions remain as weak as ever (for example, corruption is as prevalent as it was 10 years ago, if not more so), and the economy is no less dependent on commodity prices.

Internal Link Turn – High Oil Prices Discourage Russian Economic Reform

**[\_\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_\_] High oil prices carry major risks for the Russian economy

Matthew **Hulbert,** Senior fellow at the Center for Security Studies in Zurich, **2011**

(The Downside of High Oil Prices, February 2nd, http://www.themoscowtimes.com/opinion/article/the-downside-of-high-oil-prices/430204.html)

This cuts to the crux of the problem. The misperception of political risk can be just as potent as the actual risks themselves for the market. If the Egyptian crisis is anything to go by, then geopolitical factors have not been properly priced in. The initial $6 price increase from the chaos in Cairo over the past few days will look like pocket change compared with where oil prices could go if the geopolitical situation in the Middle East explodes. **High prices might sound like good news** for producers like Russia that want to replenish state coffers and boost political egos, **but they carry** two **major risks. The first is potential demand destruction.** **The assumption in 2008 that demand was inelastic was a grave miscalculation. Most leading oil producers were lucky to survive**. Whether $100 per barrel will break the bank again remains to be seen, but with anemic growth in the West and inflationary pressures in the East, it would be foolhardy to assume that anything higher than $100 per barrel would be positive for the global economy. **The second risk is that producers will rapidly lose control of the market if geopolitics starts dictating benchmark** prices beyond fundamentals. Price hawks such as Iran, Algeria, Nigeria and Venezuela probably have no problem with that since they don’t have excess supply to put on the market anyway. But that’s not what Russia wants or needs right now. **Market** stability to increase upstream investment and arrest depletion rates **should be the priority of the day**, not adding more oil, so to speak, to the geopolitical fire. It remains to be seen whether Saudi Arabia will agree to put more oil on the market or continue to appease price hawks by maximizing receipts. Price signals have been deafeningly silent so far — blaming speculation over fundamentals is the line coming out of Riyadh. No doubt that’s partially true, but that’s the point. Speculators like nothing more than the risk of geopolitical calamity to make a killing. Egypt has sent a clear signal to producers — quell the market now, or it will politically emasculate you later. **The last thing Moscow needs is heightened market volatility. The priority should be to stabilize the market**, attract consistent upstream investment and arrest depletion to keep production above 10 million bpd. Russia should take note: Take the politics out of oil, or it will surely take its vengeance out on you.

Internal Link Turn – High Oil Prices Discourage Russian Economic Reform

**[\_\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_\_] High prices kill reforms

Anne Applebaum, Director of Political Studies at the Legatum Institute, 2011

(Washington Post, ¼, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2011/01/03/AR2011010304070.html>)

Why the change of tone? Why now? Many complex theories have been hatched to explain it. This being Russia, none can be proved. But perhaps the explanation is very simple: Oil is once again above $90 a barrel - and the price is rising. And if that's the reason, it's nothing new. In fact, **if one were to plot the rise and fall of** Soviet and **Russian foreign and domestic reforms over the past 40 years** on a graph, **it would match the** fall and rise of the international **oil price** (for which domestic crude oil prices are a reasonable proxy) **with astonishing precision**. To see what I mean, begin at the beginning: In the 1970s, oil prices began to rise significantly, along with the then-Soviet Union's resistance to change. The previous decade (with oil prices at $2 or $3 a barrel, not adjusted for inflation) had been one of flux and experimentation. But **after OPEC pushed prices up in the** 19**70s**, oil revenue poured in - and **the Soviet Union entered a period of** internal "stagnation" and **external aggression**. Soviet leader Leonid **Brezhnev invested heavily in the military**, halted internal reforms **and** in 1979 (when oil was at $25 a barrel) - **invaded Afghanistan**. Brezhnev was eventually followed by Yuri Andropov, who had the good fortune to run the Soviet Union when oil prices were still high (at his death, in 1984, they averaged $28 a barrel). Andropov could thus afford both an internal crackdown on dissidents and a continued tense relationship with the West. But Andropov was followed by Mikhail Gorbachev, who took over just as prices plunged. In 1986 (with oil down to $14 a barrel), he launched his reform programs, perestroika and glasnost. By 1989 (when oil was still only at $18) he allowed the Berlin Wall to fall, freed Central Europe and ended the Cold War. Prices fluctuated, but they did not really rise again in the 1990s (plunging as low as $11 in 1998), the years when Boris Yeltsin was still trying to be best friends with Bill Clinton, the Russian media were relatively free and there was still talk, at least, of major economic reforms. But in 1999 (**when oil prices rose** to $16 a barrel), Yeltsin's prime minister, Vladimir **Putin, launched the second Chechen war**, the West bombed Belgrade, and the mood in Russia turned distinctly anti-Western once again.

Internal Link Turn – High Oil Prices Facilitate Russian Militarism

**[\_\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_\_] A drop in oil prices would force Russia to cut it’s aggressive military modernization plans

John T. Bennet, foreign policy contributor to the Chicago Tribune, 2012

**(**4/4, <http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2012-04-04/news/sns-201204041200usnewsusnwr201204030403russiaapr04_1_oil-prices-cubic-meters-natural-gas>)

**Putin made a number of big** domestic **promises** during the presidential race, including plans to usher in sweeping pension and wage hikes**. He** also **put forth "a rather ambitious military modernization program**," Pifer says. "**If oil prices remain high, he might be able to do all of those things,**" Pifer says. "**If prices come down,** however, **Putin will have** some very tough **decisions to make** at home ... **between guns versus butter**." **Should oil and gas prices tumble**, experts say **Putin would** likely **pick butter**. "In 2007 when oil was doing well, Putin [as president] could have modernized the Russian military," says Pifer. Instead, Putin made a number of economic moves, such as the creation of a rainy day fund that was used during the recent global financial crisis," Pifer notes. What's more, Putin returns to power with his sharp eyes locked on his opposition, which is composed of the country's urban, middle-class populations. Experts agree that **Putin would be hard-pressed to break his pension and wage promises in favor of a few more missiles**. But even an economically weaker Russia would likely pick its spots to block Washington's desires. "They have a very sovereigntist, non-interventionalist view of world affairs," Burwell says. That means **Moscow fundamentally opposes Western efforts to boss around the world's strongmen**, with which Russian leaders have much in common. "**The Russian also have real hard-core, national, commercial and other interests in both Iran and Syria** that cannot simply be ignored," Burwell says.

Internal Link Turn – High Oil Prices Facilitate Russian Militarism

**[\_\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_\_] High oil prices embolden Russia’s aggressive foreign policy

Steve LeVine, contributing editor at Foreign Policy, Fellow at the New America Foundation, and professor, Georgetown, Security Studies, 2011

(9/27/11, “Putin's gamble: a bet on high oil prices,” <http://oilandglory.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2011/09/27/putins_gamble_a_bet_on_high_oil_prices>)

Yet it is this very hydrocarbon foundation that Putin is banking on in a new period as president starting next May. Western financial analysts wring their hands that **Russia needs at least $116-a-barrel oil to balance its budget**, while **the price** of the Brent benchmark **is** just $**105 at the moment** and is forecast to drop over the next year or so. But, with his move, **Putin aligns himself with the longer-term outlook of most oil-price forecasters, who foresee a major spike in prices starting in** roughly **18 months** or two years and **running until the end of the decade**. At that point -- 2020 or so -- many forecasters think oil prices will be so high that they will begin to trigger more or less a permanent destruction of much demand as consumers switch to alternatives. **By that time, Putin will be the end of a** new **12-year run as president**. **His last**, highly popular 8-year **term** as Russian president **coincided with high** world **oil prices** -- reaching a record high of $147 a barrel -- **which he used to** boost employment, to build up a war chest of financial savings, to elevate the buying power of ordinary citizens, and to **lead a** voluble, **chin-out foreign policy**.

Internal Link Turn – High Oil Prices Facilitate Russian Militarism

**[\_\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_\_] High oil prices cause Russian adventurism

Steven Mufson,Staff Writer @ the Washington Post, 2007

(*Oil Price Rise Causes Global Shift in Wealth*, November 10th http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/11/09/AR2007110902573\_pf.html)

Russia, the world's No. 2 oil exporter, shows oil's transformational impact in the political as well as the economic realm. When Vladimir Putin came to power in 2000, less than two years after the collapse of the ruble and Russia's default on its international debt, the country's policymakers worried that 2003 could bring another financial crisis. The country's foreign-debt repayments were scheduled to peak at $17 billion that year. Inside the Kremlin, with Putin nearing the end of his second and final term as president, that sum now looks like peanuts. Russia's gold and foreign-currency reserves have risen by more than that amount just since July. **The soaring price of oil has helped Russia increase the federal budget tenfold** since 1999 while paying off its foreign debt and building the third-largest gold and hard-currency reserves in the world, about $425 billion. **"The government is much stronger, much more self-assured and self-confident,"** said Vladimir Milov, head of the Institute of Energy Policy in Moscow and a former deputy minister of energy. "It believes it can cope with any economic crisis at home." With good reason. Using energy revenue, the government has built up a $150 billion rainy-day account called the Stabilization Fund. "This **financial independence has contributed to more assertive actions by Russia in the international arena**," Milov said. "**There is a strong drive within part of the elite to show that we are off our knees."** The result: **Russia is trying to reclaim** former Soviet republics as part of **its sphere of influence**. Freed of the need to curry favor with foreign oil companies and Western bankers, **Russia can resist what it views as American expansionism, particularly regarding NATO enlargement** and U.S. missile defense in Eastern Europe, and forge an independent approach to contentious issues like Iran's nuclear program. The abundance of petrodollars has also led to a consumer boom evident in the sprawling malls, 24-hour hyper-markets, new apartment and office buildings, and foreign cars that have become commonplace not just in Moscow and St. Petersburg but in provincial cities. Average income has doubled under Putin, and the number of people living below the poverty line has been cut in half.

No Impact – Russian Economic Decline Won’t Cause War

**[\_\_\_\_]**

#### [\_\_\_\_] Empirically, Russian economic decline does not cause chaos and war

New York Times, 2012

(June 4, http://latitude.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/06/04/while-the-ruble-slumps/)

**I remember well** [**the Russian financial crisis of 1998**](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/1998_Russian_financial_crisis)**, when the country defaulted on its debt obligations and the ruble collapsed.** It was a textbook crisis: there was panic, there were bank runs, and the economy was the only thing people discussed for months; I recall a party at which art critics could not stop talking about exchange rates. **But ten years later, in the fall of 2008, when the worldwide economic crisis began affecting Russia, there was an eerie calm, as though the state of the national currency were an abstraction. Like today.**

[\_\_\_\_] No impact to Russian economy and its resilient

Robert Blackwill, former associate dean of the Kennedy School of Government and Deputy Assistant to the President and Deputy National Security Advisor for Strategic Planning, 2009

(RAND. “The Geopolitical Consequences of the World Economic Recession—A Caution”. http://www.rand.org/pubs/occasional\_papers/2009/RAND\_OP275.pdf)

Now on to Russia. Again, five years from today. **Did the global recession and Russia’s** present serious **economic problems substantially modify Russian foreign policy? No**. (President Obama is beginning his early July visit to Moscow as this paper goes to press; nothing fundamental will result from that visit). **Did it produce a serious weakening of** Vladimir **Putin’s power** and authority in Russia? **No**, as recent polls in Russia make clear. Did it reduce Russian worries and capacities to oppose NATO enlargement and defense measures eastward? No. Did it affect Russia’s willingness to accept much tougher sanctions against Iran? No. Russian Foreign Minister Lavrov has said there is no evidence that Iran intends to make a nuclear weapon.25 In sum, Russian foreign policy is today on a steady, consistent path that can be characterized as follows: to resurrect Russia’s standing as a great power; to reestablish Russian primary influence over the space of the former Soviet Union; to resist Western eff orts to encroach on the space of the former Soviet Union; to revive Russia’s military might and power projection; to extend the reach of Russian diplomacy in Europe, Asia, and beyond; and to oppose American global primacy. **For Moscow, these foreign policy first principles are here to stay, as they have existed in Russia for centuries**. 26 **None of these enduring objectives of Russian foreign policy are likely to be changed in any serious way by the economic crisis**.

No Impact – Russian Economic Decline Won’t Cause War

[\_\_\_\_] Impact empirically denied. Russia’s economy is constantly weak

George Friedman, Founder of the Center for Geopolitical Studies, 2009

(The Russian Economy and Russian Power, http://www.cdi.org/russia/johnson/2009-141-11.cfm)

**Russia has been an economic wreck for most of its history**, both under the czars and under the Soviets. The geography of Russia has a range of weaknesses, as we have explored. **Russia’s geography, daunting infrastructural challenges and demographic structure all conspire against it**. But the strategic power of Russia was never synchronized to its economic well-being. Certainly, following World War II the Russian economy was shattered and never quite came back together. Yet Russian global power was still enormous. A look at the crushing poverty ­ but undeniable power ­ of Russia during broad swaths of time from 1600 until Andropov arrived on the scene certainly gives credence to Putin’s view. The problems of the 1980s had as much to do with the weakening and corruption of the Communist Party under former Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev as it had to do with intrinsic economic weakness. To put it differently, the Soviet Union was an economic wreck under Joseph Stalin as well. The Germans made a massive mistake in confusing Soviet economic weakness with military weakness. During the Cold War, the United States did not make that mistake. It understood that Soviet economic weakness did not track with Russian strategic power. Moscow might not be able to house its people, but its military power was not to be dismissed. What made an economic cripple into a military giant was political power. Both the czar and the Communist Party maintained a ruthless degree of control over society. That meant Moscow could divert resources from consumption to the military and suppress resistance. In a state run by terror, dissatisfaction with the state of the economy does not translate into either policy shifts or military weakness ­ and certainly not in the short term. The czar used repression widely, and it was not until the army itself rebelled in World War I that the regime collapsed. Under Stalin, even at the worst moments of World War II, the army did not rebel. In both regimes, **economic dysfunction was accepted as the inevitable price of strategic power**. And dissent ­ even the hint of dissent ­ was dealt with by the only truly efficient state enterprise: the security apparatus, whether called the Okhraina, Cheka, NKVD, MGB or KGB. From the point of view of Putin, who has called the Soviet collapse the greatest tragedy of our time, the problem was not economic dysfunction. Rather, it was the attempt to completely overhaul the Soviet Union’s foreign and domestic policies simultaneously that led to the collapse of the Soviet Union. And that collapse did not lead to an economic renaissance. Biden might not have meant to gloat, but he drove home the point that Putin believes. For Putin, the West, and particularly the United States, engineered the fall of the Soviet Union by policies crafted by the Reagan administration ­ and that same policy remains in place under the Obama administration. It is not clear that Putin and Russian President Dmitri Medvedev disagree with Biden’s analysis ­ the Russian economy truly is “withering” ­ except in one sense. Given the policies Putin has pursued, the Russian prime minister must believe he has a way to cope with that. In the short run, Putin might well have such a coping mechanism, and this is the temporary window of opportunity Biden alluded to. But in the long run, the solution is **not improving the economy ­ that would be difficult, if not outright impossible**, for a country as large and lightly populated as Russia. Rather, the solution is accepting that **Russia’s economic weakness is endemic** and creating a regime that allows Russia to be a great power in spite of that.
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Summary

Capitalism is the word we use to describe the current economic system of the United States and the vast majority of the world. It is associated with the quest to earn money and profit from the creation of products and services. Under capitalism a small number of individuals own the companies and factories that produce the goods and profit off the labor of the majority of the population has to work for them. It is characterized by vastly unequal resources and opportunities between the rich and the poor.

The “Capitalism Critique” argues that the affirmative reinforces this system by making it easier for corporations to move their goods but then just keep the profits for themselves and their wealthy leaders. The 1NC link argument is that the transportation infrastructure that the Affirmative invests in will mostly be used to help the rich and will reinforce the already existing divide between the rich and the poor.

There are many arguments in the file about why capitalism is a poor system because it means we exploit and destroy the earth and it’s natural resources and fight others in order to gain more money. “The alternative” is to reject the system of capitalism that the Affirmative participates in order to find a more just and equitable system.

Glossary

Vocabulary

**Accumulation.** When you accumulate items you add to the number of items that you possess.

**Authentic.** Real, true

**Bourgeoisie.** Wealthy individuals.

**Capitalism.** Capitalism is an economic system in which the means of production are owned.

**Commodified.** If you take a good (say an apple) and assign it an economic value/make it available for sale, that item is commodified.

**Coopted.** Social movements are coopted when more powerful forces are able to focus the energies of that movement on supporting the cause of the more powerful force.

**Exploit.** A person is exploited when his or her labor is used and they are not properly compensated for that labor.

**Hegemony.** Hegemony refers to dominant global power. The US is considered to be the dominant global hegemon now.

**Ideology.** An ideology is a set of ideas that constitute a person’s goals, actions, and expectations (Wikipedia).

**Imperialism.** When a country attempts to expand its authority beyond its existing territory it is referred to as an imperialist power.

**Masking.** Masking refers to covering something up so that it doesn’t look like it is. In this context, a program to temporarily address inequality could mask/cover up more widespread inequality.

Neoliberalism. Modern capitalism.

**Preemption.** Preemption refers to attacking before you are attacked.

**Prevailing.** Prevailing means winning. The side that prevails in the game is the winner.

**Proletariat.** The proletariat is the working class.

**Resist.** To resist is to stand against, to oppose.

**Socialism.** Socialism is an economic system in which the means of production are owned by everyone.

Capitalism Critique – 1NC Shell

A. Federal transportation investment privileges the rich at the expense of the poor, reinforcing the inequalities of capitalism

Eric Mann et al, members of the Labor/Community Strategy Center, 2006.

(Eric Mann, Kikanza Ramsey, Barbara Lott-Holland, and Geoff Ray, “An Environmental Justice Strategy for Urban Transportation”. http://urbanhabitat.org/files/ 1%20Eric%20Mann.pdf).

Across the United States, **federal** and state **transportation funds favor suburban commuters and auto owners at the cost of the urban poor, the working class, the lowest income communities of color,** the elderly, high school students, and the disabled. People dependent on public transit for their transportation needs suffer dilapidated buses, long waits, longer rides, poor connections, service cuts, overcrowding, and daily exposure to some of the worst tail-pipe toxins. The movement for first-class, regional transportation systems that give priority to the transit dependent requires the mobilization of those excluded and marginalized from politics-as-usual, and will challenge the pro-corporate consensus. **Equity demands a mass movement of funds from the highway and rail interests** to bus systems, **from suburban commuters, corporate developers, and rail contractors to the urban working class of color**. **Such a transformation will not happen**—cannot happen— **until a mass movement of the transit-dependent is built from the bottom up.** A Transit Strategy for the Transit-Dependent In 1993, the Labor/Community Strategy Center (LCSC) in Los Angeles founded the Bus Riders Union (BRU)—now the largest multi-racial grassroots transportation group in the U.S.—with more than 3,000 members representing the roughly 400,000 daily bus riders. The BRU’s 12 years of organizing, significant policy and legal victories, and analytical and theoretical expertise can be used as a resource for the urgent work of mass transit reconstruction in U.S. urban communities. The needs and the leadership capacity of the urban working class of color must play a central role in developing sustainable communities**. We must aim to: reduce suburban sprawl; promote ecological and environmental public health; create non-racist public policy; and focus on the transportation needs of society’s most oppressed and exploited. The needs of the working class and communities of color are both an end in themselves and an essential building block of any effective organizing plan**
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B. Capitalism makes social inequality, economic turmoil and environmental destruction inevitable

Wise, Prof of Development Studies @ Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas, Mexico, **2010**

(Raúl Delgado Wise, Humberto Márquez Covarrubias, Rubén Puentes, Reframing the debate on migration, development and human rights: fundamental elements, October, 2010, www.migracionydesarrollo.org)

At the end of the first decade of the 21st century, **a general crisis centered in the United States affected the global capitalist system on several levels** (Márquez, 2009 and 2010). The consequences have been varied: Financial. **The overflowing of financial capital leads to speculative bubbles that affect the socioeconomic framework and result in global economic depressions. Speculative bubbles involve the bidding up of market prices of such commodities as real estate or electronic innovations far beyond their real value, leading inevitable to a subsequent slump** (Foster and Magdof, 2009; Bello, 2006). Overproduction. Overproduction crises emerge when the surplus capital in the global economy is not channeled into production processes due to a fall in profit margins and a slump in effective demand, the latter mainly a consequence of wage containment across all sectors of the population (Bello, 2006). Environmental. **Environmental degradation, climate change and a predatory approach to natural resources contribute to the destruction of the latter**, along with a fundamental undermining of the material bases for production and human reproduction (Fola- dori and Pierri, 2005; Hinkelammert and Mora, 2008). Social, **Growing social inequalities**, the dismantling of the welfare state and dwindling means of subsistence **accentuate problems such as poverty**, unemployment**, violence, insecurity** and labor precariousness, increasing the pressure to emigrate (Harvey, 2007; Schierup, Hansen and Castles, 2006). **The crisis raises questions about the prevailing model of globalization** and, in a deeper sense, the systemic global order, **which currently undermines our main sources of wealth**—labor and nature—**and overexploits them to the extent that civilization itself is at risk**. The responses to the crisis by the governments of developed countries and international agencies promoting globalization have been short-sighted and exclusivist. **Instead of addressing the root causes of the crisis, they have implemented limited strategies that seek to rescue financial and manufacturing corporations facing bankruptcy**. In addition, government policies of labor flexibilization and fiscal adjustment have affected the living and working conditions of most of the population. **These measures are desperate attempts to prolong the privileges of ruling elites at the risk of imminent and increasingly severe crises.** In these conditions, **migrants have been made into scapegoats, leading to repressive anti- immigrant legislation** and policies (Massey and Sánchez, 2006). A significant number of jobs have been lost while the conditions of remaining jobs deteriorate and deportations increase. Migrants’ living standards have drastically deteriorated but, contrary to expectations, there have been neither massive return flows nor a collapse in remittances, though there is evidence that migrant worker flows have indeed diminished.
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C. **Our alternative is to reject the Aff’s capitalist model of development**. Movements against capitalism are possible now; our job is to attack the imperialist system at every turn

Wise, Prof of Development Studies @ Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas, Mexico, 2009

(Raúl Delgado, Forced Migration and US Imperialism: The Dialectic of Migration and Development, Crit Sociol, 35: 767, ProQuest)

The theoretical framework outlined in this article for understanding the dialectic relationship between development and migration has four critical components. A Critical Approach to Neoliberal Globalization Contrary to the discourse regarding its inevitability (on this see Petras and Veltmeyer, 2000), we posit that **the current phase of imperialist domination** is historical and **can and should be transformed**. In this regard, it is fundamental to notice that ‘[t]he principal factor generating international migration is not globalization but **imperialism**, which **pillages nations and creates conditions for the exploitation of labor in the imperial center**’ (Petras, 2007: 51–2). A Critical Reconstitution of the Field of Development Studies **The favoring of** a singular mode of analysis based on the belief that **free markets** work as powerful regulatory mechanisms, efficiently assigning resources and providing patterns of economic convergence among countries and their populations, **has clearly resulted in failure**. New theoretical and practical alternatives are needed, and **we propose** a **reevaluation of development** as a process of social transformation through a multi-dimensional, multi-spatial, and properly contextualized approach, **‘using** the concept of **imperialism as an alternative explanatory framework of** international **capitalist expansion and** the **growing inequalities’** (Petras and Veltmeyer, 2000). This integral approach requires the consideration of **the strategic and structural aspects of** the dynamic of uneven contemporary **capitalism** development, which **should be examined at the global, regional, national, and local levels**. For this purpose it is crucial to understand, inter alia, a) the central role played by foreign investment in the process of neoliberal restructuring of peripheral economies, and b) the new modalities of surplus transfer characterizing contemporary capitalism. The Construction of an Agent of Change The globalization project led by the USA has ceased to be consensual: it has only benefited capitalist elites and excluded and damaged an overwhelming number of people throughout the world. **Economic, political, social, cultural and environmental changes are all needed** but a **transformation of this magnitude is not viable unless diverse movements, classes, and agents** can **establish common goals.** The **construction of an agent of change requires** not only an alternative theory of development but also **collective action and horizontal collaboration**: the sharing of experiences, the conciliation of interests and visions, and the construction of alliances inside the framework of South-South and South-North relations. A Reassessment of Migration and Development Studies The current explosion of forced migration is part of the intricate machinery of contemporary capitalism as an expression of the dominant imperialist project. In order to understand this process we need to redefine the boundaries of studies that address migration and development: expand our field of research and invert the terms of the unidirectional orthodox vision of the migration-development nexus in order to situate the complex issues of uneven development and imperialist domination at the center of an alternative dialectical framework. This entails a new way of understanding the migration phenomenon.

Link – Infrastructure Investment

**[\_\_\_] Infrastructure projects are enablers of capitalist consumption**

William Connolly, Professor of Political Theory at Johns Hopkins University, 2012

(William E, "Steps toward Ecology of Late Capitalism," Theory and Event Vol. 15 Issue 1, 2012, Muse)

Today, perhaps **the** initial **target should be** on **reconstituting** established **patterns of consumption** by a combination of direct citizen actions in consumption choices, publicity of such actions, and social movements to reconstitute the state/market supported infrastructure of consumption. **By the *infrastructure of consumption* I mean state support for market subsystems such as a national highway system**, a system **of airports**, medical care through private insurance, etc., etc., **that enable** some **modes of consumption in the zones of travel,** education, **diet,** retirement, medical care, **energy use, health, and education** and render others more difficult or expensive to procure.[21](http://muse.jhu.edu.go.libproxy.wfubmc.edu/journals/theory_and_event/v015/15.1.connolly.html" \l "f21) **To shift** several of these in the correct direction **would** already **reduce** extant **inequalities.** To change the infrastructure is also to affect the types of work and investment available. Social movements that work upon the infrastructure and ethos in tandem can make a real difference directly, encourage more people to extend their critical perspectives, and thereby open more people to a militant politics if and as a new disruptive event emerges**. Perhaps a** cross-state **citizen goal** should be to construct a pluralist assemblage by moving back and forth between shifts in role performance, revisions in political ideology, and adjustments in political sensibility, doing so to generate enough collective energy to launch a general strike simultaneously in several countries in the near future. Its aim **would be to reduce inequality** and to reverse the deadly future created by established patterns of climate change **by fomenting significant shifts in patterns of consumption**, corporate policies, state law and the priorities of interstate organizations. Again, the dilemma of today is that the fragility of things demands shifting and slowing down intrusions into several aspects of nature as we speed up shifts in identity, role performance, cultural ethos, market regulation, and citizen activism.

Link – Infrastructure Investment

**[\_\_\_] Investment in infrastructure, especially as economic stimulus, just works to hide the evils of capitalism**

Jason Smith, assistant professor of history at the University of New Mexico, 2008

(Jason Scott, "The New Deal Order," Enterprise and Society Vol. 9 Num 3 2008, p. 524-5)

**By using the lens of political economy to focus on the New Deal's public works spending, we can begin to see the** outlines of a different interpretation. The huge amount of funds devoted to public construction, the far-reaching federal efforts invested in directing this money, and the **long-run impact of the infrastructure** itself form the components of the story of a public works revolution.[9](http://muse.jhu.edu.go.libproxy.wfubmc.edu/journals/enterprise_and_society/v009/9.3.smith.html#f9) **This revolution helped justify the new role of the federal government in American life**, **legitimizing**—intellectually and physically—what has come to be known as **Keynesian management of the economy**. **By sponsoring** this **infrastructure, New Dealers remade the built environment that managed the movement of people, goods, electricity, water, and waste.** Among the New Deal's projects were some of the largest and most significant structures ever built in human history.[10](http://muse.jhu.edu.go.libproxy.wfubmc.edu/journals/enterprise_and_society/v009/9.3.smith.html" \l "f10) **These programs not only anticipated the** national **highways** and the military-industrial complex; **in the postwar period** government-sponsored **economic development** also **looked abroad**. For example, Harry **Truman's** Point IV program was **conceived of** as an international PWA, **building roads and airports in countries like Afghanistan and Vietnam**. Similarly, Lyndon Johnson's vision of **exporting Keynesian style economic development** to Southeast Asia by replicating the Tennessee Valley Authority on the Mekong Delta reflected the powerful example set by the New Deal. After World War II, construction firms like Bechtel and Brown & Root (today a subsidiary of Halliburton) took their expertise overseas as well. **The New Deal's public** works programs employed millions of unemployed workers, both urban and rural, while **building** **the infrastructure that helped integrate the disparate regions of the country into a national market**

Link – Railroads

[\_\_\_] High speed rail infrastructure will only reinforce urban capitalism and the mobility of business to exploit workers

Deike Peters, Associated Faculty at Center for Metropolitan Studies, 2009

(Summer 2009. "The Renaissance of Inner-City Rail Station Areas: A Key Element in Contemporary Urban Restructuring, Dynamics")

The ongoing **remaking of urban cores through urban redevelopment mega-projects is** part and parcel of the “**urbanization of neoliberalism**” (Brenner and Theodore 2002) and post-Fordist restructuring. Large-scale manufacturing employment and production have given way to an urban economy dominated by service-, knowledge-, and consumption-based industries (Harvey 1989). **The heightened competition for investments forces cities’ governing elites to search proactively for new opportunities of economic growth**, leading to processes of disembedding (Castells 1996), the emergence of new “geographies of centrality” (Sassen 1991), and a shift from a “managerial” to an “entrepreneurial” governance approach (Harvey 1989; Dangschat 1992). Meanwhile, new logistics and distribution gateways and terminals are emerging at the edges of large metropolitan areas (Hesse 2008). **Central cities are gaining ground as key locales for capitalist consumption and culture.** Urban cores are (re-)gentrified as attractive tourist spaces (Judd and Fainstein 1999; Hoffman et al. 2003; Hannigan 1999) and as prime living and working spaces for the “creative class” (Florida 2002). **An updated version of urban “growth machine politics” emerges** (Molotch 1976; Logan and Molotch 1987; Savitch and Kantor 2002) which, in Europe, is strongly related to the EU Lisbon Agenda and corresponding national politics. The specifics of these processes need to be understood through solid macro- and micro-level analyses that feature in-depth comparative case studies of particular places and actors within particular cities. There is not one single dominant theory on contemporary urban restructuring, of course. Rather, there are several strands of literature vying for prominence, each contributing certain key insights to the complex subject matter and presenting sometimes-conflicting views on the same cities.2 Nevertheless, there is wide agreement among urban scholars that postindustrial, post-Fordist, neoliberal restructuring represents a double-edged sword for cities. **High-speed communication and transportation infrastructures** **enable corporations to avoid the high land costs and negative agglomeration externalities associated with high-profile central city locations and relocate elsewhere**. However, for many key, high-profile economic activities, “place still matters” (Dreier, Mollenkopf, and Swanstrom 2004). Sassen (1991) first showed how advanced producer and financial services remain clustered in urban cores, and how certain centralizing tendencies in fact intensify in “global cities” that represent the most strategic command and control centers of the global economy.3

Link – Highways

**[\_\_\_] Highway infrastructure enables the worst social effects of capitalism**

Shane Hamilton, assistant professor of history at the University of Georgia, 2006

(Shane, "Trucking Country: Food Politics and the Transformation of Rural Life in Postwar America," Trucking Country: Food Politics and the Transformation of Rural Life in Postwar America, Muse)

By showing how trucking reconfigured the technological, political, and cultural relationships between rural producers and urban consumers from the 1930s to the 1970s, my dissertation reveals the rural roots of a radical transformation of American capitalism in the midtwentieth century. **Highway transportation provided the infrastructure for a transition** from the New Deal–era political economy—based on centralized political authority, a highly regulated economy, and collective social values—**to a** post–New Deal **capitalist culture marked by** widespread antistatism, **minimal market regulation, and fierce individualism.** From the 1930s to the late 1970s, consumer demand for low-priced food, coupled with farmers' demands for high commodity prices, prompted the federal government to encourage agribusinesses to use long-haul trucks, piloted by fiercely independent "truck driven' men," to privatize the politics of food. Western meatpackers and other agribusinesses were determined to shred government regulations and labor unions in the name of "free enterprise," low wages, and irresistibly low consumer prices for goods such as well-marbled steaks, jugs of milk, and frozen orange juice. **The post–World War II highway-based food economy began unraveling the social fabric of rural America for the sake of low consumer prices**—long before Wal-Mart became infamous for said strategy.**[1](http://muse.jhu.edu.go.libproxy.wfubmc.edu/journals/enterprise_and_society/v007/7.4hamilton.html" \l "FOOT1) Trucks**, I contend**, were political technologies, used to define the contours of public policy regarding foods and farmers**; at the same time, **trucks** as technologies **shaped the economic and social structures underlying those political debates.** In doing so, **long-haul trucking** in the rural countryside **set the pace** for the low-price, low-wage, "free-market" **economic ideologies of** late twentieth-century **American capitalism.**

Link – Highways

[\_\_\_] Investment in highways directly reinforces the inequalities of capitalism

Thomas Sanchez et al, associate professor of Urban Affairs and Planning at Virginia Tech, 2003

(Thomas W. Sanchez, Rich Stolz, Jacinta S. M, “MOVING TO EQUITY: Addressing Inequitable Effects of Transportation Policies on Minorities”)

Transportation costs are particularly burdensome for low-income households, which devote greater proportions of their incomes to transportation-related expenses than do higher-income households. In 1998, those in the lowest income quintile, making $11,943 or less, spent 36 percent of their household budget on transportation, compared with those in the highest income quintile, making $60,535 or more, who spent only 14 percent. **Transportation expenditures continue to rise, reducing the amount low-income households have to spend on housing, food, health care, insurance, education, and other needs**. The costs of car ownership can make it difficult to afford to purchase a home, and cars quickly depreciate compared with real property. Between 1992 and 2000, households with incomes of less than $20,000 saw the amount of their income spent on transportation increase by 36.5 percent or more (households with incomes between $5,000 and $9,999 spent 57 percent more on transportation than they did in 1992). In comparison, households with incomes of $70,000 and above only spent 16.8 percent more on transportation expenses than they did in 1992. There are significant inequities between bus service, which tends to serve more low-income riders, and rail service, which tends to serve higher-income riders. These inequities pale in comparison to the differences between governmental financial and political support for highway systems and for public transit systems. Many **transportation planners** and policymakers, concerned primarily with the needs of suburban commuters, have focused on constructing highways and commuter rail lines that **do little to serve the needs of minority and low-income communities that depend on public transportation**. Examination of state transportation spending priorities reveals another inequity. A body of research suggests that states are spending more resources on transportation needs in nonmetropolitan areas than in metropolitan areas. More research examining geographically coded data on spending between cities and other areas would provide a better understanding of how transportation spending patterns impact minority and low-income communities. **Transportation policies that favor highway development over public transit** have several indirect negative effects. For one, such policies encourage housing development increasingly farther away from central cities, which **has played an important role in fostering residential segregation and income inequalities**. Also, **the practice** of locating major highways in minority and low-income communities **has** reduced housing in those areas. Other transportation investments, such as extending a rail line into a community, have **made it more difficult for minorities and low-income individuals living there to afford housing** because of ensuing property value increases. Individuals displaced by rising property values commonly have few alternative housing options and may end up living farther away from their jobs and social networks—a problem that is compounded by limited transportation options. **Transportation policies favoring highways over transit have also helped to create “spatial mismatch”**—the disconnect that occurs when new entry-level and low-skill jobs are located on the fringes of urban areas that are inaccessible to central-city residents who need those jobs.

Link – Highways

[\_\_\_] The government gives preference to highways, devaluing the poor minorities who can’t afford cars to use highways

Bullard, Ph.D. in Sociology from Iowa State University, 2004

(Robert D. Bullard, Highway Robbery: Transportation Racism & New Routes to Equity)

Over the past 75 years, **automobile** production **and highway construction have multiplied, while** urban **mass transit systems have been dismantled** or allowed to fall into disrepair. The American **automobile culture was spurred by massive government investments in roads** (3 million miles) **and** interstate **highways** (45,000 miles). Automobiles account for 28 percent of our nation's energy consumption. Transportation consumes 67 percent of the petroleum used in the United States." And over 75 percent of transportation energy is used by highway vehicles. From 1998 to 1999, US gasoline consumption rose by 2.5 percent and vehicle miles traveled increased by 1.4 percent. **More cars** on the road have **meant more pollution, traffic congestion, wasted energy, urban sprawl, residential segregation, and social disruption**. Indeed, not all Americans have received the same benefits from the massive road and highway spending over the past several decades. Generally, **the benefits of highways are** widely **dispersed** among the many travelers who drive them, **while the burdens** of those roads **are more localized**. **Having a** seven-lane **freeway next door**, for instance, **is not a benefit to someone who does not** even **own a car. People of color are twice as likely to use** nonautornotive modes of travel-**public transit, walking, and biking**-to get to work, as **compared to** their **white counterparts**. In urban areas, African Americans and Latinos comprise 54 percent of transit users (62 percent of bus riders, 35 percent of subway riders, and 29 percent of commuter riders).' Many Americans have cars and the majority of American workers opt for private automobiles, which provide speed and convenience. Most drivers forego carpooling, with three-fourths of all commuting cars carrying only one person. Generally, **people who commute using public transit spend twice as much time traveling as those who travel by car**. Consider that the average commute takes about 20 minutes by car, 38 minutes by bus, and 45 minutes by train. For millions of inner-city residents, public transportation is the only means of getting around. For them, there is no question that energy-efficient public transportation is needed for easy access to child-care services, shopping, job centers, and health care services.

Capitalism Bad Impact – Collapse Inevitable

**[\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_] Capitalism will inevitably collapse–we are witnessing the deterioration of the system as it approaches its structural limits. The crisis opens an opportunity for truly radical politics

John Bellamy Foster, professor of sociology at the University of Oregon in Eugene, 2005

(“Naked Imperialism” Monthly review Volume 57, Number 4, 2005)

**The United States is seeking to exercise sovereign authority over the planet during a time of widening global crisis: economic stagnation, increasing polarization between the global rich and the global poor, weakening U.S. economic hegemony, growing nuclear threats, and deepening ecological decline. The result is a heightening of international instability. Other potential forces are emerging in the world,** such as the European Community and China that could eventually challenge U.S. power, regionally and even globally. **Third world revolutions**, far from ceasing, **are beginning to gain momentum again**, symbolized by Venezuela’s Bolivarian Revolution under Hugo Chávez. U.S. attempts to tighten its imperial grip on the Middle East and its oil have had to cope with a fierce, seemingly unstoppable, Iraqi resistance, generating conditions of imperial overstretch. **With the United States brandishing its nuclear arsenal and refusing to support international agreements on the control of such weapons, nuclear proliferation is continuing.** New nations, such as North Korea, are entering or can be expected soon to enter the “nuclear club.” **Terrorist blowback from imperialist wars in the third world is now a well-recognized reality, generating rising fear of further terrorist attacks** in New York, London, and elsewhere. **Such vast and overlapping historical contradictions, rooted in the combined and uneven development of the global capitalist economy along with the U.S. drive for planetary domination, foreshadow what is potentially the most dangerous period in the history of imperialism**. **The course on which U.S and world capitalism is now headed points to global barbarism—or worse. Yet it is important to remember that nothing in the development of human history is inevitable. There still remains an alternative path—the global struggle for a humane, egalitarian, democratic, and sustainable society. The classic name for such a society is “socialism.” Such a renewed struggle for a world of substantive human equality must begin by addressing the system’s weakest link and at the same time the world’s most pressing needs—by organizing a global resistance movement against the new naked imperialism.**

Capitalism Bad Impact – Collapse Inevitable

**[\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_] Prolonging the collapse of the system causes nuclear war, racism, extreme poverty, patriarchy, and environmental destruction that will end in our extinction.

Charles Brown, Professor of Economics and Research Scientist at the University of Michigan, 2005

(May 13th, http://archives.econ.utah.edu/archives/pen-l/2005w15/msg00062.htm)

The capitalist class owns the factories, the banks, and transportation-the means of production and distribution. Workers sell their ability to work in order to acquire the necessities of life. Capitalists buy the workers' labor, but only pay them back a portion of the wealth they create. Because the capitalists own the means of production, they are able to keep the surplus wealth created by workers above and beyond the cost of paying worker's wages and other costs of production. This surplus is called "profit" and consists of unpaid labor that the capitalists appropriate and use to achieve ever-greater profits. These profits are turned into capital which capitalists use to further exploit the producers of all wealth-the working class. Capitalists are compelled by competition to seek to maximize profits. The capitalist class as a whole can do that only by extracting a greater surplus from the unpaid labor of workers by increasing exploitation. Under capitalism, economic development happens only if it is profitable to the individual capitalists, not for any social need or good. The profit drive is inherent in capitalism, and underlies or exacerbates all major social ills of our times. With the rapid advance of technology and productivity, new forms of capitalist ownership have developed to maximize profit. The working people of our country confront serious, chronic problems because of capitalism. These chronic problems become part of the objective conditions that confront each new generation of working people. The threat of nuclear war, which can destroy all humanity, grows with the spread of nuclear weapons, space-based weaponry, and a military doctrine that justifies their use in preemptive wars and wars without end. Ever since the end of World War II, the U.S. has been constantly involved in aggressive military actions big and small. These wars have cost millions of lives and casualties, huge material losses, as well as trillions of U.S. taxpayer dollars. Threats to the environment continue to spiral, threatening all life on our planet. Millions of workers are unemployed or insecure in their jobs, even during economic upswings and periods of "recovery" from recessions. Most workers experience long years of stagnant real wages, while health and education costs soar. Many workers are forced to work second and third jobs to make ends meet. Most workers now average four different occupations during their lifetime, being involuntarily moved from job to job and career to career. Often, retirement-age workers are forced to continue working just to provide health care for themselves. With capitalist globalization, jobs move as capitalists export factories and even entire industries to other countries. Millions of people continuously live below the poverty level; many suffer homelessness and hunger. Public and private programs to alleviate poverty and hunger do not reach everyone, and are inadequate even for those they do reach. Racism remains the most potent weapon to divide working people. Institutionalized racism provides billions in extra profits for the capitalists every year due to the unequal pay racially oppressed workers receive for work

Capitalism Bad Impact – War

**[\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_] Capitalist globalization will cause endless war

Kanishka Chowdhury, Professor of American Culture at St. Thomas University, 2006

(“Interrogating ‘Newness’”, Culture Critique, p. 127-8, Project MUSE)

In a sense, globalization is now used as a cover for endless war. Countries are designated as "rogue" regimes to the extent that they fail to assimilate into global capitalism. Globalization, then, has been presented as the natural economic order and one connected inextricably to the forces of democracy and civilization. Globalization as described by its advocates thus suggests a natural, neutral process, one in which a larger, benign global family looks out for each member's interests, and where the powerful nations teach, at a cost, those who are economically "backward" the ways of the world**.** This is a process in which the "Third World" elite are, of course, willing participants. Consider, for instance, the text of the May 6, 2003, full-page advertisement in the *New York Times* celebrating the new Nigeria: "In Nigeria, a new generation is looking to attract increased foreign investment. . . . New legislation has made foreign involvement easier. . . . Several state-owned enterprises are being prepared for privatization. . . . Foreign investors with unique and innovative projects are granted 'pioneer status.' . . . We have very generous tax-waivers—five years for pioneer status companies. . . . We are doing everything possible to cooperate with the United States" (C11). One doesn't have to look very hard at this advertisement to understand that the forces of multinational capital have produced this text many times over. After all, such "promotions," paid for in more ways than one by Third World citizens, are created in the West, for the Western consumer, and by Western advertising firms. Despite such glossy claims, we are clearly not considering a harmonious, mutually beneficial process of global cooperation here; rather, we are witnessing the legitimized and systematic looting and subjugation of a sovereign nation, assisted by its national bourgeoisie; in short, we are observing another step in the process of endless war. Let us then begin our analysis of globalization by reattaching the designation "capitalist" to globalization, so we can focus on the unvarnished economic logic of this violent process of endless war. Globalization, of course, is not merely an economic process but one that has multiple cultural articulations. Although advocates celebrate the growth of cultural exchange, the greater accessibility to a range of cultural products, and the potential democratization of authoritarian societies through so-called liberatory cultural imports, these cultural transactions are characterized by and depend upon existing economic inequalities between metropolitan centers and the peripheries.

Capitalism Bad Impact – Terrorism

**[\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_] **Capitalist-driven hegemony fosters terrorism**

John Bellamy Foster, Professor, University of Oregon, 2001

(“Imperialism and Empire,” <http://werple.net.au/~andy/blackwood/bellamy-foster.htm>)

Socialism or Barbarism, however, would appear to suggest an altogether different interpretation, one that sees U.S. imperialism as central to the terror crisis. In this view, the terrorists attacking the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, were not attacking global sovereignty or civilization (it wasn’t the United Nations in New York that was attacked) — much less the values of freedom and democracy as claimed by the U.S. state — but were deliberately targeting the symbols of U.S. financial and military power, and thus of U.S. global power. **As unjustifiable as these terrorist acts were in every sense, they nonetheless belong to the larger history of U.S. imperialism and the attempt of the U.S. to establish global hegemony** — particularly to the history of its interventions in the Middle East. Further, the United States responded not through a process of global constitutionalism, nor in the form of a mere police action, but imperialistically by unilaterally declaring war on international terrorism and setting loose its war machine on the Taliban government in Afghanistan. In Afghanistan, the U.S. military is seeking to destroy terrorist forces that it once played a role in creating. Far from adhering to its own constitutional principles in the international domain the U.S. has long supported terrorist groups whenever it served its own imperialist designs, and has itself carried out state terrorism, killing civilian populations. Its new **war on terrorism**, Washington has declared, **may require U.S. military intervention in numerous countries** beyond Afghanistan — with such nations as Iraq, **Syria, Sudan,** Libya, **Indonesia, Malaysia and the Philippines already singled out as possible locales for further interventions.** All of this, coupled with a worldwide economic downturn and increased repression in the leading capitalist states, seems to suggest that **capital’s “destructive uncontrollability” is coming more and more to the fore. Imperialism**, in the process of blocking autocentric development — i.e., in perpetuating the development of underdevelopment — in the periphery, **has bred terrorism, which has blown back on the leading imperialist state itself, creating a spiral of destruction without apparent end.** Since global government is impossible under capitalism, but necessary in the more globalized reality of today, **the system,** Mészáros insists, **is thrown increasingly upon** the “extreme violent rule of the whole world by one hegemonic imperialist country on a permanent basis**: an...absurd and unsustainable way of running the world order.”** (p. 73).

Capitalism Bad Impact – Economy

**[\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_] The spread of capitalism makes environmental and economic collapse inevitable

Wise, Prof of Development Studies @ Universidad Autónoma de Zacatecas, Mexico, **2010**

(Raúl Delgado Wise, Humberto Márquez Covarrubias, Rubén Puentes, Reframing the debate on migration, development and human rights: fundamental elements, October, 2010, www.migracionydesarrollo.org)

The internationalization of capital. **The expansion strategy of the global economy in- volves a profound economic restructuring based on the establishment of subcontracting chains dominated by large multinational corporations, which have a global reach**. This form of expansion seeks to economically reinsert peripheral countries that are rich in natural resources and ensure an abundant and cheap workforce. The new export platforms, in fact, operate as enclaves, that is production, commercial and services zones dominated by multinational corporations and often exempted from national taxation and regulation of working and environmental conditions. These types of plants cur- rental employ between 55 million (Robinson, 2008) and 66 million Southern workers (Singa Boyenge, 2006) and the strategy is widely implemented by large manufacturing, financial, agricultural, commercial, and service-sector multinationals (Robinson, 2008). Financialization. **Financial capital generates speculative strategies that foster the chan- neling of investment funds, sovereign funds, pension funds and social savings toward new financial instruments that offer short-term high profit margins but can entail re- current crises and massive fraud**. **These speculative strategies obstruct** and affect **the functioning of the so-called real economy** (Foster and Magdof, 2009; Bello, 2006). Environmental degradation. **Biodiversity, natural resources, and** communal and national **wealth are privatized for the benefit of large corporations** that favor profits **while ignoring** **social and environmental** **costs**. **This leads to increased environmental degradation, pollution, famine, and disease, as well as climate changes** (global warming and increasingly frequent extreme climatic events) **that threaten the symbiotic relationship between humans and the environment** (Foladori and Pierri, 2005).

Capitalism Bad Impact – Energy Crisis

**[\_\_\_]**

**[\_\_\_] Capitalism is the root cause of energy crisis**

Paul **Sweezy,** economist and former instructor at Harvard, **1997**

(The Guilt of Capitalism, Monthly Review, vol. 49, no. 2, June 1997, <http://monthlyreview.org/2010/11/01/the-guilt-of-capitalism>)

Why, then, are we not already living in the period of transition from a proven deadly to a proven safe form of energy production? The short answer is capitalism—and this is in two complementary senses. First, **in capitalist society power is in the hands of capitalists and their acolytes. They cannot be assumed to be ignorant of the energy situation and the dangers it portends for the future. Yet they have never used that power to take remedial action**. Second, **when faced with the energy crises of the 1970s and the widespread popular reaction, they did their best to confuse the real issues and limited themselves to making soothing promises which they promptly forgot—and obviously never intended to honor—when things calmed down.** (Again Berman and O’Connor provide a wealth of confirming evidence.) **By the late 1980s what had seemed to be a snowballing popular movement for an energy new deal was effectively scotched and by now is hardly more than a fading memory.**

Capitalism Bad Impact – Environment

### 

**[\_\_\_]**

**[\_\_\_] Capitalism is the root cause of environmental destruction**

Paul **Sweezy,** economist and former instructor at Harvard, **2004**

(Paul Capitalism and the Environment. Monthly Review, Vol. 56, October 2004)

It is this obsession with capital accumulation that distinguishes capitalism from the simple system for satisfying human needs it is portrayed as in mainstream economic theory. And a system driven by capital accumulation is one that never stands still, one that is forever changing, adopting new and discarding old methods of production and distribution, opening up new territories, subjecting to its purposes societies too weak to protect themselves. Caught up in this process of restless innovation and expansion, the system rides roughshod over even its own beneficiaries if they get in its way or fall by the roadside. **As far as the natural environment is concerned, capitalism perceives it not as something to be cherished** and **enjoyed but as a means to the** paramount **ends of profit-making** and still more capital accumulation. Such is the inner nature, **the essential drive of the economic system** that **has generated the present environmental crisis**. Naturally it does not operate without opposition. Efforts have always been made to curb its excesses, not only by its victims but also in extreme cases by its more farsighted leaders. Marx, in Capital, wrote feelingly about nineteenth-century movements for factory legislation and the ten-hours bill, describing the latter as a great victory for the political economy of the working class. And during the present century conservation movements have emerged in all the leading capitalist countries and have succeeded in imposing certain limits on the more destructive depredations of uncontrolled capital. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that without constraints of this kind arising within the system, capitalism by now would have destroyed both its environment and itself. Not surprisingly, such constraints, while sometimes interfering with the operations of individual capitalists, never go so far as to threaten the system as a whole. Long before that point is reached, the capitalist class, including the state which it controls, mobilizes its defenses to repulse environmental-protection measures perceived as dangerously extreme. Thus despite the development of a growing environmental consciousness and the movements to which it has given rise in the last century, the environmental crisis continues to deepen. There is nothing in the record or on the horizon that could lead us to believe the situation will significantly change in the foreseeable future. If this conclusion is accepted--and it is hard to see how anyone who has studied the history of our time can refuse, at the very least, to take it seriously--it follows that **what has to be done to resolve the environmental crisis, hence also to insure that humanity has a future, is to replace capitalism with a social order based on an economy devoted not to maximizing private profit and accumulating ever more capital but rather to meeting real human needs and restoring the environment to a sustainably healthy condition**.

Capitalism Bad Impact – Environment

**[\_\_\_]**

**[\_\_\_] Capitalism makes environmental destruction inevitable – no environmental problem can be solved from within the system**

Victor Wallis, Professor of Liberal Arts at Berkeley, 2010

(Victor, “Beyond “green capitalism”, February http://monthlyreview.org/2010/02/01/beyond-green-capitalism)

A **disdain for the** natural **environment** has **characterized capitalism from the beginning**. As Marx noted, **capital abuses the soil as much as it exploits the worker**.[1](http://monthlyreview.org/2010/02/01/beyond-green-capitalism#fn32) **The makings of ecological breakdown are thus inherent in capitalism**. No serious observer now denies the severity of **the environmental crisis**, but it is still not widely recognized as **a capitalist crisis**, that is, as a crisis **arising from and perpetuated by the rule of capital,****and hence incapable of resolution within the capitalist framework***.* It is useful to remind ourselves that, although Marx situated **capitalism’s crisis tendencies** initially in the business cycle (specifically, in its downward phase), he recognized at the same time that those tendencies could manifest themselves under other forms—the first of these being the drive to global expansion.[2](http://monthlyreview.org/2010/02/01/beyond-green-capitalism#fn31) Such manifestations are not inherently cyclical; they are permanent trends. They can be sporadically offset, but for as long as capitalism prevails, they cannot be reversed. They **encompass**: (1) increased concentration of economic power; (2) increased polarization between rich and poor, both within and across national boundaries; (3) **a permanent readiness for military engagement in support of these drives; and** (4) of special concern to us here, the **uninterrupted debasement or depletion of vital natural resources.**

Alternative -- Rejection

**[\_\_\_]**

**[\_\_\_]** **Capitalism has reached a legitimacy crisis that makes it vulnerable to rejection**

John Sanbonmatsu, Associate Professor of Philosophy at Worcester Polytechnic Institute, 2009

(May/June 09, Tikkun Vol. 24, Issue 3pg 21-72)

ALAS, THE DISAPPEARANCE OF VIBRANT social movements from the field of history could not come at a more tragic time: **for the first time in seventy years, after decades of unquestioned supremacy over every aspect of human and natural life, capitalism is beginning to suffer its own "legitimacy crisis.**" The German philosopher Georg Hegel famously wrote that the Owl of Minerva would only take wing at dusk. That is, only at the end of history would Reason and divine Spirit at last come to be reconciled, in human self-consciousness, human self-knowledge. Today, however, as the Marxist James O'Connor has ironically remarked, the Owl of Minerva folds its wings at day-break — closing up shop, as it were, just when things at last start to get interesting. Antonio Gramsci, the great Italian theorist, observed **that severe economic disruptions can "lead in the long run to a widespread skepticism" toward the existing order as a whole. When that happens, even the most seemingly entrenched political and social arrangements can disappear overnight**. **In 1997, when foreign traders suddenly pulled the plug on the "Asian miracle," devaluing currencies such as the Thai bhat and Indonesian rupiah, mass protests and riots spread through the region overnight. Within a year, the democracy movement had toppled the authoritarian government of President Suharto in Indonesia**, a nation of over 200 million. **A year after that, the East Timorese at last overcame decades of repression by the Suharto regime by declaring their national independence**. The traumatic economic dislocations of the 1920s and 1930s, by contrast, prepared the ground for even more intensive and extensive social upheavals. When Gramsci spoke of popular "skepticism" toward an older regime, he knew of what he spoke, having himself been thrown in jail by the fascist leader, Benito Mussolini. If fascism and world war were the products of the last depression, what will the next one bring? As the world economy deteriorates, as hundreds of millions of people lose their jobs, and as the state scales back on social welfare and public services, we may see a widening crisis of confidence in the economic and social order as such. That worry seems to have been on the mind of George W. Bush last autumn, when he felt compelled to defend the capitalist system by name.

Answers to: Transition Wars

**[\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_] Transition wars from hegemony are inevitable only in a world of capitalism – its contradictions will force America to go to war with the rest of the planet

Samir Amin, director of the Third World Forum in Dakar, Senegal, 2000

(Samir, “The political economy of the twentieth century,” *Monthly Review*. New York: Jun 2000. Vol. 52, Iss. 2; p. 1)

**This vision of a unipolar world is being increasingly opposed by that of a multipolar globalization, the only strategy that would allow the different regions of the world to achieve acceptable social development,** and would thereby foster social democratization and the reduction of the motives for conflict. The hegemonic strategy of the United States and its NATO allies is today the main enemy of social progress, democracy, and peace. **The twenty-first century will not be America's century. It will be one of vast conflicts, and the rise of social struggles that question the ambitions of Washington and of capital. The crisis is exacerbating contradictions within the dominant classes. These conflicts must take on increasingly acute international dimensions, and therefore pit states and groups of states against each other. One can already discern the first hints of a conflict between the United States, Japan, and their faithful Australian ally on the one hand, and China and other Asian countries on the other. Nor is it difficult to envisage the rebirth of a conflict between the United States and Russia**, if the latter manages to extricate itself from the nightmarish spiral of death and disintegration into which Boris Yeltsin and his U.S. "advisors" have plunged it. And if the European Left could free itself from submission to the double dictates of capital and Washington, it would be possible to imagine that the new European strategy could be intertwined with those of Russia, China, India, and the third world in general, in a necessary, multipolar construction effort. If this does not come about, the European project itself will fade away. The central question, therefore, is how conflicts and social struggles (it is important to differentiate between the two) will be articulated. Which will triumph? Will social struggles be subordinated, framed by conflicts, and therefore mastered by the dominant powers, even made instruments to the benefit of those powers? Or will social struggles surmount their autonomy and force the major powers to respond to their urgent demands? Of course, I do not imagine that the conflicts and struggles of the twenty-first century will produce a remake of the previous century. History does not repeat itself according to a cyclical model. Today's societies are confronted by new challenges at all levels. **But precisely because the immanent contradictions of capitalism are sharper at the end of the century than they were at its beginning, and because the means of destruction are also far greater than they were, the alternatives for the twenty-first century are (more than ever before) "socialism or barbarism."**

Answers to: Transition Wars

**[\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_] Wars are inevitable under capitalism

Istvan Meszaros, Prof of Philosophy & Political Theory, 1995

(Professor at University of Sussex, England, “Beyond Capital: Toward a Theory of Transition”)

With regard to its innermost determination **the capital system is expansion oriented and accumulation-driven.** Such a determination **constitutes both a formerly unimaginable dynamism and a fateful deficiency.** In this sense, as a system of social metabolic control capital is quite irresistible for as long as it can successfully extract and accumulate surplus-labor-whether in directly economic or in primarily political form- in the course of the given society’s expanded reproduction. **Once**, however, **this dynamic process of expansion and accumulation gets stuck** (for whatever reason) **the consequences must be** quite **devastating**. For even under the ‘normality’ of relatively limited cyclic disturbances and blockages **the destruction that goes with the ensuing socioeconomic and political crises can be enormous,** as the annals of the twentieth century reveal it, **including two world wars** (not to mention **numerous smaller conflagrations**). It is therefore not too difficult to imagine the implications of a systemic, truly structural crisis; i.e. one that affects the global capital system not simply under one if its aspects-the financial/monetary one, for instance-but in all its fundamental dimensions, questioning its viability altogether as a social reproductive system. **Under the conditions of capital's structural crisis its destructive constituents come to the fore with a vengeance, activating the specter of total uncontrollability in a form that foreshadows self-destruction both for this unique social reproductive system itself and for humanity in general.**

Answers to: Permutation

**[\_\_\_]**

**[\_\_\_] Reform of capitalism fails – capitalism will always regenerate**

James Herod, political activist, Columbia graduate, 2004

(<http://site.www.umb.edu/faculty/salzman_g/Strate/GetFre/4thEd/4-index.htm>, Getting Free, A sketch of an association of democratic, autonomous neighborhoods and how to create it, Fourth Edition, January 2004)

**Capitalism must be *explicitly refused*** and replaced by something else. **This constitutes *War***, but it is not a war in the traditional sense of armies and tanks, but a war **fought on a daily basis, on the level of everyday life,** by millions of people. It is a war nevertheless because the accumulators of capital will use coercion, brutality, and murder, as they have always done in the past, to try to block any rejection of the system. They have always had to force compliance; they will not hesitate to continue doing so. Nevertheless, there are many concrete ways that individuals, groups, and neighborhoods can gut capitalism, which I will enumerate shortly. We must always keep in mind how we became slaves; then we can see more clearly how we can cease being slaves. We were forced into wage-slavery because the ruling class slowly, systematically, and brutally destroyed our ability to live autonomously. By driving us off the land, changing the property laws, destroying community rights, destroying our tools, imposing taxes, destroying our local markets, and so forth, we were forced onto the labor market in order to survive, our only remaining option being to sell, for a wage, our ability to work. It’s quite clear then how we can overthrow slavery. We must reverse this process. We must begin to reacquire the ability to live without working for a wage or buying the products made by wage-slaves (that is, we must get free from the labor market and the way of living based on it), and embed ourselves instead in cooperative labor and cooperatively produced goods. Another clarification is needed. **This strategy does not call for *reforming* capitalism, for changing capitalism into something else. It calls for *replacing* capitalism**, **totally, with a new civilization. This is an important distinction, because capitalism has proved impervious to reforms, as a system. We can sometimes in some places win certain concessions from it (usually only temporary ones) and win some (usually short-lived) improvements in our lives as its victims, but we cannot reform it piecemeal, as a system. Thus our strategy of gutting and eventually destroying capitalism requires at a minimum a totalizing image, an awareness that we are attacking an entire way of life and replacing it with another, and not merely reforming one way of life into something else**.

Answers to: Permutation

**[\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_] Single-issue campaigns like the affirmative are nothing more than masking reforms that sustain the system. The only escape from capitalism is its total destruction, anything less only serves to promote it

James Herod, political activist, Columbia graduate, 2006

(“Strategies that have failed” http://site.www.umb.edu/faculty/salzman\_g/Strate/GetFre/05.htm)

**Single-issue campaigns. We cannot destroy capitalism with single-issue campaigns. Yet the great bulk of the energies of radicals is spent on these campaigns**. There are dozens of them: **campaigns to preserve the forests, keep rent control**, stop whaling, stop animal experiments, defend abortion rights, stop toxic dumping, stop the killing of baby seals, stop nuclear testing, stop smoking, stop pornography, **stop drug testing**, stop drugs, stop the war on drugs, stop police brutality, stop union busting, stop red-lining, stop the death penalty, **stop racism, stop sexism**, stop child abuse, stop the re-emerging slave trade, stop the bombing of Yugoslavia, stop the logging of redwoods, stop the spread of advertising, stop the patenting of genes, stop the trapping and killing of animals for furs, stop irradiated meat, stop genetically modified foods, stop human cloning, stop the death squads in Colombia, **stop the World Bank** and the World Trade Organization, stop the extermination of species, **stop corporations** from buying politicians, stop high stakes educational testing, stop the bovine growth hormone from being used on milk cows, stop micro radio from being banned, stop global warming, stop the militarization of space, stop the killing of the oceans, and on and on. **What we are doing is spending our lives trying to fix up a system which generates evils far faster than we can ever eradicate them**. Although some of these campaigns use direct action (e.g., spikes in the trees to stop the chain saws or Greenpeace boats in front of the whaling ships to block the harpoons), for the most part **the campaigns are directed at passing legislation in Congress to correct the problem.** Unfortunately, **reforms that are won in one decade, after endless agitation, can be easily wiped off the books the following decade, after the protesters have gone home, or after a new administration comes to power**. These struggles all have value and are needed. Could anyone think that the campaigns against global warming, or to free Leonard Peltier, or to aid the East Timorese ought to be abandoned? **Single issue campaigns keep us aware of what's wrong, and sometimes even win. But in and of themselves, they cannot destroy capitalism**, and thus cannot really fix things. **It is utopian to believe that we can reform capitalism. Most of these evils can only be eradicated for good if we destroy capitalism itself and create a new civilization.** **We cannot afford to aim for anything less**. **Our very survival is at stake. There is one single-issue campaign I can wholehearted endorse: the total and permanent eradication of capitalism.**

Answers to: Capitalism is Inevitable

**[\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_] Capitalism is not inevitable

Joel Kovel, Professor of Social Studies at Bard, 2002

(Joel, The Enemy of Nature, p115-116)

For example, **it is a commonly held opinion that capitalism** **is** an **innate** and therefore inevitable outcome for the human species. If this is the case, then the necessary path of human evolution travels from the Olduvai Gorge to the New York Stock Exchange, and to think of a world beyond capital is mere baying at the moon. It only takes a brief reflection to demolish the received understanding. **Capital is certainly a potentiality for human nature, but, despite all the efforts of ideologues to argue for its natural inevitability, no more than this. For if capital were natural, why has it only occupied the last 500 years of a record that goes back for hundreds of thousands?** More to the point, **why did it have to be imposed through violence wherever it set down its rule? And** most importantly, **why does it have to be continually maintained through violence, and continuously re-imposed on each generation through an enormous apparatus of indoctrination?**

**Capitalism Critique Answers**
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Glossary

**Accumulation.** When you accumulate items you add to the number of items that you possess.

**Authentic.** Real, true

**Bourgeoisie.** Wealthy individuals.

**Capitalism.** Capitalism is an economic system in which the means of production are owned.

**Commodified**. If you take a good (say an apple) and assign it an economic value/make it available for sale, that item is commodified.

**Coopted.** Social movements are coopted when more powerful forces are able to focus the energies of that movement on supporting the cause of the more powerful force.

**Exploit.** A person is exploited when his or her labor is used and they are not properly compensated for that labor.

**Hegemony.** Hegemony refers to dominant global power. The US is considered to be the dominant global hegemon now.

**Ideology.** An ideology is a set of ideas that constitute a person’s goals, actions, and expectations (Wikipedia).

**Imperialism.** When a country attempts to expand its authority beyond its existing territory it is referred to as an imperialist power.

**Masking.** Masking refers to covering something up so that it doesn’t look like it is. In this context, a program to temporarily address inequality could mask/cover up more widespread inequality.

**Preemption.** Preemption refers to attacking before you are attacked.

**Prevailing.** Prevailing means winning. The side that prevails in the game is the winner.

**Proletariat.** The proletariat is the working class.

**Resist.** To resist is to stand against, to oppose.

**Socialism.** Socialism is an economic system in which the means of production are owned by everyone.

Alternative Can’t Solve – Capitalism Inevitable

### 

**[\_\_\_]**

### [\_\_\_] Capitalism inevitable – all other stable economic systems are just variants of capitalism

James Speth, Former dean of Yale school of forestry and environmentalism, 2008

(The bridge at the end of the world, 188-9)

Of course, **the big problem facing all discussions of alternatives to capitalism is that there do not seem to be any alternatives. Throughout the Cold War, the alternative was state socialism or communism, but it is fading fast around the globe. Asked about alternatives to capitalism today, most people draw blank.** Some would add, for good reason. **It is therefore worth noting the diversity of economic systems** both **within capitalism** and within socialism, a point stressed by the Tellus Institute**." Within capitalism, a variety of national economic systems exist, where the key variable is the degree of engagement of government in determining economic priorities and social conditions.** At one end of the spectrum, the so-called Anglo-American model approximates laissez-faire. Here, the market tends to dominate the state. In Scandinavia and elsewhere on the Continent, one finds varieties of social democratic capitalism." Social democratic nations exert greater public control over capital investment and have created more comprehensive social programs including higher minimum wages and unemployment compensation, greater protections against layoffs, free or near-free health care and schooling, and so on. In these countries the market and the state are seen as partners. In Japan and elsewhere in Asia, there are systems that can be described as state capitalism, where there is heavy government involvement in directing the economy and where the state tends to dominate the market.

Alternative Can’t Solve – Capitalism Inevitable

**[\_\_\_] No alternatives to capitalism have managed to survive**

John Isbister,Professor Economics, U. Cal @ Santa Cruz, 2001

(Capitalism and Justice, p. 46)

Some in the capitalist world try to retain or re-create the best parts of precapitalism. Some Amish and Mennonite communities are based on precapitalist values, as are some other faith-based groups. The 1960s and 1970s saw the creation of secular alternative rural communes, communities whose members tried to eliminate all marks of distinction between them, to be self-sufficient, and to live simply. The communes had some successes, but most eventually collapsed. **Communities such as these have attempted to embody precapitalist values, but none has succeeded in cutting itself off from capitalist influences: from the market, from the media, from the legal system, and from other influences of the modern world. While we can learn from our antecedent societies, we cannot return to them. The door has been closed**.

[\_\_\_] Capitalism is too ingrained to be wished away

Wilson, coordinator of the Independent Press Association’s Campus Journalism Project, 2000

(How the Left can Win Arguments and Influence People, pg 15- 16)

**Capitalism is far too ingrained** in American life **to eliminate. If you go into the most impoverished areas of America, you will find that the people who live there are not seeking government control over factories** or even more social welfare programs; **they're hoping**, usually in vain, **for a fair chance to share** in the capitalist wealth. The poor do not pray for socialism-they strive to be a part of the capitalist system. They want jobs, they want to start businesses, and they want to make money and be successful. What's wrong with America is not capitalism as a system but capitalism as a religion. We worship the accumulation of wealth and treat the horrible inequality between rich and poor as if it were an act of God. Worst of all, we allow the government to exacerbate the financial divide by favoring the wealthy: go anywhere in America, and compare a rich suburb with a poor town-the city services, schools, parks, and practically everything else will be better financed in the place populated by rich people. **The aim is not to overthrow capitalism but to overhaul it. Give it a social-justice tune-up,** make it more efficient, get the economic engine to hit on all cylinders for everybody, and stop putting out so many environmentally hazardous substances. To some people, this goal means selling out leftist ideals for the sake of capitalism. But the right thrives on having an ineffective opposition. The Revolutionary Communist Party helps stabilize the "free market" capitalist system by making it seem as if the only alternative to free-market capitalism is a return to Stalinism. Prospective **activists for cha**nge are instead **channeled into pointless discussions about the revolutionary potential of the proletariat. Instead of working to persuade people to accept progressive ideas, the far left talks to itself** (which may be a blessing, given the way it communicates) and tries to sell copies of the Socialist Worker to an uninterested public.

Alternative Can’t Solve – Transition Wars

**[\_\_\_]**

**[\_\_\_] The break from capitalism will be met with transition wars**

Ted Trainer, Senior Lecturer in Sociology at the School of Social Work, University of New South Wales, 2003

(“The Simpler Way”, http://ssis.arts.unsw.edu.au/tsw/02-The-Simpler-Way.html , February 13)

"When corporations rule the world" This heading, the title of a recent book by David Korten, sums up the situation that has arisen over the last 20 years. **A tiny corporate super-rich class has raised to extraordinary wealth and power and are now able to more or less run the world in the ways that suit it.** (About 1% of the world’s people now control more than half the capital; Note 7.) They run the transnational corporations, the media and especially the World Bank, IMF and World Trade Organization. Their wealth funds the think tanks, foundations, universities, journals etc which pump out the message that the neo-liberal way is the best and the only way. Governments eagerly comply with this agenda. . They have routed the working class. **The Left has been eliminated as a political force. Above all the rich have crushingly won the ideological battle establishing neo-liberalism as the only way. Rich world military power is likely to be used ruthlessly against nations which interfere with this agenda of free access for corporations and integration of all regions into the one global market** (e.g., Yugoslavia, Iraq.) Much of the literature on globalization is alarmed at this situation of corporate rule; (see especially Chussudowsky, 1996, Fotopolous, 2002, and many of the works by Chomsky.) **There are good reasons for thinking that it is now too late to do anything about this rapid surge to world domination by the super-rich, especially since the "war on terrorism" has provided a perfect pretext for crushing dissent.**

Permutation – Must Work Within the System

**[\_\_\_]**

**[\_\_\_] Change in capitalism must occur within the system**

James Speth, Former dean of Yale school of forestry and environmentalism, 2008

(*The bridge at the end of the world*, 192)

Greider, a long-term Washington observer, sees little hope that Washington will drive major change. “The larger point … is that **the collision between society and capitalism has endured over many years, despite the laws and shifting political sensibilities, because it is essentially a clash of two different value systems. Government has not succeeded in reconciling the clash because, though it issues many rules of dos and don’ts for enterprise to follow, it does not attempt to alter the underlying values that shape capitalism’s behavior**. To be enduring, that **change has to occur inside capitalism, like altering the gene system of a plant or animal.”**

Capitalism Good – Freedom/Prosperity

**[\_\_\_]**

**[\_\_\_] Alternatives to capitalism are worse – capitalism is key to freedom**

Andrew Bernstein,Visiting Professor of Philosophy at Marist College, 2003

(“The Freeman: Ideas on Liberty, http://www.fee.org/PUBLICATIONS/THE-FREEMAN/article.asp?aid=5332, December)

**The freedom of the capitalist system liberates creative human brainpower from bondage to the state. The ensuing advances in science, medicine, agriculture, technology, and industry generate vast increases in living standards and life expectancies**. It is not surprising that during the capitalist epoch, roughly 1820 to the present, the free countries of western Europe and North America saw their total economic output increase 60 times, and per capita income grow to be 13 times what it had been previously.[4](http://www.fee.org/PUBLICATIONS/THE-FREEMAN/article.asp?aid=5332#4) Even minimal capitalist elements have already produced salutary results in communist Vietnam. The annual minimum wage there is $134; but Nike, which owns Vietnamese factories—misleadingly dubbed “sweatshops” by anti-capitalist ideologues—pays an average salary of $670, which is double the country’s per capita GDP.[5](http://www.fee.org/PUBLICATIONS/THE-FREEMAN/article.asp?aid=5332#5) **Western companies in the poorest countries pay their workers, on average, twice what the corresponding native firms pay. Most important, workers voluntarily seek such employment, and unlike the repressive governments, these private companies have no legal right to initiate force against them. Capitalism is freedom—and freedom leads to prosperity**. The moral is the practical. On the other hand, statism is oppression—and oppression leads to destitution. The immoral is the impractical. **After two centuries of capitalism, 80 years of socialism, and a millennium of feudalism, the contest is over and the scores are on the board. The alternatives open to human beings are stark: freedom and prosperity or statism and misery. We have only to make our choice.**

Capitalism Good – Environment

**[\_\_\_]**

**[\_\_\_] Capitalism is key to environmental preservation**

Jenny Taylor,senior fellow CATO institute, 2003

(Happy Earth Day? Thank Capitalism, http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=3073)

This is unfortunate because it's businessmen **-- not bureaucrats or environmental activists -- who deserve most of the credit for the environmental gains over the past century and who represent the best hope for a Greener tomorrow**. Indeed, **we wouldn't even have environmentalists in our midst were it not for capitalism. Environmental amenities**, after all, **are luxury goods. America** -- like much of the Third World today -- **had no environmental movement to speak of until living standards rose sufficiently so that we could turn our attention from simply providing for food, shelter, and a reasonable education to higher "quality of life" issues**. The richer you are, the more likely you are to be an environmentalist. And people wouldn't be rich without capitalism. **Wealth not only breeds environmentalists, it begets environmental quality.** There are dozens of studies showing that, as per capita income initially rises from subsistence levels, air and water pollution increases correspondingly. But once per capita income hits between $3,500 and $15,000 (dependent upon the pollutant), the ambient concentration of pollutants begins to decline just as rapidly as it had previously increased. This relationship is found for virtually every significant pollutant in every single region of the planet. It is an iron law. Given that wealthier societies use more resources than poorer societies, such findings are indeed counterintuitive. But the data don't lie. How do we explain this? The obvious answer -- that wealthier **societies are willing to trade-off the economic costs of government regulation for environmental improvements and that poorer society are not -- is only partially correct. In the United States, pollution declines generally predated the passage of laws mandating pollution controls.**

Capitalism Good – Environment

**[\_\_\_]**

**[\_\_\_] Capitalism improves the environment: 4 ways**

Joseph Bast,president, Heartland Institute, 1994

(ECO-SANITY, p. 193)

**It is time to update our attitudes toward capitalism, and particularly our understanding of how it puts “a proper price on environmental resources.” Capitalism is based on a system of markets and private property rights.** When rights are correctly defined and enforced**, capitalism will protect the environment for four reasons: It creates incentives to do the right things; It generates and distributes needed information; It enables people to trade things or rights in order to solve problems that otherwise can’t be solved; and It enables property rights to evolve over time. The free-enterprise system creates wealth, rewards efficiency, and protects the environment better than any other system yet devised by man.**

**[\_\_\_] Capitalism is good for the environment**

Joseph Bast,president, Heartland Institute, 1994

(ECO-SANITY, p. 193)

**Without private ownership, it is difficult to protect wildlife, forests, or other environmental resources, because no one directly benefits when the resource is conserved or suffers a loss if the resource is mismanaged. When natural resources are owned collectively (or “by the government”), each of us may use or manage the resource very negligently, because we aren’t affected much by our careless behavior.** As a result**, public ownership often leaves the environment dependent on people’s charity of “good instincts**.” These qualities are admirable, to be sure. But as the passenger pigeon, buffalo, and African elephant show**, we can’t rely on admirable qualities alone to protect rare or endangered animals.**

Capitalism Good – Inequality

**[\_\_\_]**

[\_\_\_] Capitalism helps to decrease global inequality

Bill Gates, founder of Microsoft, 2008

(Writing for Time Magazine. 7/31/08 "Making Capitalism More Creative", http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1828417,00.html)

**It might seem strange to talk** about creative capitalism **when** we're paying more than $4 for a gallon of gas and people are having trouble paying their mortgages. **There's no doubt that today's economic troubles are real**; people feel them deeply, and **they deserve immediate attention**. Creative capitalism isn't an answer to the relatively short-term ups and downs of the economic cycle. It's a response to the longer-term fact that too many people are missing out on a historic, century-long improvement in the quality of life. **In many nations, life expectancy has grown dramatically in the past 100 years. More people vote in elections, express their views and enjoy economic freedom than ever before. Even with all the problems we face today, we are at a high point of human well-be**ing. The world is getting a lot better. The problem is, **it's not getting better fast enough, and it's not getting better for everyone**. One billion people live on less than a dollar a day. They don't have enough nutritious food, clean water or electricity. The amazing innovations that have made many lives so much better — like vaccines and microchips — have largely passed them by. **This is where governments and nonprofits come in**. As I see it, there are two great forces of human nature: self-interest and caring for others. **Capitalism harnesses self-interest in a helpful and sustainable way but only on behalf of those who can pay**. **Government aid and philanthropy channel our caring for those who can't pay**. And the world will make lasting progress on the big inequities that remain — problems like AIDS, poverty and education — **only if governments and nonprofits do their part by giving more aid and more effective aid.** **But the improvements will happen faster and last longer if we can channel market forces,** including innovation that's tailored to the needs of the poorest, to complement what governments and nonprofits do. We need a system that draws in innovators and businesses in a far better way than we do today.

Capitalism Good – Democracy

**[\_\_\_]**

### [\_\_\_] **Capitalism is key to democracy**

Rhoda E. Howard-Hassmann, Prof of Political Science at Wilfrid Laurier University, 2005

(“The Second Great Transformation: Human Rights Leapfrogging in the Era of Globalization,” Human Rights Quarterly, 2005, p. 24-5)

One piece of good news, however, is that **almost all countries of the world** now **accept capitalism.** Rueschmeyer, Stephens, and Stephens have shown the connection between capitalism and democracy: **capitalism is a necessary**, though not sufficient, **prerequisite for democracy. Both quantitative and qualitative studies finding a correlation between capitalism and democracy also show that an intervening variable is necessary to effect such a correlation. That intervening variable is class action and organization. In a review of many studies of the relationship between economic development and human rights**, Landman also **finds that** "economic development [usually capitalist] does not enhance directly political or civil rights," but that **"social mobilization has a direct relationship with the expansion and contraction of political and civil rights."** Rueschemeyer, Stephens, and Stephens' analysis confirms Sen's assertion that development depends on human agency: the "achievement of development is thoroughly dependent on the free agency of people." Participatory freedoms are particularly important, says Sen. "Political freedoms (in the form of free speech and elections) help to promote economic security. Social opportunities (in the form of education and health facilities) facilitate economic participation. Economic facilities (in the form of opportunities for participation in trade and production) can help to generate personal abundance as well as public resources for social facilities. Freedoms of different kinds can strengthen one another."73 But the **class action and human agency** to which Rueschemeyer, Stephens and Stephens refer is not purely voluntarist: it **arises only if the structural conditions are appropriate. Democracy**, Rueschemeyer, Stephens, and Stephens assert is above all “abovealla **matter of power": it is necessary for the subordinated classes to wrest democracy from the powerful.**

Capitalism Good – Poverty

**[\_\_\_]**

**[\_\_\_] Poverty & inequity are the result of limiting capitalism's reach**

Michael Boskin, Professor of Economics at Stanford University, 1999

(Boskin, CAPITALISM AND ITS DISCONTENTS, 1999, p. 32)

To be sure, **large segments of mankind were left behind, both economically and politically. As a gross historical generalization, they were in societies that lacked both economic and political freedoms and competition. Although the capitalist economies have wide dispersions in the distribution of consumption, the average poor family in the United States has a standard of living well beyond that of the average Russian family**, for example, and above that of the average American family of a couple of generations ago. And **the most entrenched poverty in the American economy occurs in pockets of a quasi-socialist economy, with little competition, private capital, or private incentives, such as inner-city public housing and schools.**

Capitalism Good – War

**[\_\_\_]**

**[\_\_\_] Capitalism is key to maintaining world peace**

Doug Bandow, senior fellow at the Cato Institute, 2005

(“Spreading Capitalism is good for peace”, Korean Herald, November 10)

In a world that seems constantly aflame, one naturally asks: **What causes peace**? Many people, including U.S. President George W. Bush, hope that spreading democracy will discourage war. But new research suggests that expanding **free markets is a** far more **important factor**, leading to what Columbia University's Erik Gartzke calls a "capitalist peace." It's a reason for even the left to support free markets. The capitalist peace theory isn't new: Montesquieu and Adam Smith believed in it. Many of Britain's classical liberals, such as Richard Cobden, pushed free markets while opposing imperialism. But World War I demonstrated that increased trade was not enough. The prospect of economic ruin did not prevent rampant nationalism, ethnic hatred, and security fears from trumping the power of markets. An even greater conflict followed a generation later. Thankfully, World War II left war essentially unthinkable among leading industrialized - and democratic - states. Support grew for the argument, going back to Immanual Kant, that **republics are less warlike than other systems.** Today's corollary is that creating democracies out of dictatorships will reduce conflict. This contention animated some support outside as well as inside the United States for the invasion of Iraq. But Gartzke argues that "the 'democratic peace' is a mirage created by the overlap between economic and political freedom." That is, democracies typically have freer economies than do authoritarian states. Thus, while "democracy is desirable for many reasons," he notes in a chapter in the latest volume of Economic Freedom in the World, created by the Fraser Institute, "representative governments are unlikely to contribute directly to international peace." **Capitalism is by far the more important factor. The shift from statist mercantilism to high-tech capitalism has transformed the economics behind war. Markets generate economic opportunities that make war less desirable. Territorial aggrandizement no longer provides the best path to riches. Free-flowing capital markets and other aspects of globalization simultaneously draw nations together and raise the economic price of military conflict. Moreover, sanctions, which interfere with economic prosperity, provides a coercive step short of war to achieve foreign policy ends. Positive economic trends are not enough to prevent war, but then, neither is democracy. It long has been obvious that democracies are willing to fight, just usually not each other.**

Capitalism Good – War

**[\_\_\_]**

**[\_\_\_] Global spread of democracy and capitalism best way to promote peace and security**

Wyatt Rogers,President III Sigma Company, 2000

(Third Millennium Capitalism, p. 22-3)

**Capitalism has flourished under democracy largely because the freedoms needed for its success have been preserved for the most part, notwithstanding the historic struggles associated with slavery and various forms of ethnic discrimination.** In the Third Millennium, capitalism in the United States is expected to continue to serve as the foundation for economic progress. The extent to which capitalism can be nurtured in the developing nations is an open question. American businesses can no doubt be instrumental in encouraging capitalism in foreign nations through trade relations and cooperative business ventures. Foreign policies of **the US government** in recent years have generally encouraged American business to establish such mutually beneficial links. In effect, the nation **has sought to export capitalism as well as democracy, since the two are believed to be the best combination of political and economic systems for promoting world peace and domestic national security.**

Capitalism Good – Collapse Not Inevitable

[\_\_\_] Capitalism is self-correcting and sustainable

Indur Goklany, Fellow at the Political Economy Research Center, 2007

(Now For the Good News, http://www.reason.com/news/show/119252.html)

Environmentalists and **globalization foes are united in their fear that** greater **population and consumption** of energy, materials, and chemicals **accompanying** economic **growth**, technological change **and free trade**—the mainstays of globalization—**degrade human and environmental well-being.** Indeed**, the 20th century saw the United States’ population multiply** by four, income by seven, carbon dioxide emissions by nine, use of materials by 27, and use of chemicals by more than 100. Yet life **expectancy increased** from 47 years to 77 years. **Onset of major** disease such as cancer, heart, and respiratory disease **has been postponed** between eight and eleven years in the past century. Heart disease and cancer rates have been in rapid decline over the last two decades, and total cancer deaths have actually declined the last two years, despite increases in population. Among the very young, infant mortality has declined from 100 deaths per 1,000 births in 1913 to just seven per 1,000 today. **These improvements haven’t been restricted to the United States. It’s a global phenomenon. Worldwide, life expectancy has more than doubled,** from 31 years in 1900 to 67 years today. India’s and China’s infant mortalities exceeded 190 per 1,000 births in the early 1950s; today they are 62 and 26, respectively. In the developing world, the proportion of the population suffering from chronic hunger declined from 37 percent to 17 percent between 1970 and 2001 despite a 83 percent increase in population. Globally average annual incomes in real dollars have tripled since 1950. Consequently, the proportion of the planet's developing-world population living in absolute **poverty has halved** since 1981, from 40 percent to 20 percent. **Child labor in low income countries declined** from 30 percent to 18 percent between 1960 and 2003. Equally important, the **world is more literate and better educated** than ever. People are freer politically, economically, and socially to pursue their well-being as they see fit. **More people choose their own rulers, and have freedom of expression. They are more likely to live under rule of law**, and less likely to be arbitrarily deprived of life, limb, and property. Social and professional mobility have also never been greater. **It’s easier than ever for people across the world to transcend the bonds of caste, place, gender, and other accidents of birth**. People today work fewer hours and have more money and better health to enjoy their leisure time than their ancestors. Man’s environmental record is more complex. **The early stages of development can indeed cause some environmental deterioration** as societies pursue first-order problems affecting human well-being. These include hunger, malnutrition, illiteracy, and lack of education, basic public health services, safe water, sanitation, mobility, and ready sources of energy. Because **greater wealth alleviates these problems** while providing basic creature comforts, individuals and societies initially focus on economic development, often neglecting other aspects of environmental quality. **In time**, however, they recognize that environmental deterioration reduces their quality of life. Accordingly, **they put more of their recently acquired wealth and human capital into developing and implementing cleaner technologies**.
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States Counterplan 1NC

**Counterplan Text: The 50 states of the United States of America should [write in here the mandates of the plan].**

[Sample Text: The 50 states of the United States of America should increase transportation infrastructure investment by investing in a national high-speed rail network.]

The counterplan solves -- States solve the economic benefits of infrastructure spending better – they have flexibility and are responsive to local needs.

Chris Edwards, director of tax policy studies at the Cato Institute, 2011

(“Federal Infrastructure Investment,” http://www.cato.org/publications/congressional-testimony/federal-infrastructure-investment)

The U.S. economy needs infrastructure, but state and local governments and the private sector are generally the best places to fund and manage it. The states should be the "laboratories of democracy" for infrastructure, and they should be able to innovate freely with new ways of financing and managing their roads, bridges, airports, seaports, and other facilities. It is true that — like the federal government — the states can make infrastructure mistakes. But at least state-level mistakes aren't automatically repeated across the country. If we ended federal involvement in high-speed rail, for example, California could continue to move ahead with its own system. Other states could wait and see how California's system was performing before putting their own taxpayers on the hook.

States Net Benefit – Spending

­[­\_\_\_\_]

[­\_\_\_\_] State infrastructure spending is more efficient and does not contribute to the deficit.

Chris Edwards, director of tax policy studies at the Cato Institute, 2011

(“Federal Infrastructure Investment,” http://www.cato.org/publications/congressional-testimony/federal-infrastructure-investment)

One implication of this data is that if Congress wants to boost infrastructure spending, the first priority should be to make reforms to encourage private investment**.** Tax reforms, such as a corporate tax rate cut, would increase the net returns to a broad range of private infrastructure investments. Regulatory reforms to reduce barriers to investment are also needed, as illustrated by the delays in approving the $7 billion Keystone XL pipeline from Alberta to Texas. Despite its smaller magnitude**,** public-sector infrastructure spending is also very important to the U.S. economy. But the usual recommendation to simply spend more federal taxpayer money on infrastructure is misguided. For one thing, the government simply can't afford more spending givenitsmassive ongoing deficits. More importantly, much of the infrastructure spending carried out by Washington would be more efficiently handled by devolving it to state and local governments and the private sector.

States Net-Benefit – Federalism

[­\_\_\_\_]

[­\_\_\_\_] Strengthening state involvement in economic growth boosts federalism

Bruce Katz, Vice President Metropolitan Program, Brookings, 2012

(February 16, “Remaking Federalism to Remake the American Economy,” <http://www.brookings.edu/research/papers/2012/02/16-federalism-katz>)

This is the tallest of economic orders and it is well beyond the scope of exclusive federal solutions, the traditional focus of presidential candidates in both political parties. Rather, **the next President must look beyond Washington and enlist states and metropolitan areas as active co-partners in the restructuring of the national economy. Remaking the economy, in essence, requires a remaking of federalism so that governments at all levels “collaborate to compete” and work closely with each other and the private and civic sectors to burnish American competitiveness in the new global economic order. The time for remaking federalism could not be more propitious. With Washington mired in partisan gridlock, the states and metropolitan areas are once again playing their traditional roles as “laboratories of democracy” and centers of economic and policy innovation. An enormous opportunity exists for the next president to mobilize these federalist partners in a focused campaign for national economic renewal.**

### [­\_\_\_\_] Exclusivity of state power is critical to federalism

Stephen Gardbaum, Associate Prof – Northwestern U., 1997

(Texas Law Review, March, p. 796)

Despite their diametrically opposed conclusions, however, **a fundamental premise** is shared by both sides in this long-standing debate -- a premise **that characterizes almost all analyses of American federalism**. This shared premise **is that the existence of areas of exclusive state power is a necessary condition of constitutional federalism: in order for federalism to operate as a principle of constitutional law, there** **must** **in practice (and not merely in rhetoric** or national myth) **be areas of regulatory authority reserved exclusively to the states** **-- areas in which Congress cannot regulate**. Given this shared premise, the debate has focused on whether or not such areas currently exist constitutionally speaking, and its content consists largely of arguments for and against various proposed textual bases for them. Leading candidates over the years have included the Commerce Clause, [6](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=9f79c613d46dc07894fa5c6aa95694f5&docnum=3&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAW&_md5=69233bd42dce64f76cbdd67be14a863e&focBudTerms=existence%20of%20areas%20of%20exclusive%20state&focBudSel=all#n6) the Tenth Amendment, [7](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=9f79c613d46dc07894fa5c6aa95694f5&docnum=3&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAW&_md5=69233bd42dce64f76cbdd67be14a863e&focBudTerms=existence%20of%20areas%20of%20exclusive%20state&focBudSel=all#n7) and the Guarantee Clause.

Answers to: Perm – Do Both

[­\_\_\_\_]

### [­\_\_\_\_] **Federal investment incentivizes states to opt for projects that make no economic sense, increasing operating costs and decreasing efficiency.**

Chris Edwards, director of tax policy studies at the Cato Institute, 2011

(“Federal Infrastructure Investment,” http://www.cato.org/publications/congressional-testimony/federal-infrastructure-investment)

Perhaps the biggest problem with federal involvement in infrastructure is that when Washington makes mistakes it replicates those mistakes **across the nation**. Federal efforts to build massive public housing projects in dozens of cities during the 20th century had very negative economic and social effects. Or consider the distortions caused by current federal subsidies for urban light-rail systems. These subsidies bias cities across the country to opt for light rail, yet rail systems are generally less efficient and flexible than bus systems, and they saddle cities with higher operating and maintenance costs down the road. When the federal government subsidizes certain types of infrastructure, the states want to grab a share of the funding and they often don't worry about long-term efficiency**.** High-speed rail is a rare example where some states are rejecting the "free" dollars from Washington because the economics of high-speed rail seem to be so poor.11 The Obama administration is trying to impose its rail vision on the nation, but the escalating costs of California's system will hopefully warn other states not to go down that path.12 Even if federal officials were expert at choosing the best types of infrastructure to fund, politics usually intrudes on the efficient allocation of dollars. Passenger rail investment through Amtrak, for example, gets spread around to low-population areas where passenger rail makes no economic sense. Indeed, most of Amtrak's financial loses come from long-distance routes through rural areas that account for only a small fraction of all riders. Every lawmaker wants an Amtrak route through their state, and the result is that investment gets misallocated away from where it is really needed, such as the Northeast corridor.

Answers to: Perm – Do Both

[­\_\_\_\_]

### [­\_\_\_\_] Inclusion of federal spending increases regulations, which massively increase spending and doom program effectiveness.

Chris Edwards, director of tax policy studies at the Cato Institute, 2011

(“Federal Infrastructure Investment,” http://www.cato.org/publications/congressional-testimony/federal-infrastructure-investment)

Another problem is that federal infrastructure spending comes with piles of regulations**.** Davis-Bacon rules and other federal regulations raise the cost of building infrastructure. Regulations also impose one-size-fits-all solutions on the states, even though the states have diverse needs**.** The former 55-mph speed limit, which used to be tied to federal highway funds, is a good example. Today, federal highway funds come with requirements for the states to spend money on activities such as bicycle paths, which state policymakers may think are extraneous.

Answers to: Perm – Do Both

[­\_\_\_\_]

**[­\_\_\_\_]** **Joint federal-state action fails to capture any of federalism's benefits**

Chris Edwards, director of tax policy studies at the Cato Institute, 2011

(“Federal Infrastructure Investment,” http://www.cato.org/publications/congressional-testimony/federal-infrastructure-investment)

Examining this list, it becomes apparent that **different institutional features of the federal structure are more or less important for securing these different values. Some of the values ‑ diversity, competition, and experimentalism ‑ appear to depend significantly on the existence of many states pursuing unique regulatory agendas. If all of the states pursued identical regulatory strategies, or were prevented from instituting meaningful agendas altogether, these values, as a logical matter, could not be promoted.** Obviously there would be no regulatory diversity, because all of the states would structure the lives of their citizens in the same way. Moreover, **this uniformity would prevent state competition and experimentation: people would have no incentive to "vote with their feet" if each state provided the same package of public goods, and experimentation by definition requires that different states attempt different solutions to the same social problems.**

[­\_\_\_\_] Federal Infrastructure spending distorts investment, undermining infrastructure

Chris Edwards, director of tax policy studies at the Cato Institute, 2011

(“Federal Infrastructure Investment,” http://www.cato.org/publications/congressional-testimony/federal-infrastructure-investment)

There are calls today for more federal spending on infrastructure, but advocates seem to overlook the downsides of past federal efforts. Certainly, there have been federal infrastructure successes, but there has alsobeen a history of pork barrel politics and bureaucratic bungling in federal investment spending. A substantial portion of federal infrastructure spending has gone to low-value and dubious activities. I've examined spending by the two oldest federal infrastructure agencies — the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation.7 While both of those agencies constructed some impressive projects, they have also been known for proceeding with uneconomic boondoggles, fudging the analyses of proposed projects, and spending on activities that serve private interests rather than the general public interest. (I am referring to the Civil Works part of the Corps here). Federal infrastructure projects have often suffered from large cost overruns. Highway projects, energy projects, airport projects, and air traffic control projects have ended up costing far more than originally promised.

Answers to: Counterplan Not Educational/Not Real World

[­\_\_\_\_]

[­\_\_\_\_] There is a real world debate about what level of government should pay for transportation spending

The Transportation Politic, 2012

(February 16, Clearing it Up on Federal Transportation Expenditures,” http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2012/02/16/clearing-it-up-on-federal-transportation-expenditures/)

The reaction to [President Obama’s 2013 budget for transportation](http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2012/02/14/the-presidents-budget-full-of-ambition-short-on-congressional-support/) has ranged from the dismissive — “it’s too big to be part of the discussion” — to the supportive (myself, among others), most of the commentary revolving around the proposed program’s large size. **Another** **theme**, however, **has reemerged in the discussion: The role of the federal government in funding transportation.** It’s not a new conversation, of course; **in American transportation circles, the roles of the three major levels of government are constantly being put into question.**

Solvency – States Solves Transportation Policy

[­\_\_\_\_]

[­\_\_\_\_] Transportation spending should be covered by the states

[Edward Glaeser](http://topics.bloomberg.com/edward-glaeser/), an economics professor at [Harvard University](http://topics.bloomberg.com/harvard-university/), Bloomberg, 2012

(February 14, “Spending Won’t Fix What Ails US Infrastructure,” <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-02-14/spending-won-t-fix-what-ails-u-s-transport-commentary-by-edward-glaeser.html>)

DE-FEDERALIZE TRANSPORT SPENDING: **Most forms of transport infrastructure overwhelmingly serve the residents of a single state. Yet the federal government has played an outsized role in funding transportation** for 50 years. Whenever the person paying isn’t the person who benefits, there will always be a push for more largesse and little check on spending efficiency. **Would** [**Detroit**](http://topics.bloomberg.com/detroit/)**’s People Mover have ever been built if the people of Detroit had to pay for it? We should move toward a system in which states and localities take more responsibility for the infrastructure that serves their citizens.**

### [­\_\_\_\_] States can fund transit

Lisa Schweitzer, USC, 2012

(February 16, “Doing on the TEA Party and the “War on Transit” at Salon.com,” <http://lisaschweitzer.com/2012/02/16/doig-on-the-tea-party-and-a-war-on-transit-in-salon-com/>)

Mostly, culture war arguments are lazy. Both sides use culture war arguments to whine and accuse rather than getting off their butts and constructing principled arguments. For example**, I have yet to hear one compelling reason why the Federal government is a better funder of sidewalks and bike lanes than states or cities, other than the typical arguments that “those things are good for us!” Of course they are. Why can’t you fund them at the city, or in the case of transit, the state level?**

Solvency – Federal Government Fails

[­\_\_\_\_]

[­\_\_\_\_] States solve best – federal infrastructure funding distorts market signals and magnifies inefficient programs.

Chris Edwards, director of tax policy studies at the Cato Institute, 2011

(“Federal Infrastructure Investment,” http://www.cato.org/publications/congressional-testimony/federal-infrastructure-investment)

In its report on the state of U.S. infrastructure, the American Society of Civil Engineers gives America a grade of "D."37 However, the ASCE report mainly focuses on infrastructure provided by governments, so if you believe that this low grade is correct, then it is mainly due to government failures. The ASCE lobbies for more federal spending, but OECD data shows that public-sector spending on infrastructure is about the same in this country as in other high-income nations. **Some of the infrastructure shortcomings in the United States stem from mismanagement and misallocation by the federal government, rather than a lack of taxpayer support.** So **part of the solution is to decentralize infrastructure financing, management, and ownership as much as possible. State and local governments** and the private sector **are more likely to make sound investment decisions without the federal subsidies and regulations that distort their decision-making.**

Solvency – Should Devolve Transportation Funding to the States

[­­\_\_\_\_]

[­\_\_\_\_] Federal transit spending should be devolved to the states

Lisa Schweitzer, USC, 2012

(February 16, “Doing on the TEA Party and the “War on Transit” at Salon.com,” <http://lisaschweitzer.com/2012/02/16/doig-on-the-tea-party-and-a-war-on-transit-in-salon-com/>)

**Whatever percentage of federal funding had been going into the Highway Trust Fund via dedicated transit funds, move that back to the states–revenue neutral. The ones that want it for their own highway projects, fine.**

[­\_\_\_\_] Real world advocates of devolving federal authority over transportation to the states

Robert Jay Dilgerm, Senior Specialist in American National Government at the Congressional Research Service, 2011

(January 10, “Federalism Issues in Surface Transportation Policy: Past and Present,” <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R40431.pdf>)

**Several bills have been introduced during previous Congresses that would fundamentally change existing federal, state, and local government roles and responsibilities in surface transportation policy**. For example, Senator Jim **DeMint** and Representative Jeff **Flake introduced legislation** during the 109th Congress and Senator DeMint introduced legislation in the 110th Congress (S. 2823) **that would phase-out most of the federal fuel and excise taxes that support the Highway Trust Fund over five years; preserve federal responsibility for interstate highways,** transportation facilities on public lands, national transportation research and safety programs, and emergency transportation assistance; **and devolve most** other **surface transportation programs to states.** In addition, during previous reauthorizations some congressional Members from “donor” states (states whose highway users pay more in estimated federal highway tax revenue to the Highway Trust Fund than that state receives from the program) advocated program devolution as a means to achieve program efficiencies and to address what they viewed as an inequitable distribution of federal surface transportation funds to states.

Answers to: Uniformity Best

[­\_\_\_\_]

**[­\_\_\_\_]** **Uniformity does not make governance easier**

Judith Olans Brown and Peter D. Enrich, Law Professors @ Northeastern, 2000

(HASTINGS CONSTITUTIONAL LAW QUARTERLY, Fall, pp. 108‑9)

Apart from the issue of state sovereignty, the interest in uniformity that animates the lockstep approach has also received criticism. Professor Tarr has questioned the claim that uniformity would simplify the task of government officials. **First, state officials need to respect only one standard, the most rights‑protective; in a given case, this standard may derive from the state or the federal constitution, but it remains, nonetheless, a single standard. Second, the wholesale adoption of a federal standard does not necessarily produce greater clarity in the law: given the U.S. Supreme Court's struggle to articulate coherent principles in such areas as search and seizure, there is no reason to believe in theory or expect in practice that federal standards will be inherently easier to comprehend and apply.**

Answers to: States Won’t Spend on Infrastructure

[­\_\_\_\_]

[­\_\_\_\_] Fiat solves – the states can spend on infrastructure – the counterplan fiats that they do

Washington Post, 2012

(March 21, Why Can’t We just Leave Infrastructure Spending to the States?,” http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/ezra-klein/post/why-cant-we-just-leave-infrastructure-spending-to-the-states/2012/03/21/gIQAjpYBSS\_blog.html)

Yesterday, **I** [**pointed out**](http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/ezra-klein/post/what-paul-ryans-budget-actually-cuts--and-by-how-much/2012/03/20/gIQAL43vPS_blog.html) **that** Rep. Paul **Ryan’s GOP budget proposal would require the federal government to spend less and less on transportation over time. Reihan Salam** [**asks**](http://www.nationalreview.com/agenda/293990/implications-path-prosperitys-long-term-spending-trajectory-reihan-salam) **whether this is really such a bad thing. Can’t state governments just pick up the slack? That’s possible, sure**.

[­\_\_\_\_] States paying for transportation projects now

The Transportation Politic, 2012

(February 16, “Clearing it Up on Federal Transportation Expenditures,” http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2012/02/16/clearing-it-up-on-federal-transportation-expenditures/)

Meanwhile, **states and local governments *are* contributing massively to transportation funding already, just as Ms. Schweitzer asks them to. I** [**studied Oregon and Illinois a year and a half ago and found**](http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2010/06/08/asserting-state-responsibility-over-transportation-financing/) **that only about a quarter of Oregon’s Department of Transportation budget comes from Washington; about a third of Illinois’ comes from the national capital.**

[­\_\_\_\_] States spend on transportation infrastructure now

Congressional Budget Office, 2010

(November 17, “Public Spending on Transportation and Water Infrastructure,” http://www.cbo.gov/publication/21902)

**In fiscal year 2007—the most recent year for which data on combined spending by the federal government and by state and local governments are available—total public spending for transportation and water infrastructure was $356 billion, or 2.4 percent of the nation’s economic output as measured by its gross domestic product.**

Answers to: Federal Implementation Key to Solve

[­\_\_\_\_]

[­\_\_\_\_] States implementing federal transportation programs now

The Transportation Politic, 2012

(February 16, “Clearing it Up on Federal Transportation Expenditures,” http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2012/02/16/clearing-it-up-on-federal-transportation-expenditures/)

Here’s the thing: **The large majority of decisions on transportation spending with *federal dollars* is *already made* at the state and local levels. And state and local governments already contribute huge sums to the operation, maintenance, and expansion of their transportation programs**.

[­\_\_\_\_] States getting money for federal projects they want now

The Transportation Politic, 2012

(February 16, “Clearing it Up on Federal Transportation Expenditures,” http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2012/02/16/clearing-it-up-on-federal-transportation-expenditures/)

**Once the federal government collects tax revenue, it distributes funding to the states** based on formulas agreed upon by members of Congress. For the most, part, **the money goes back to the states and to metropolitan areas, which then fund projects based on the priority lists that *they* generate. It is true that Washington allocates some money for transit and some for highways, but within those categories, states and local governments generally have power to pay for the projects they want.**

Answers to: Federal Funding Solves Best

[­\_\_\_\_]

[­\_\_\_\_] Feds only account for 25% of transportation spending and the money is poorly allocated

Economist, 2011

(April 28, “Life in the Slow Lane,” http://www.economist.com/node/18620944)

**The federal government is responsible for only a quarter of total transport spending**, but the way it allocates funding shapes the way things are done at the state and local levels. Unfortunately, **it tends not to reward the prudent, thanks to formulas that govern over 70% of federal investment**. Petrol-tax revenues, for instance, are returned to the states according to the miles of highway they contain, the distances their residents drive, and the fuel they burn. The system is awash with perverse incentives. A state using road-pricing to limit travel and congestion would be punished for its efforts with reduced funding, whereas one that built highways it could not afford to maintain would receive a larger allocation.

[­\_\_\_\_] Federal spending just substitutes for state spending

Economist, 2011

(April 28, “Life in the Slow Lane,” http://www.economist.com/node/18620944)

Formula-determined block grants to states are, at least, designed to leave important decisions to local authorities. But **the formulas used to allocate the money shape infrastructure planning in a remarkably block-headed manner. Cost-benefit studies are almost entirely lacking. Federal guidelines for new construction tend to reflect politics rather than anything else. States tend to use federal money as a substitute for local spending, rather than to supplement or leverage it. The Government Accountability Office estimates that substitution has risen substantially since the 1980s, and increases particularly when states get into budget difficulties.** From 1998 to 2002, a period during which economic fortunes were generally deteriorating, state and local transport investment declined by 4% while federal investment rose by 40%. State and local shrinkage is almost certainly worse now.

Answers to: Devolution Bad

[­\_\_\_\_]

**[­\_\_\_\_]** **State constitutional protections protect against the harms of devolution**

Helen Hershkoff, professor, New York University School of Law, 1999

(Fordham Law Review, March 1999, "Welfare Devolution & State Constitutions," p. 1430-1)

Second, **state constitutional welfare provisions establish a principle of state responsibility for meeting the needs of the poor, curtailing devolution's assumption that subsidiary units are best placed to make decisions about social welfare programs. Subsidiary units are often smaller units, and are believed to have a greater structural capacity to protect human rights and to encourage participation values**. Small communities do not, however, always protect minority civil rights, they do not always produce greater opportunities for citizen participation, and they do not always have the resources to carry out the social welfare preferences of their members. As Paul E. Peterson has observed, localities rarely define their community purposes as "the enhancement of the material well-being of workers, the poor, or minorities." **Given interregional variances in wealth, race, and capacity, as well as the greater likelihood of special interest capture of local communities, state primacy - not local control - is critical to the enforcement of a state constitutional welfare right.**

Answers to: Race to the Bottom

[\_\_\_\_]

**[­\_\_\_\_]** **Studies prove – no race to the bottom with state welfare programs**

Olivia Golden, project director of the Urban Institute, 2005

(“ASSESSING THE NEW FEDERALISM: Eight Years Later”, http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/311198\_ANF\_EightYearsLater.pdf)

To better understand what might have driven these significant shifts in the experiences of low-income families, **ANF documented and studied state policies. A key focal point was the transition from the old to the new welfare system: the choices states made, the degree of change realized, and the challenges faced.** Specifically, **we looked at how states responded to increased operating flexibility and the focus on work** in the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996. This research drew heavily on the case studies of 17 sites in 13 states that were an integral part of ANF. Based on site visits, these studies say more about formal policy changes at the state and local levels than about how the policies were implemented over time. Since each site was visited twice, researchers could gauge the extent of change by comparing policy and administrative arrangements across the interval. **We found that states substantially changed their welfare programs by focusing on such goals as work rather than simply reducing benefits in a “race to the bottom” (as many feared** when PRWORA was enacted). More specifically, ANF case studies showed that states moved quickly in 1996–97 to design welfare-to-work policies that emphasized getting recipients into jobs.

Answers to: Race to the Bottom

[­\_\_\_\_]

**[­\_\_\_\_]** **No race to the bottom**

Jonathan Adler, Associate Professor of Law at Case Western Reserve University School of Law, 2005

(January, 90 Iowa L. Rev. 377, p. 467-8)

In addition, **the adoption of minimum federal environmental standards** to prevent a race to the bottom in environmental policy **would not eliminate the competitive pressures.** Rather**, it would shift them to other contexts**, and the hypothesized welfare losses would remain. n605 Professor Revesz also points out that the same dynamic that could theoretically produce systematic environmental underregulation could also produce overregulation. n606 If states are more aggressive at competing for industry through tax policy than through environmental policy, the likely result would be suboptimal tax rates but superoptimal levels of regulation. n607 The theory persists, despite its flaws, because it is reasonable to assume that jurisdictions will seek to create a comparatively more attractive investment climate in order to better compete economically. Insofar as environmental regulations impose significant economic burdens on existing and prospective economic actors in a given area, it is also reasonable to expect jurisdictions to act so as to lessen such burdens. n608 Recent empirical work suggests that this is in fact the case as **government officials acknowledge efforts to reduce the economic pinch of environmental regulation for economic purposes. Yet for this to prove the race to the bottom** hypothesis**, it is necessary to** further **assume that reducing the** economic **cost** of environmental regulation **necessarily reduces** **the** level of environmental **protection**. While **such a conclusion** may be justified in certain contexts, it **cannot be assumed** across the board. As **not all** environmental protection **measures produce equivalent levels of** environmental **protection** at equivalent costs, it should be possible for many jurisdictions to reduce the economic cost associated with environmental measures without sacrificing environmental quality. n610 In addition, it is important to recognize that **many states compete for citizens by seeking to improve their environmental performance**. Because many people may be more likely to move to a state with high levels of environmental quality, **this creates pressure for states to adopt more protective environmental policies**. In practice, **the race to the bottom has not been observed** in environmental policy. As already noted, **state and local governments** often **regulated well before the federal government** became involved. While this fact alone does not disprove the race to the bottom thesis - such state regulations could still have been suboptimal when compared to the federal alternative or some theoretical ideal - they demonstrate that competitive pressures do not preclude effective state regulation. More significantly, **where the race to the bottom thesis has been** directly **tested in** the context of **wetlands,** **the pattern** of state regulation **has been precisely the opposite of what the theory would predict.**

Answers to: States Are Racist

[­\_\_\_\_]

[­\_\_\_\_] Claims of state racism are a myth ---- Courts will block

Timothy Zick, Associate Professor of Law at Saint Johns, 2004

(William and Mary Law Review, v46 i1 p213(131) Statehood as the new personhood: the discovery of fundamental "states' rights")

Perhaps it was not institutional incompetence or necessity that led the Garcia Court to purport to leave the federalism area, and that has led the Court more generally to avoid, at least until recently, an expansive rights regime for states. Perhaps, as Baker and Young contend, individual rights like abortion and sexual privacy are simply "normatively more attractive than states' rights." **After all, the phrase "states' rights," for many, conjures a host of negative associations, including, for some, virulent racism**. It is possible, therefore, that the Court, and many scholars as well, have been "read[ing] particular values out of the Constitution simply because popular opinion at a given point in history finds them normatively unattractive." **This proposition cannot, of course, be tested empirically. There may indeed have been some residual judicial ill will toward "states' rights" due to its association with bad actors, both public and private, in our nation's past. It seems unlikely, however, that in 1985, when Garcia was decided, the Court rested its decision to curtail fundamental "states' rights" federalism on these sorts of negative associations. It probably gives too little credit to the Court, and to scholars, to suggest that modes of judicial enforcement or scholarly support are based primarily upon "changing normative preferences" or mere popularity. Even if one is not willing to give judges and scholars such credit, it is surely a stretch to paint the "states' rights" of National League of Cities with the same brush as the old "states' rights" of segregationists. The "states' rights" of what might be considered the modern era--freedom from federal wages and hours regulations, for example--are hardly the sort that invoke segregationist ghosts.**

Answers to: Mass Spending DA

[­\_\_\_\_]

[­\_\_\_\_] No link – the funds can just come from the state’s rainy day fund

Shannon Young, Associated Press, 2012

(Boston Globe, June 28, Mass. lawmakers approve final state budget, http://www.boston.com/news/local/massachusetts/articles/2012/06/28/mass\_lawmakers\_set\_to\_vote\_on\_final\_state\_budget/)

Additionally, **the budget includes no new taxes or fees but relies on** $516 million in one-time funds, including **a $350 million withdrawal from the state's rainy day fund. That still leaves the state with a rainy day fund of more than $1 billion**, lawmakers said.

[­\_\_\_\_] Education funds are doing fine – this years budget actually increased them

Dan Ring, writer for Mass Live, 2012

(Massachusetts Gov. Deval Patrick signs $32.5 billion state budget, vetoes $32.1 million in spending, Sunday, July 08, http://www.masslive.com/politics/index.ssf/2012/07/massachusetts\_gov\_deval\_patric\_7.html)

**Patrick** said the colleges are vital to the state's economic success. He **approved new money for the community colleges including $5 million for competitive grants to improve graduation rates**, develop standard courses that can easily be transferred to other colleges and universities and ways to consolidate administration and bidding for services. **He also signed a new program for $2.25 million in grants to** community colleges, partly to **establish worker training programs** within three months of a request by an employer.

Answers to: Mass Spending DA

[­\_\_\_\_]

[­\_\_\_\_] Even if there were some cuts to education, the overall strength of the system would be fine

[Matt Caron](http://www.wwlp.com/dpp/news/news_team/matt-caron), reporter for WWLP, 2012

(09 Jul 2012, State budget raises education spending, doesn't raise taxes, http://www.wwlp.com/dpp/news/massachusetts/state-budget-raises-education-spending-doesnt-raise-taxes)

Governor Deval Patrick has signed **a new state budget**, after taking the maximum 10 full days to review spending for the next fiscal year. The budget totals $32.5 billion, and **includes a 4.5% increase in public school funding from last year**. **In fact, it provides for the most money that the Commonwealth has ever spent on education.**

Article: Federal Infrastructure Investment

By Chris Edwards, http://www.cato.org/publications/congressional-testimony/federal-infrastructure-investment?print

*Joint Economic Committee  
United States Congress*

Joint Economic Committee United States Congress

Added to *cato.org* on November 16, 2011

*This testimony was delivered on November 16, 2011.*

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, thank you for inviting me to testify today. My comments will examine the federal role in the nation's infrastructure.

In the description of today's hearing, the committee asked how infrastructure helps to promote growth, jobs, and manufacturing. The short answer is that we can spur growth by ensuring that America's infrastructure investment is as efficient as possible. Infrastructure funding should be allocated to the highest-value projects, and those projects should be constructed and maintained in the most cost-effective manner. My testimony will discuss why reducing the federal role in infrastructure will help to increase the efficiency of our investment.

The first thing to note about America's infrastructure is that most of it is not provided by the government, but by the private sector. A broad measure of private infrastructure spending — on items such as buildings, factories, freight rail, pipelines, and refineries — is much larger than government infrastructure spending on items such as roads and airports. In Figure 1, data from the Bureau of Economic Analysis show that private gross fixed investment was $1.7 trillion in 2010, which compared to gross fixed investment by federal, state, and local governments of $505 billion.1 When defense investment is excluded, government infrastructure spending was just $388 billion, or less than one-quarter of private infrastructure spending.

One implication of this data is that if Congress wants to boost infrastructure spending, the first priority should be to make reforms to encourage private investment. Tax reforms, such as a corporate tax rate cut, would increase the net returns to a broad range of private infrastructure investments. Regulatory reforms to reduce barriers to investment are also needed, as illustrated by the delays in approving the $7 billion Keystone XL pipeline from Alberta to Texas.

Despite its smaller magnitude, public-sector infrastructure spending is also very important to the U.S. economy. But the usual recommendation to simply spend more federal taxpayer money on infrastructure is misguided. For one thing, the government simply can't afford more spending given its massive ongoing deficits. More importantly, much of the infrastructure spending carried out by Washington would be more efficiently handled by devolving it to state and local governments and the private sector.

**Notes on Government Infrastructure**  
Many types of current government infrastructure used to be owned and financed by the private sector. Before the 20th century, for example, more than 2,000 turnpike companies in America built more than 10,000 miles of toll roads.2 And up until the mid-20th century, most urban rail and bus services were private.3 With respect to railroads, the federal government subsidized some of the companies building railroads to the West, but most U.S. rail mileage in the 19th century was in the East, and it was generally unsubsidized. The takeover of private infrastructure activities by governments in the United States and abroad in the 20th century caused many problems. Fortunately, most governments have reversed course in recent decades and have started to hand back infrastructure to the private sector.

Let's look at current data on infrastructure spending. Interest groups complain that governments in the United States aren't spending enough on infrastructure, and we often hear that U.S. roads and other assets are crumbling. However, Figure 2 shows that while federal, state, and local infrastructure spending in the United States has dipped a little in recent decades, U.S. spending has closely tracked trends in other high-income nations. The figure shows gross fixed investment as a share of gross domestic product in the United States compared to the average of countries in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.4 In 2010, U.S. infrastructure spending by governments was 3.5 percent of GDP, which was a little higher than the OECD average of 3.3 percent.

Let's take a closer look at just U.S. federal infrastructure spending using data from the Bureau of Economic Analysis.5 Figure 3 shows that federal nondefense infrastructure spending declined somewhat during the 1980s and 1990s, but started to rise again during the 2000s even before the recent "stimulus" spending. Spending in recent decades was generally above the levels of the 1950s, but below the high levels of the 1960s.

The high federal infrastructure spending of the 1960s was unique. A large share of that spending was for building the Interstate Highway System, which is now complete. Also note that substantial federal infrastructure spending at that time was misallocated to dubious or harmful activities. For example, federal funding of urban redevelopment and high-rise public housing schemes often had damaging social and economic effects. Also, federal spending on water infrastructure, such as dams, peaked in the mid-20th century, and a substantial part of that spending made little sense from an economic or an environmental perspective.

Thus, the important thing about infrastructure is to focus on allocating funds efficiently, not to maximize the amount of government spending. If infrastructure funding flows to low-value activities, it doesn't aid economic growth, nor does it help industries such as manufacturing. Experience shows that Washington often does a poor job at allocating infrastructure spending, in part because its decisions are far removed from market-based demands and price signals.

Most federal nondefense infrastructure spending today is for activities that are state, local, and private in nature. Federal budget data for fiscal 2011 show that nondefense infrastructure spending was about $162 billion, including both direct spending and aid to the states.6 Some of that spending which was state, local, and private in nature included: $42.0 billion for highways, $16.8 billion for water and power projects, $14.3 billion for urban transit, $12.5 billion for community development, $12.5 billion for housing, and $3.5 billion for airports.

Problems with Federal Infrastructure Investment  
There are calls today for more federal spending on infrastructure, but advocates seem to overlook the downsides of past federal efforts. Certainly, there have been federal infrastructure successes, but there has also been a history of pork barrel politics and bureaucratic bungling in federal investment spending. A substantial portion of federal infrastructure spending has gone to low-value and dubious activities.

I've examined spending by the two oldest federal infrastructure agencies — the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation.7 While both of those agencies constructed some impressive projects, they have also been known for proceeding with uneconomic boondoggles, fudging the analyses of proposed projects, and spending on activities that serve private interests rather than the general public interest. (I am referring to the Civil Works part of the Corps here).

Federal infrastructure projects have often suffered from large cost overruns.8 Highway projects, energy projects, airport projects, and air traffic control projects have ended up costing far more than originally promised. Cost overruns can happen on both public and private infrastructure projects, but the problem is exacerbated when multiple levels of government are involved in a project because there is less accountability. Boston's Big Dig — which exploded in cost to five times the original estimate — is a classic example of mismanagement in a federal-state project.9

Perhaps the biggest problem with federal involvement in infrastructure is that when Washington makes mistakes it replicates those mistakes across the nation. Federal efforts to build massive public housing projects in dozens of cities during the 20th century had very negative economic and social effects. Or consider the distortions caused by current federal subsidies for urban light-rail systems. These subsidies bias cities across the country to opt for light rail, yet rail systems are generally less efficient and flexible than bus systems, and they saddle cities with higher operating and maintenance costs down the road.10

When the federal government subsidizes certain types of infrastructure, the states want to grab a share of the funding and they often don't worry about long-term efficiency. High-speed rail is a rare example where some states are rejecting the "free" dollars from Washington because the economics of high-speed rail seem to be so poor.11 The Obama administration is trying to impose its rail vision on the nation, but the escalating costs of California's system will hopefully warn other states not to go down that path.12

Even if federal officials were expert at choosing the best types of infrastructure to fund, politics usually intrudes on the efficient allocation of dollars. Passenger rail investment through Amtrak, for example, gets spread around to low-population areas where passenger rail makes no economic sense. Indeed, most of Amtrak's financial loses come from long-distance routes through rural areas that account for only a small fraction of all riders.13 Every lawmaker wants an Amtrak route through their state, and the result is that investment gets misallocated away from where it is really needed, such as the Northeast corridor.

Another problem is that federal infrastructure spending comes with piles of regulations. Davis-Bacon rules and other federal regulations raise the cost of building infrastructure. Regulations also impose one-size-fits-all solutions on the states, even though the states have diverse needs. The former 55-mph speed limit, which used to be tied to federal highway funds, is a good example. Today, federal highway funds come with requirements for the states to spend money on activities such as bicycle paths, which state policymakers may think are extraneous.14

Decentralizing Infrastructure Financing  
The U.S. economy needs infrastructure, but state and local governments and the private sector are generally the best places to fund and manage it. The states should be the "laboratories of democracy" for infrastructure, and they should be able to innovate freely with new ways of financing and managing their roads, bridges, airports, seaports, and other facilities.

It is true that — like the federal government — the states can make infrastructure mistakes. But at least state-level mistakes aren't automatically repeated across the country. If we ended federal involvement in high-speed rail, for example, California could continue to move ahead with its own system. Other states could wait and see how California's system was performing before putting their own taxpayers on the hook.

A big step toward devolving infrastructure financing would be to cut or eliminate the federal gasoline tax and allow the states to replace the funds with their own financing sources. President Reagan tried to partly devolve highway funding to the states, and more recent legislation by Rep. Scott Garrett (R-NJ) and Rep. Jeff Flake (R-AZ) would move in that direction.15 Reforms to decentralize highway funding would give states more freedom to innovate with the financing, construction, and management of their systems.16

One option for the states is to move more of their infrastructure financing to the private sector through the use of public-private partnerships (PPP) and privatization. The OECD has issued a new report that takes a favorable view on the global trend towards infrastructure PPPs, and notes the "widespread recognition" of "the need for greater recourse to private sector finance" in infrastructure.17 The value of PPP infrastructure projects has soared over the past 15 years in major industrial countries.18

PPPs differ from traditional government projects by shifting activities such as financing, maintenance, management, and project risks to the private sector. There are different types of PPP projects, each fitting somewhere between traditional government contracting and full privatization. In my view, full privatization is the preferred reform option for infrastructure that can be supported by user fees and other revenue sources in the marketplace.

Transportation is the largest area of PPP investment. A number of projects in Virginia illustrate the options:

* *Midtown Tunnel*. Skanska and Macquarie will be building a three-mile tolled tunnel under the Elizabeth River between Norfolk and Portsmouth. Private debt and equity will pay $1.5 billion of the project's $1.9 billion cost.19
* *Capital Beltway*. Transurban and Fluor will be building, operating, and maintaining new toll lanes on the I-495. The firms are financing $1.4 billion of the project's $1.9 billion cost.20
* *Dulles Greenway*. The Greenway is a privately-owned toll highway in Northern Virginia completed with $350 million of private debt and equity in mid-1990s.21
* *Jordan Bridge*. FIGG Engineering Group is constructing, financing, and will own a $100 million toll bridge over the Elizabeth River between Chesapeake and Portsmouth, which is to be completed in 2012.22

About $900 billion of state-owned assets have been sold in OECD countries since 1990, and about 63 percent of the total has been infrastructure assets.23 The OECD notes that "public provision of infrastructure has sometimes failed to deliver efficient investment with misallocation across sectors, regions or time often due to political considerations. Constraints on public finance and recognized limitations on the public sector's effectiveness in managing projects have led to a reconsideration of the role of the state in infrastructure provision."24

There has been a large increase in privatization and infrastructure PPPs in many countries, but the OECD notes that the United States "has lagged behind Australia and Europe in privatization of infrastructure such as roads, bridges and tunnels."25 More than one-fifth of infrastructure spending in Britain and Portugal is now through the PPP process, so this is becoming a normal way of doing business in some countries.26

The industry reference guide for infrastructure PPP and privatization is *Public Works Financing*.27 According to this source, only 2 of the top 40 companies doing transportation PPP and privatization around the world are American. Of 733 transportation projects currently listed by *PWF*, only 20 are in the United States. Canada — a country with one-tenth of our population — has more PPP deals than we do. In Canada, PPPs account for 10 to 20 percent of all public infrastructure spending.28

One of the fuels for infrastructure PPP has been growing investment by pension funds.29 In Canada, Australia, and other countries, there is larger pension fund investment in infrastructure than in the United States. In some countries, such as Australia, the growth in pension assets has been driven by the privatization of government retirement programs.30 Thus, there is a virtuous cycle in place — the privatization of savings in some countries has created growing pools of capital available to invest in privatized infrastructure.

There are many advantages of infrastructure PPP and privatization. One advantage is that we are more likely to get funding allocated to high-return investments when private-sector profits are on the line. Of course, businesses can make investment mistakes just as governments do. But unlike governments, businesses have a systematic way of choosing investments to maximize the net returns. And when investment returns are maximized, it stimulates the largest gains to the broader economy.

One reason that privatized infrastructure is efficient is that private companies can freely tap debt and equity markets to build capacity and meet market demands. By contrast, government investment suffers from the politics and uncertainties of the federal budget process. You can see the problems with our air traffic control system, which needs long-term investment but the Federal Aviation Administration can't count on a stable funding stream. For its part, the FAA's management of ATC investment has been poor. The agency has a history of delays and cost overruns on its technology upgrade projects. The solution is to privatize our air traffic control system, as Canada has done with very favorable results.31

A recent Brookings Institution study describes some of the advantages of PPPs. It notes that the usual process for government infrastructure investment decouples the initial construction from the later management, which results in contractors having few incentives to build projects that will minimize operation and maintenance costs.32 PPP solves this problem because the same company will both build and operate projects. "Many advantages of PPP stem from the fact that they bundle construction, operations, and maintenance in a single contract. This provides incentives to minimize life-cycle costs which are typically not present when the project is publicly provided," notes the Brookings' study.33

There are other advantages of infrastructure PPP and privatization. One advantage is the greater efficiency of construction. Extensive British experience shows that PPP projects are more likely to be completed on time than traditional government projects.34 Another advantage is the greater efficiency of operations. Private firms have incentives to reduce excessive operational costs, as illustrated by the labor cost savings from the leasing of the Chicago Skyway.35 Finally, private operators of infrastructure such as toll roads are more likely to charge efficient market rates to users, as illustrated by the leasing of the Indiana Toll Road.36

The Brookings' paper raises some important concerns with PPP, which I share. One is that state officials may lease assets such as toll roads simply to paper over short-term budget deficits. Another concern is that policymakers write poor contracts that assign profits to private parties but risks and possible losses to taxpayers. The Brookings' authors propose approaches to structuring contracts and competitive bidding to ensure efficiency.

For new infrastructure investments, well-structured PPP or full privatization appears to be a winning approach for taxpayers, governments, and the broader economy. Taxpayers win because subsidies to infrastructure users are minimized. Governments win because they get new facilities built. And the economy wins because private investment is more likely to be cost-efficient and well-targeted than traditional government investments.

Conclusions  
In its report on the state of U.S. infrastructure, the American Society of Civil Engineers gives America a grade of "D."37 However, the ASCE report mainly focuses on infrastructure provided by governments, so if you believe that this low grade is correct, then it is mainly due to government failures. The ASCE lobbies for more federal spending, but OECD data shows that public-sector spending on infrastructure is about the same in this country as in other high-income nations.

Some of the infrastructure shortcomings in the United States stem from mismanagement and misallocation by the federal government, rather than a lack of taxpayer support. So part of the solution is to decentralize infrastructure financing, management, and ownership as much as possible. State and local governments and the private sector are more likely to make sound investment decisions without the federal subsidies and regulations that distort their decisionmaking.

This committee's description of today's hearing noted: "Transportation infrastructure is especially important to the manufacturing sector, which relies on various modes of transportation to obtain raw materials and to transport end products to the marketplace." That is certainly true, and I think transportation privatization is part of the answer to improve America's competitiveness in global markets. For example, nearly all airports and seaports in this country are owned by governments, but many airports and seaports abroad have been partly or fully privatized. The World Economic Forum rates America's seaports only 23rd in the world, but the first- and third-best seaports in the world, according to the WEF, are private — Singapore and Hong Kong.38

The federal government cannot afford to expand its infrastructure spending because of today's massive deficits. Many states are also in a budget squeeze. Fortunately, the global trend is toward partly or fully privatizing the financing and ownership of infrastructure. U.S. policymakers should study the recent innovations in infrastructure investment, and then start unloading the financing and ownership of our infrastructure to the private sector.
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No Solvency – State Funding Not Stable

[\_\_\_]

[\_\_\_] States will cut-back even more as the economy slows

Washington Post, 2012

(March 21, Why Can’t We just Leave Infrastructure Spending to the States?,” http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/ezra-klein/post/why-cant-we-just-leave-infrastructure-spending-to-the-states/2012/03/21/gIQAjpYBSS\_blog.html)

One potential pitfall with handing over more and more infrastructure responsibilities to the states, meanwhile, is that states tend to cut way back on spending during recessions. And **local funding can be pretty erratic, all told**. [Here’s](http://newamerica.net/publications/policy/the_infrastructure_deficit) a graph from New America’s Samuel Sherradan, based on CBO data: We’ve seen this in the current downturn. **Sherraden observes that California’s transportation spending declined by 31 percent from 2007 to 2009 after the housing bubble burst and local tax revenue fell. The same goes for Texas, which saw an 8 percent drop. “[I]t is clear,” Sherraden writes, “that leaving a greater share of infrastructure spending to state and local governments makes infrastructure investment more vulnerable during downturns.”**

[\_\_\_] Federal funding more stable because states can’t deficit spend

The Transportation Politic, 2012

(February 16, 2012, “Clearing it Up on Federal Transportation Expenditures,” http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2012/02/16/clearing-it-up-on-federal-transportation-expenditures/)

[Commenter John notes](http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2012/02/16/clearing-it-up-on-federal-transportation-expenditures/#comment-546614) that many transit projects are paid for through bonds, which are in essence deficits, and that states have the technical power to have deficits — and these points are both valid. However, all states except Vermont have some form of balanced budget rule. And **the selling of bonds by transit agencies are reliant on them having future guaranteed funding sources to pay back the debt — federal funding like capital grants are an important part of making that equation happen**. **Transit agencies do not have the ability to expand their debt capacity greatly (unlike the federal government) because of investor fears about future funding security.**

No Solvency – State Funding Not Stable

[\_\_\_]

#### [\_\_\_] States fail at transportation programs because of budget instability

AECOM 2011

(“U.S. Infrastructure: Ignore the Need or Retake the Lead?”, March 30-April 2, <http://www.aecom.com/deployedfiles/Internet/Brochures/AECOM_ACEC%20white%20paper_v3.pdf>, DOA: 4-8-12)

Meanwhile, states continue to experience cuts in transportation-related and public works budgets for the foreseeable future. Adding pressure, a potential increase in municipal bond defaults threatens to dampen investor enthusiasm for what has been a widely successful financing tool for state and local projects. Even if widespread municipal bond defaults are unlikely, the cost of capital will assuredly increase to reflect a risk premium.

#### [\_\_\_] States legally can’t run deficits and the courts will enforce balanced budget amendments

National Review 2011

(On Balanced-Budget Amendments; July 19, <http://www.nationalreview.com/corner/272203/balanced-budget-amendments-michael-j-new>)

However, enforceability is not among my main concerns. Right now, 49 states have balanced-budget amendments. Obviously these amendments differ in terms of their stringency, but they all seem fairly well enforced. In many cases, state balanced-budget amendments have resulted in politically damaging spending cuts and tax hikes. I am sure that in these situations, many legislators and governors would have liked to ignore these balanced-budget amendments, but they seemed to make a good faith effort to abide by them. I really cannot think of any instances where state balanced-budget amendments were unenforced. Interestingly, state courts have been very tough on other fiscal limits, but fairly supportive of balanced-budget amendments. During a budget standoff in Nevada in 2003, the courts basically nullified Nevada’s constitutional supermajority requirement for tax increases. However, they left Nevada’s balanced-budget amendment intact.

No Solvency – State Funding Not Stable

[\_\_\_\_]

#### [\_\_\_\_] States can’t solve because of budget crunch

Council on Economic Advisors, 2012

(Council of Economic Advisors, “A NEW ECONOMIC ANALYSIS OF INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT”, 3-23, <http://www.treasury.gov/resource-center/economic-policy/Documents/20120323InfrastructureReport.pdf>, DOA: 4-8-12)

Finally, it is important to consider the economic situation facing state and local governments who are significant partners in funding public infrastructure. During recessions, it is common for state and local governments to cut back on capital projects – such as building schools, roads, and parks – in order to meet balanced budget requirements. At the beginning of the most recent recession, tax receipts at the state and local level contracted for four straight quarters; receipts are still below pre-recession levels. Past research has found that expenditures on capital projects are more than four times as sensitive to year-to-year fluctuations in state income as is state spending in general. 30 However, the need for improved and expanded infrastructure is just as great during a downturn as it is during a boom. Providing immediate additional federal support for transportation infrastructure investment would be prudent given the ongoing budgetary constraints facing state and local governments, the upcoming reduction in federal infrastructure investment as Recovery Act funds are depleted, and the strong benefits associated with public investment.

No Solvency – Uniformity

[\_\_\_\_] State action fails

A. State action lacks uniformity

Jack Goldsmith, Associate Prof at University of Chicago, 1997

(Virginia Law Review, November, Lexis)

Nonetheless, these concerns need not affect the legitimacy of the federal common law of foreign relations. Although federal courts might be generally unsuited to make federal foreign relations law on both legitimacy and competence grounds, **the adverse consequences of state-by-state regulation** in the face of federal political branch silence **might be worse. States suffer from many** of the same **disabilities** as federal courts in this context. Moreover, federal courts, in contrast to the states, have independence from local political processes and, as a branch of the national government, are likely to be more sensitive to national foreign relations interests. Even in the absence of strategic behavior by the states, one might think that, **all things being equal, suboptimal** but uniform federal **judge-made regulation of foreign relations is preferable to the nonuniformity inherent in state-by-state regulation of a foreign relations issue**. [213](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=30e57da0c4e98dad4748fc94bcd482ae&csvc=bl&cform=bool&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtb-zSkAW&_md5=4c3bbc49db3765e390d1f2e67acc99c4#n213) Finally, the federal common law of foreign relations is designed to protect political branch prerogatives in foreign relations that the political branches themselves are structurally unsuited to protect. Any remaining concerns about the legitimacy or competence of the federal common law of foreign relations are thus mitigated by the political branches' ability to override judicial errors in the development of such law.

b. That tanks solvency

John Donahue, JFK School of Government, 1997

(Disunited States, p. 42)

Even **when states vary**, of course, **there are arguments for uniformity. Institutions** and individuals who live or do business **in several states face the expense, bother, and confusion of coping with different (and sometimes conflicting) rules. Inconsistencies among state laws and regulations can lead to disputes of great complexity and to resolutions of limited appeal**. After taking its case all the way to the Supreme Court, for example, a cruise ship operator won the right to be sued only in Florida by aggrieved passengers who had been on a trip between Washington State and Mexico.

No Solvency – Uniformity Ext.

#### [\_\_\_] Political polarity between states makes transportation uniformity impossible

John Kincaid, Professor of Government and Public Service at Lafayette College, 2004

(‘Trends in Federalism: Continuity, Change and Polarization’, <http://dspace.lafayette.edu/bitstream/handle/10385/521/Kincaid-BookoftheStates-2004.pdf?sequence=1>)

The partisan polarization evident in the 2000 presidential election and in Washington, D.C., is a new contextual trend that is increasingly shaping federalism and intergovernmental relations. In 2003, it became evident that **polarization has strained the traditional bipartisanship of the Big 7 state and local associations, especially the National Governors Association** (NGA), where partisan conflict led to the firing of NGA’s chief lobbyist, to reduced dues payments by some states, and to several states withdrawing from the NGA for a time. **Although bipartisanship still prevails generally in these associations, continued polarization will weaken their ability to present a united front, especially on major issues that have significant impacts on both the states and the national electoral balance. This polarization has affected public, presidential, congressional and judicial responses to virtually all public policy issues** and introduced fundamental philosophical differences over some long-standing federal-state practices and intergovernmental programs. **The consequences of polarization were reflected,** for example, **in** the battles that scuttled reauthorization of three major intergovernmental programs in 2003: the 1996 welfare-reform law, the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (**TEA-21)**, and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The compromises needed to enact legislation under conditions of polarization will likely make some intergovernmental programs more complex and somewhat schizophrenic. **This polarization also makes it impossible to resurrect bipartisan and nonpartisan intergovernmental institutions,** such as the U.S. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR), which were dismantled or defunded during the 1980s and 1990s. These institutions sought to foster intergovernmental cooperation and consensus.

No Solvency – Federal Government Key Generic

[\_\_\_] Transportation infrastructure is inherently national – only the federal government can effectively plan and manage it

Rico **Maggi**, Socioeconomic Institute, University of Zurich, **1992**

(Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice, “SWISS TRANSPORT POLICY FOR EUROPE? FEDERALISM AND THE DOMINANCE OF LOCAL ISSUES”)

AS is well known, **transport infrastructure has a network character.** This has two important implications in the case of transport policy proposals relating to the national or international road-network (for the ease of the argument the analysis will be restricted to road transport, but the model could easily be adapted to other modes). **First, the road network creates spatial externalities because any single link in a specific location can have impacts on the national economic development** (e.g. if it solves a bottleneck problem of national relevance). With regard to the national development, these **externalities would lead to a suboptimal provision of** (large-scale) **transport infrastructure in the case of a federalist solution, because local or regional units would take a free-rider position.** **This is the reason why, traditionally, motorway networks, train systems etc. are planned on a national level. A second implicat**ion of the network character of transport **is that the costs and benefits of a specific transport policy** project **may be unequally distributed among the nodes of a network and, moreover, an imbalance may also exist between the areas along the link and those surrounding the nodes.** **Thus, (internal) economic benefits will often occur in the nodes whereas (external) ecological disbenefits are felt in the areas along the links. The consequence** of these externalities **is a growing local resistance** against the planning and implementation of national or international transport infrastructure projects. Especially in Austria and Switzerland, it has also provoked an increasing demand for restrictive regulation of transit traffic on roads. These distributional aspects become relevant for democratic decision-making. Given a normal spatial settlement pattern, the majority of the people (voters) will normally live in the centers (nodes) and the minority in the areas along the links. **To find majorities, the policymakers will therefore usually propose transport projects establishing more performing links between the big nodes. This solves the externality problems in the case of simple majority rules. However, if federalist elements are introduced in decision-making on centrally provided goods** (or regulations), the local perspective will become relevant and **may lead to a dominance of local issues in national policy.**

No Solvency – Race to the Bottom

#### [\_\_\_] Competitive pressures between states will lead to poor infrastructure development as they rush to try to attract business

Wallace E. Oates, Professor of Economics. University of Maryland, 1999

(September “An Essay on Fiscal Federalism”, Journal of Economic Literature, JSTOR, http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/2564874)

**The general idea of decentralizing the provision of public services to the jurisdictions of concern has been widely recognized.** It manifests itself clearly on both sides of the Atlantic. We see it in Europe under the nomenclature of the "principle of subsidiarity," where it is explicitly enshrined in the Maastrict Treaty as a fundamental principle for European union. **In the U.S., it often appears** more informally **as an aversion to the "one size fits all" approach.** Somewhat paradoxically, however, **this view is the subject of a widespread and fundamental challenge both at the theoretical and policy levels. The source of this challenge is the claim that interjurisdictional competition among decentralized levels of government introduces serious allocative distortions. In their eagerness to promote economic development with the creation of new jobs** (so the argument goes), **state and local officials tend to hold down tax rates and, consequently, outputs of public services so as to reduce the costs for existing and prospective business enterprise. This results in a "race to the bottom” with** suboptimal outputs of public services.24

Permutation – Generic

[\_\_\_]

[\_\_\_] Permutation – Do both

A) Do both – joint federal and state action solves the impacts

Ernest Young, Law Professor, University of Texas, 2004

(TEXAS LAW REVIEW, November 2004, p. 59-60)

**The intertwining of federal and state bureaucracies through various forms of "cooperative federalism" likewise gives state and local officials the ability to resist federal initiatives in more subtle ways**. Recently, for instance, dozens of localities and several states have criticized - and sometimes even refused to cooperate with - aspects of the War on Terrorism that they felt intruded too far into personal liberties.

B) Joint implementation maximizes solvency

Richard Danzig and Peter Szanton, law professor, Stanford, former OMB Director, 1986

(NATIONAL SERVICE: WHAT WOULD IT MEAN?, 1986, p. 190)

**State and local programs would diminish prospects for welding the nation’s youth together in a common experience, but because they would be localized, they could enhance their participants’ sense of common service to their own community.** Further, **by included selected state and local programs in national service and by having the NSO create a common recognition for all service activity, some synergy and sense of unity could be created among state programs and between state and federal programs.** We could have the NSO endorse and subsidize half the costs of two kinds of local programs, conservation corps and community service programs.

Stimulus DA

[\_\_\_]

[\_\_\_] States have no money – federal spending on infrastructure is a critical economic stimulus for the states

Bruce Katz, Vice President Metropolitan Program, Brookings, 2012

(February 16, “Remaking Federalism to Remake the American Economy,” <http://www.brookings.edu/research/papers/2012/02/16-federalism-katz>)

President-elect Barack **Obama’s advocacy of a historic infrastructure spending plan looks like another example of the federal government wanting to spread the wealth of its economic rescue efforts. With the government having already employed financial sector bailout packages, special lending facilities, lower interest rates, tax rebates and housing relief, the infrastructure plan appears aimed at helping cash-strapped states as much as the average worker “We need to try to do some direct stimulus, direct job creation,**” says John Irons, research director at the Economic Policy Institute, which has been advocating such a plan for about a year. “You hear from mayors and governors. They all have projects that are ready to go and just need funding. We know the money is going to be spent.”

States Racism Turn

[\_\_\_] States are more likely to implement the plan in a discriminatory manner, killing solvency

Stanford Journal of Civil Rights & Civil Liberties 6

(Aug 2006, "Arizona's Proposition 200 and the Supremacy of Federal Law: Elements of Law, Politics, and Faith")

Though not a major problem given the political legitimacy and responsiveness of state government vis-a-vis the federal government, I do pause here to flag one civic concern: **the legacy of oppression and discrimination that particular minority communities associate with their state governments has not yet**, unfortunately, **been relegated** to the annals of ancient history. Not only do segregationist **policies, denial of the franchise, and ruthless state-sponsored violence come to mind for many poor black southerners** when they think about their relationship to the state government; they may also have salient memories of King v. Smith types of intrusive, humiliating home visits related directly to welfare administration. n167 In light of PRWORA's abandonment of federal welfare entitlements, **the oppressive and discriminatory policies and attitudes of the 1950s and 1960s, which had been reined in by the federal protections afforded by way of Goldberg and King, may potentially be revived.** Indeed**, institutional racism at the state and local level is alarmingly enduring**. Professor Cashin, for one, devotes considerable attention to how states profoundly discriminate against their African-American welfare populations. N168 and another, **Professor** Susan **Gooden**, presents a particularly salient case study of Virginia welfare services. In her study, she **documents and contrasts state administrators' disparaging and ungenerous treatment of black welfare recipients with their treatment of similarly situated white clients who were always given first notice of new jobs, offered the "newest" work clothes, and given access to automobiles. N169** Understanding discrimination is not just an academic exercise, but also a visceral part of the welfare experience. **The civic harms associated with returning power to the states cannot be disregarded as historically contingent. Such harms persist today.**

Massachusetts Spending DA – Shell

#### [\_\_\_\_] A. Massachusetts budget is tight – no room to expand transportation infrastructure spending

Boston Herald, 2012

(May 10, 2012, Boston Herald, “Long Term Budget Out of Balance,” http://bostonherald.com/news/opinion/op\_ed/view.bg?articleid=1061130500&format=text)

A new long-term revenue and expenditure forecast released earlier this week by the Patrick administration suggests that **Massachusetts faces some difficult fiscal choices.** It builds on a positive but little recognized achievement of our state government: For many, many years, governors of both parties have worked with the legislative leadership and outside economists to prepare — and agree on — revenue estimates prepared without regard to politics or partisanship. Based on these estimates, Gov. [Deval Patrick](http://news.bostonherald.com/search/?topic=Deval+Patrick&searchSite=pubdate), his Republican predecessors and the legislative leadership have been more cautious than their counterparts in other states about using one-time revenues and have on the whole been prudent in setting aside funds in good years. Patrick’s long-term projections can add a new dimension to this cooperation by looking at the outlook not for one year but for 10. (Full disclosure: I was one of the outside economists — with colleagues both liberal and conservative — who worked with the governor’s staff on this project.) The report provides a helpful check on the use of one-time funds to balance next year’s budget. Specifically, it’s fiscally prudent to use one-time revenues if and only if the spending they support is in line with revenues the economy will generate when it eventually returns to full employment. The governor proposes to use one-time revenues of $446 million — just under half the billion dollar gap next year between actual and full-employment revenues. Looking ahead a few years, however, we face some hard choices. **Because of the long-term impact of the Great Recession, state and national output and employment** (and therefore state tax revenues) **are not going to grow over the next decade at rates comparable to the last period of extended economic growth** — the years from 1990 to 2000. Prepared before major European economies entered recession, the Patrick outlook assumes somewhat stronger revenue growth over the next two years. But after this period of recovery, revenue growth slows and falls behind the expected growth in spending. In economists’ jargon, by 2016 we’ll have a structural deficit — the long-term growth in spending will not be supported by the long-term growth in revenues. Over the last year, Massachusetts has seen surprisingly low growth in insurance costs for government health programs. Barring structural change, this can’t continue. Absent major reforms, the Patrick projections are somewhat optimistic — they assume health-care cost increases over the next decade somewhat lower than the past several years. **If the reforms proposed by Patrick and the legislative leadership eventually knock 2 percent or 3 percent off the annual growth in Medicaid and other government health costs, the budget will be in long-term balance.** Still, as the report observes, “**This reduction . . . would only allow for maintenance level spending for existing government programs and would not allow for increased investments for transportation infrastructure**, education (or) restoration of past budget cuts.”

Massachusetts Spending DA – Shell

#### [\_\_\_\_] B. Education is vulnerable – Lack of existing revenue to spend on education causes cuts

Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, 1997

(“Perspective on State Tax Policy,” http://www.bos.frb.org/economic/nerr/rr1997/winter/prtv97\_1.htm)

In recent years, **states have been more inclined than they have in the past to cut spending** in response to shrinking revenues, **and to restrain spending growth** as revenues have recovered. In the recession of the early 1990s, **when revenues fell dramatically throughout New England, the largest cuts often came in higher education**. And rather than cut their own budgets further**, state legislators often chose to give less "local aid" to cities and towns,where the cuts had similar effects**. Raising local taxes was difficult, especially in poorer communities, so cuts in local aid tended to result in cuts in spending. **As the largest budget item, education often bore the brunt.** At both the state and local levels, **revenue cuts thus often led to reductions in education spending.**

Massachusetts Spending DA – Shell

#### [\_\_\_\_] C. Investments in education is critical to the economy and economic opportunity

Calvert-Henderson 2012

(Quality of Life Indicators, 2012, http://www.calvert-henderson.com/edu.htm)

In today's globalized information-based economy, **knowledge is now widely recognized as a key factor of production**. Politicians in many countries, including the USA, run for office on platforms that stress education. The World Bank and other multilateral institutions now agree that **investments in education (particularly at preschool and K through 12 levels) are the new keys, along with investments in health, to economic development. Nothing is changing our business and academic institutions faster than the new definitions of human and intellectual capital.** As many new Internet-based, e-commerce businesses know, a company cannot "own" the part of its knowledge base that resides in the heads of its employees. This new evaluation of intellectual capital, on which all technical and social innovation is based, is still under-estimated in the US GDP. Current GDP still accounts for education costs as "expenditures" rather than as investments in human capital. (To see Hazel Henderson's article on education, *Key Investments in the Wealth of Nations* go to [www.hazelhenderson.com](http://www.hazelhenderson.com/) and click on 'Editorials'.) Although **education is a significant foundation of our country's economic vitality**, preparing individuals for the workforce is only one goal of education. Of equal importance are enabling individuals to: lead lives of dignity and purpose; construct knowledge and put it to humane ends; and participate as informed citizens in a democratic society. The Calvert-Henderson Education Indicator provides summary statistics that provide insight into whether and how well our educational systems are achieving these goals. First we look at several overall measures of the educational achievement of the US adult population and the resulting economic impact. Second we look at measures of who is being served by the existing educational system and how well. Finally we look at the investment that the US is making in our educational system and our human capital and how that compares with other countries, both in the amount being invested and the results being achieved. As can be seen in the graph below, **the education level of the US population has increased dramatically in the last 60 years**. In 1940, 74% of the population had less than 12 years of school, while by 2010, the percentage had reversed, with more than 87% of the adult population having completed at least 12 years of school and nearly a third of all adults having completed at least 4 years of college.

Massachusetts Spending DA – Extensions

[­\_\_\_\_]

[­\_\_\_\_] The budget is tight but balanced now

Shannon Young, Associated Press, 2012

(Boston Globe, June 28, Mass. lawmakers approve final state budget, http://www.boston.com/news/local/massachusetts/articles/2012/06/28/mass\_lawmakers\_set\_to\_vote\_on\_final\_state\_budget/)

"**This budget makes smart investments to maintain our fiscal health and continue our economic recovery and job growth**," Senate President Therese Murray, D-Plymouth, said in a statement. **"It also reflects our priority to protect important funding for the essential services** and programs in the Commonwealth." The spending plan includes $898 million in local aid for cities and towns, tightens restrictions on the use of Electronic Benefit Transfer cards by welfare recipients, and maintains 45 beds at Taunton State Hospital, which state officials were considering closing. Sen. Marc Pacheco, D-Taunton, who pushed for funding at the state hospital, said while the funding is not exactly what he hoped for, it is a "good compromise." In January, the Patrick administration announced it was closing the hospital, saying it was antiquated and not cost effective. The House and governor had suggested moving most of its patients to a new state hospital opening in Worcester. "We faced an uphill battle after the House accepted the Governor's proposal. This budget will allow us to keep the lights on at Taunton State Hospital," Pacheco said in a statement. Additionally, **the budget includes no new taxes or fees** but relies on $516 million in one-time funds, including a $350 million withdrawal from the state's rainy day fund. That still leaves the state with a rainy day fund of more than $1 billion, lawmakers said.

Answers to: Federal Funding Inefficient

[\_\_\_]

[\_\_\_] Federal funding is efficient

**The Transportation Politic**, February 16, **2012,** “Clearing it Up on Federal Transportation Expenditures,” http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2012/02/16/clearing-it-up-on-federal-transportation-expenditures/

**Washington does run very competitive grant programs — exactly the type of performance-based financing Mr. Glaeser demands — for transit investment projects and for programs like TIGER (and, indeed, for the much-hated high-speed rail program). Federal guidelines require most of these projects (unlike those funded by formula) to meet cost-effectiveness and ridership standards**

[\_\_\_] State transportation funding limited

**Economist**, April 28, **2011**, “Life in the Slow Lane,” http://www.economist.com/node/18620944

**At the state and local level transport budgets will remain tight** while unemployment is high. With luck, **this pressure could spark a wave of innovative planning focused on improving the return on infrastructure spending.**

Answers to: States are Laboratories

[\_\_\_]

[\_\_\_] States are not laboratories

Allan Well, Dir., National Academy for State Health Policy, 2008

(HEALTH AFFAIRS, May/June 2008, 738)

**While states have accomplished a great deal with their reform efforts targeting access and quality, there is little about state health policy that resembles the conditions of a laboratory. Scientists in laboratories develop hypotheses, conduct experiments, collect and analyze data, and reach conclusions that are then applied to real-world conditions. State health policy development, by contrast, is episodic. Sometimes the spread of ideas is based on political trends that shift much more rapidly than the knowledge base that would support a policy shift.** Examples can be found in state-level adoption of managed care regulation, regulation of the small-group insurance market, the wholesale adoption of managed care in Medicaid, and the growing application of cost sharing in public programs.

Answers to: State Leadership Good

[\_\_\_]

[\_\_\_] State leadership bad for the nation as a whole

Allan Well, Dir., National Academy for State Health Policy, 2008

(HEALTH AFFAIRS, May/June 2008, 738)

**Relying upon states to lead comes at a price for the nation, particularly if it is encouraged through a process of selecting volunteer states to pursue a range of comprehensive reform plans. This approach is likely to increase interstate variation in health indicators, at least in the short run and probably in the long run as well.**

Answers to: Federalism Net Benefit

[\_\_\_]

[\_\_\_] State leadership hurts federalism

Allan Well, Dir., National Academy for State Health Policy, 2008

(HEALTH AFFAIRS, May/June 2008, 738)

Ultimately, **the weakest link of the state leadership approach is its unrealistic view of federalism. It is no easier for Congress and the president to give stated the authority and resources they need to do the job right than it is to get Congress and the president to agree on a health policy course for the nation. The most likely outcome is a marginal shift in power to states combined with outsize expectations for the state response.**
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1NC – Increase doesn’t = create

#### A. Interpretation – In order to be topical the Affirmative must increase investment in a pre-existing program. Since the word “increase” requires a pre-exisitng base line the affirmative cannot topically create a new program.

Jeremiah Buckly, Attorney writing in an Amicus Curiae Brief to the Supreme Court, 2006

(<http://supreme.lp.findlaw.com/supreme_court/briefs/06-84/06-84.mer.ami.mica.pdf>Safeco Ins. Co. of America et al v. Charles Burr et al,)

First, the court said that the ordinary meaning of the word “increase” is “to make something greater,” which it believed should not “be limited to cases in which a company raises the rate that an individual has previously been charged.” 435 F.3d at 1091. Yet the definition offered by the Ninth Circuit compels the opposite conclusion. **Because “increase” means “to make something greater,” there must necessarily have been an existing premium**, to which **Edo’s actual premium may be compared, to determine whether an “increase” occurred**. Congress could have provided that “ad-verse action” in the insurance context means charging an amount greater than the optimal premium, but instead chose to define adverse action in terms of an “increase.” That def-initional choice must be respected, not ignored. See Colautti v. Franklin, 439 U.S. 379, 392-93 n.10 (1979) (“[a] defin-ition which declares what a term ‘means’ . . . excludes any meaning that is not stated”). Next, the Ninth Circuit reasoned that because the Insurance Prong includes the words “existing or applied for,” Congress intended that an “increase in any charge” for insurance must “apply to all insurance transactions – from an initial policy of insurance to a renewal of a long-held policy.” 435 F.3d at 1091. This interpretation reads the words “exist-ing or applied for” in isolation. Other types of adverse action described in the Insurance Prong apply only to situations where a consumer had an existing policy of insurance, such as a “cancellation,” “reduction,” or “change” in insurance. Each of these forms of adverse action presupposes an already-existing policy, and under usual canons of statutory construction the term **“increase” also should be construed to apply to increases of an already-existing policy**. See Hibbs v. Winn, 542 U.S. 88, 101 (2004) (“a phrase gathers meaning from the words around it”) (citation omitted).

#### B. Violation – The Affirmative doesn’t increase, they create. They create a new program that hasn’t existed before.

#### C. Standards-

#### 1. Predictable limits – History should limit the topic, our interpretation limits debate to making current infrastructure and programs better and stronger. There is not Aff and Neg literature on hypothetical programs. We should limit the topic to an area where literature exists on both sides.

#### 2. Ground – There is no literature for our off case arguments because no one has written against things that haven’t been tried yet. So there is no possible way we can research the topic and be well prepared.

#### D. T is a voter for fairness and education, it is critical to preserve the integrity of debate.

1NC – In = Throughout

A. Interpretation – In order to be topical, an affirmative must increase transportation infrastructure across the entirety of the United States, not just a section of it.

#### First note that ‘In’ means throughout

Words and Phrases, 1959

(p. 546 (PDNS3566))

In the Act of 1861 providing that justices of the peace shall have jurisdiction “in” their respective counties to hear and determine all complaints, **the word “in” should be construed to mean “throughout”** such counties. Reynolds v. Larkin, 14, p. 114, 117, 10 Colo. 126.

Second, The United States includes all the territories and land over which it has jurisdiction

Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms 5

(Dictionary of Military, <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/United+States>, 2005)

**Includes the land area, internal waters, territorial sea, and airspace of the United States, including** the following: a. US **territories, possessions, and commonwealths; and** b. **Other areas over which the US Government has** complete jurisdiction and control or has **exclusive authority** or defense responsibility.

B. Violation – the Affirmative only increases transportation infrastructure in one section of the United States but does not include vast sections of the continental United States or its territories

C. Standards

1. Predictable Limits – There are a small number of affirmatives that deal with connecting all of the United States, whereas if the Affirmatives are allowed to select very small parts of the country to invest in than the negative will be unable to prepare for the number of miniscule Affirmatives possible

2. Ground – Our best disadvantage links are to large, national changes in policy not tiny changes in local monetary allocation. We should discuss the largest thrusts of the literature, not small projects that only affect one sector like barges or airplanes

#### D. T is a voter for fairness and education, it is critical to preserve the integrity of debate.

1NC – Substantially = without material qualification

A. Interpretation – In order to be topical, the Affirmative must not place any qualifications on how the increase investment in transportation infrastructure. That means that they need to invest in all transportation infrastructure, not just one sub-section

Substantially is without material qualification

BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY, 1991

(p. 1024 (MHBLUE0036))

Substantially - means essentially; without material qualification.

B. The Affirmative only increases investment in \_\_\_\_, not transportation infrastructure as a whole.

C. Standards

1. Predictable Limits – Allowing the Affirmative to pick any small sub-set of transportation infrastructure makes it difficult for the negative to compete. We should focus debate on the broad US policies towards transportation, not focus on minute areas that could change rapidly

2. Grammar – Only our interpretation accurately reflects the true meaning of the word substantially, even if increasing all transportation infrastructure seems like a high burden to place on the affirmative we are bound to sit within the limits placed by the resolution

#### D. T is a voter for fairness and education, it is critical to preserve the integrity of debate.

Aff Answers – Increase includes create

[\_\_\_] Increase doesn’t require pre-existence

Stephen Reinhardt, U.S. Judge for the UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT, 2005

(JASON RAY REYNOLDS; MATTHEW RAUSCH, Plaintiffs-Appellants, v. HARTFORD FINANCIAL SERVICES GROUP, INC.; HARTFORD FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY, Defendants-Appellees., p. 1090-1

Specifically, we must decide whether charging a higher price for initial insurance than the insured would otherwise have been charged because of information in a consumer credit report constitutes an "increase in any charge" within the meaning of FCRA. First, we examine the definitions of "increase" and "charge." Hartford Fire contends that, limited to their ordinary definitions, these words apply only when a consumer has previously been charged for insurance and that charge has thereafter been increased by the insurer. The phrase, "has previously been charged," as used by Hartford, refers not only to a rate that the consumer has previously paid for insurance but also to a rate that the consumer has previously been quoted, even if that rate was increased before the consumer made any payment. Reynolds disagrees, asserting that, **under the ordinary definition of the term, an increase in a charge also occurs whenever an insurer charges a higher rate than it would otherwise have charged because of any factor**--such as adverse credit information, age, or driving record 8 --**regardless of whether the customer was previously charged some other rate.** According to Reynolds, he was charged an increased rate because of his credit rating when he was compelled to pay a rate higher than the premium rate because he failed to obtain a high insurance score. Thus, he argues, the definitions of "increase" and "charge" encompass the insurance companies' practice. Reynolds is correct. **“Increase" means to make something greater.** See, e.g., OXFORD ENGLISH DICTIONARY (2d ed. 1989) ("The action, process, or fact of becoming or making greater; augmentation, growth, enlargement, extension."); WEBSTER'S NEW WORLD DICTIONARY OF AMERICAN ENGLISH (3d college ed. 1988) (defining "increase" as "growth, enlargement, etc[.]"). "Charge" means the price demanded for goods or services. See, e.g., OXFORD ENGLISH DICTIONARY (2d ed. 1989) ("The price required or demanded for service rendered, or (less usually) for goods supplied."); WEBSTER'S NEW WORLD DICTIONARY OF AMERICAN ENGLISH (3d college ed. 1988) ("The cost or price of an article, service, etc."). **Nothing in the definition of** these words implies that the term **"increase** in any charge for" **should be limited to cases in which a company raises the rate that an individual has previously been charged**.

[\_\_\_] One can increase from zero

WORDS AND PHRASES, 07

(CUMULATIVE SUPPLEMENTARY PAMPHLET, 2007 Vol. 20A, 07, 76.

Increase: **Salary change of from zero to $12,000 and $1,200 annually for mayor and councilmen respectively was an “increase” in salary and not merely the fixing of salary**. King v. Herron, 243 S.E.2d36, 241 Ga. 5.

Aff Answers – Increase includes create

#### [\_\_\_] “Increase” doesn’t require preexistence

Words and Phrases 8

(Words and Phrases Permanent Edition, “Increase,” Volume 20B, p. 263-267 March 2008, Thomson West)

Wahs. 1942. The granting of compensation to any officer after he has commenced to serve the term for which he has been chosen, when no compensation was provided by law before he assumed the duties of his office, is an “increase” in salary or compensation within the constitutional provision prohibiting an increase of the compensation of a public officer during his term of office. Const. art, 2, 25; art. 11, 8. – State ex rel. Jaspers v. West 125 P.2d 694, 13 Wash.2d 514. Offic 100(1).

[\_\_\_] Increase means to grow something that exists

CORPUS JURIS SECUNDUM, 1944, p. 545

**Increase.** In General: A word in common use and variously used and therefore of doubtful and equivocal import. It is derived from “cresco”, **to grow and implies the existence of something made, the subject of the increase**, etc.

Aff Answers – In = Within the Limits Of

#### [\_\_\_] In simply means within the limits of, it doesn’t imply that it has to be over the entirety of the US

Merriam Webster Online Dictionary, 2006

**(**p. http://www.m-w.com/cgi-bin/dictionary?book=Dictionary&va=in (PDNS3565))

Main Entry: 1in Pronunciation: 'in, &n, &n Function: preposition Etymology: Middle English, from Old English; akin to Old High German in in, Latin in, Greek en 1 a -- **used as a function word to indicate inclusion, location, or position within limits** <in the lake> <wounded in the leg> <in the summer>

Aff Answers – Substantially

#### [\_\_\_] "Substantial" means considerable in amount or value

Words and Phrases 2

(Volume 40A p. 453)

N.D.Ala. 1957. The word “substantial” means considerable in amount, value, or the like, large, as a substantial gain

#### [\_\_\_] “Substantially” is a relative term --- context key

Words and Phrases 64

(Vol. 40, p. 816)

The word “substantially” is a relative term and should be interpreted in accordance with the context of claim in which it is used. Moss v. Patterson Ballagh Corp. D.C.Cal., 80 P.Supp. C10, 637.

Transportation Infrastructure Definitions

[\_\_\_] Transportation infrastructure is highways, roads, bridges, intermodal transit, inland waterways, ports, aviation, and rail systems.

Congress ‘11

(The US House of Representatives – the 112th Congress of the United States. “HR 402 – National Infrastructure Development Bank Act of 2011” 1/24/11 <http://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/112/hr402/text//Cal-JV>)

(25) TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECT- The term ‘transportation infrastructure project’ means any project for the construction, maintenance, or enhancement of highways, roads, bridges, transit and intermodal systems, inland waterways, commercial ports, airports, high speed rail and freight rail systems.

[\_\_\_] Transportation infrastructure is defined as transit, highways, airports, railways, waterways and intermodal links

Susanne Trimbath, Ph.D., former Senior Research Economist in Capital Market Studies at Milken Institute, 2011

(Transportation Infrastructure: Paving the Way, STP Advisory Services, LLC, p. 9)

The strategy applied by the **US Chamber of Commerce** for the infrastructure performance index project presents a model for **developing the way forward**. A stakeholder-centric approach allows you to measure the right things, communicate to the people in a language they understand and get to ACTION faster. The process, detailed in the Technical Report last summer (US Chamber 2010), is basically this: 1. Clearly **define “transportation infrastructure**” as the underlying structures that support the delivery of inputs to places of production, goods and services to customers, and customers to marketplaces. The structures are: • Transit • Highways • Airports • Railways • Waterways (Ports) • Intermodal Links

Transportation Infrastructure Definitions

[\_\_\_] Transportation infrastructure refers to one of 9 subsectors – water and energy are topical

American Jobs Act, 11

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

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

Investment Definitions

#### [\_\_\_] “Investment” is disbursement of public funds

Perez, Bustamonte, and Ponce, Law Firm, 2010

(“Executive Summary of the Organic Code on Public Planning and Finance”, Legal Newsletter, 11-4, http://www.pbplaw.com/boletines/2010/20101104\_boletinPBP\_bl\_en.pdf)

Public investment is defined as “… a set of disbursements and/or transactions made out of public funds to maintain or increase social and State wealth and capacities for the purpose of achieving the planned objectives”. And Article 77 of the Code referred to herein provides that the State General Budget is an instrument used “to determine and manage income and disbursements of all the entities comprised in the different State branches.”

#### [\_\_\_] Infrastructure Investment includes only the support for large infrastructure projects – repairs, maintenance, and minor projects aren’t topical

Diana Chang, et. al. 2010

(Sheryl Pankhurst, Matthew Schneer, and Daniel Schreiner, Monitoring and State Improvement Planning Division Recovery Act Facilitators “MSIP ARRA Monitoring and Technical Assistance” leadershipmega-conf-reg.tadnet.org/.../original\_S3-105-ARRA\_Technical-RAF.ppt)

Financial support for a physical asset or structure needed for the operation of a larger enterprise. Therefore, infrastructure investments include support for tangible assets or structures such as roads, public buildings (including schools), mass transit systems, water and sewage systems, communication and utility systems and other assets or structures that provide a reliable flow of products and services essential to the defense and economic security of the United States, the smooth functioning of government at all levels, and society as a whole. However, **an infrastructure investment does not include “minor remodeling**” as defined in 34 CFR §77.1(c).’

#### [\_\_\_] Infra investment is the financial support for physical transportation assets

US DOE ‘9

[The US Dept of Education. “The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act: Saving And Creating Jobs And Reforming Education.” 2009, media.ncrtm.org/presentations/RSA\_TA.../ARRACIL121409.doc)

An infrastructure investment is financial support for a physical asset or structure needed for the operation of a larger enterprise. Therefore, infrastructure investments include support for tangible assets or structures such as roads, public buildings (including schools), mass transit systems, water and sewage systems, communication and utility systems and other assets or structures that provide a reliable flow of products and services essential to the defense and economic security of the United States, the smooth functioning of government at all levels, and society as a whole.

Investment Definitions

#### [\_\_\_] “Investment” requires spending money

Edward Anderson, Lecturer in Development Studies – University of East Anglia, 2006

(“The Role of Public Investment in Poverty Reduction: Theories, Evidence and Methods”, Overseas Development Institute Working Paper 263, March, http://www.odi.org.uk/resources/docs/1786.pdf)

1.3 Definitions We define (net) public investment as public expenditure that **adds to the public physical capital stock.** This would include the building of roads, ports, schools, hospitals etc. This corresponds to the definition of public investment in national accounts data**, namely, capital expenditure**. It is not within the scope of this paper to include public expenditure on health and education, despite the fact that many regard such expenditure as investment. Methods for assessing the poverty impact of public expenditure on social sectors such as health and education have been well covered elsewhere in recent years (see for example, van de Walle and Nead, 1995; Sahn and Younger, 2000; and World Bank, 2002).