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Megacities

new transportation investment fuels development of megacities – ignore alt causes

EIU 9 (Economist Intelligence Unit, in coordination with MRC McLean Hazel and Siemens Scientific Organization, http://www.siemens.com/entry/cc/features/urbanization\_development/all/en/pdf/study\_megacities\_en.pdf)JFS

Transport preoccupies the stakeholders like no other infrastructure issue. As noted above, the general survey marks transport out as the single biggest infrastructure challenge faced by their cities, and by a large margin\*. That focus is particularly high in Mature cities (45%) and Transitional cities (43%) and in Europe (52%), where car ownership in the EU has risen ten times more quickly than the population over the past ten years. In Emerging cities, the emphasis on transport is less pronounced, but at 17% is still far ahead of the other infrastructure mentioned such as water (8%) and electricity (5%). Transport is also the priority for spending, with 86% of stakeholders overall citing this as an important area for investment. Transportation is top of the pile for a number of reasons. Whereas some infrastructure problems, such as lack of water, primarily affect the poorer areas of the city, congestion, crowded trains and traffic-linked pollution are very visible at all levels of society. But there is also a clear and direct link with city competitiveness. If megacities are the engines of the global economy, it is the transport network that keeps those engines working efficiently. When roads and railways seize up, or when ports and airports become overloaded, the cost to the economy is high. In the UK, where many cities including London are struggling to keep up with travel demand, the Confederation of British Industry (CBI) estimates that the cost of congestion is £20 billion (US$38 billion) a year\*\*. Stakeholders in the overall survey are acutely aware of the importance of transport networks in driving the economy: 27% mention transport as the one area of the city’s infrastructure that is most critical in attracting investment, far ahead of the second most cited issue (safety and security, 9%). Coping with growth: As well as cutting across all levels of civic society, transport problems affect cities at all levels of development, although they manifest themselves in different ways across our three archetypes. For Mature cities, the primary problem is old or obsolete systems (40%), then system capacity (35%), according to respondents with specialist knowledge of transport in their city. With its ageing rail and underground systems, London is a prime example. In a metropolitan area where an estimated 30 million journeys take place every day, transport investment over the past two decades has barely been sufficient to maintain the system, let alone to increase capacity to cope with soaring demand. As a result, congestion and overcrowding is already acute on all of London’s transport networks, according to a recent report from Transport for London (TfL). In Emerging and Transitional cities, stakeholders with specialist knowledge of transport tend to be more concerned about inadequate system capacity than ageing infrastructure. Indeed, sometimes basic infrastructure is non-existent. For example, Karachi is the only megacity in the world without a mass transit system such as a metro system or monorail, despite the fact that the idea for one was floated as far back as 1952. Meanwhile the number of public transport vehicles is insufficient for the population of the city, forcing commuters to travel on the rooftops of buses with all the inherent safety issues that this implies. Istanbul, a Transitional city according to our methodology, faces both problems. The city’s geography poses its own problems, with many of its residents commuting daily across the Bosphorus from one part of the city to the other. With its many hills and narrow streets, Istanbul has a major problem with traffic congestion, particularly at peak travel times. There is also a serious lack of public transport capacity on the Asian side of the city. Istanbul is having to make major investments to address these problems. A 22km light metro line is currently under construction, and further lines are planned. In total, Istanbul plans to invest a further US$4.9 billion in tram and metro projects over the coming ten years, over and above the US$1.6 billion on current schemes\*. The main cause of these problems, according to stakeholders in transport, is lack of resources, which usually means lack of money (although skills and technology limitation are also noted). The second most cited underlying cause, however, is governance related: poor planning is selected by 21% of transport specialists overall, and is especially emphasized by those in Transitional cities. Again, this is a significant challenge in Istanbul’s case. The city has varying administrative bodies that have similar and sometimes overlapping responsibilities. The result, a recent report concluded, is that the city lacks any form of holistic transportation planning\*\*. Incremental improvements over new investments: Stakeholders are split over whether they will invest in new transport capacity as the primary solution to the challenges outlined above, or seek to increase efficiency of existing infrastructure. Even where new investment is made available, however, it will most often be used to deliver incremental improvements to the transport system (for example, adding new lines to an existing metro or new bus services) rather than outright spending on new transport projects. The most frequently mentioned solution to transport problems is to reorganize or revitalize the existing infrastructure (33%), whereas building new roads and facilities gets mentioned by only 12% of respondents. This finding seems to reflect a growing trend. In the UK, for example, the recent review of UK transport policy by Rod Eddington emphasized the need for incremental improvements to existing systems rather than new, showcase infrastructure projects.

Megacities destroy the water cycle – causes extinction

GNG 12 (Global Nomad Group, an international NGO whose mission is to foster dialogue and understanding among the world’s youth, http://gng.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/12/Module-2-Flows-and-Cycles1.pdf?f22064)JFS

The water cycle renews fresh water, one of the most important resources for life on earth. Water is needed for food production, economic development and human survival. Climate change is predicted to have a range of impacts on water resources. Variation in temperature and rainfall may affect water availability, increase the frequency and severity of floods and droughts, and disrupt ecosystems that maintain water quality.5 By 2023, 1800 million people will be living in countries or regions with absolute water scarcity, and two-thirds of the world pollution could be under stress conditions.6 Water shortages are an important concern because they can increase conflict and public health problems, reduce food production and endanger the environment. In China, underwater aquifers that take millennia to fill have been depleted by the rapid growth of megacities with surging populations.7 Like China, many countries and regions are now satisfying the demand for water by withdrawing groundwater faster than it is replenished, thereby potentially depleting their supply for future generations. This type of mismanagement can lead to major disruptions in the natural water cycle. Creating a sustainable future will depend on learning how to effectively manage water resources. We must understand the capacities and limitations of the natural water cycle, the consequences of overdrawing water resources and how to conserve water resources that are still available.

Consult the Tribes

CP Text: The United States federal government should engage in prior binding consultation with American Indian Tribes over <INSERT PLAN>. Minor modifications recommended by American Indian Tribes will be adopted in the event of implementation.

The CP is essential to protect American Indian cultural sites – tribes will agree if consulted prior to implementation as they recognize the need for transportation improvements.

NCAI 04

The National Congress of American Indians,¶ Resolution #FTL-04-008, 10/10/2004, <http://www.ncai.org/attachments/Resolution_yzMpvFWtmQpnWEeVuTxKGBjRmYVcrInqMBdvrvTDbrRkmTGRSFI_ftl04-008.pdf>

Whereas, we, the members of the National Congress of American Indians¶ of the United States, invoking the divine blessing of the Creator upon our efforts and¶ purposes, in order to preserve for ourselves and our descendants the inherent¶ sovereign rights of our Indian nations, rights secured under Indian treaties and¶ agreements with the United States, and all other rights and benefits to which we are¶ entitled under the laws and Constitution of the United States, to enlighten the public¶ toward a better understanding of the Indian people, to preserve Indian cultural values,¶ and otherwise promote the health, safety and welfare of the Indian people, do hereby¶ establish and submit the following resolution; and¶ Whereas, the National Congress of American Indians (NCAI) was¶ established in 1944 and is the oldest and largest national organization of American¶ Indian and Alaska Native tribal governments; and¶ Whereas, the United States has a unique government-to-government¶ relationship with American Indian Tribes and this special relationship is affirmed in¶ Treaties, Supreme Court decisions, and Executive Orders, and provides that Federal¶ agencies consult with American Indian Tribes regarding policy and regulatory matters;¶ and¶ Whereas, consultation with American Indian Tribes on proposed federal¶ transportation project undertakings that may have an effect on traditional religious or¶ culturally significant site prior the implementation of such actions is required by the¶ National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the National Historic Preservation Act¶ (NHPA), the American Indian Religious Freedom Act, and various Presidential¶ Executive Orders prior to project approval; and¶ whereas, the majority of federal regulations committed to gaining¶ American Indian tribal involvement in decision making concerning federal actions are¶ seen by most American Indian Tribes as being developed from the perspective of the¶ implementing agency of jurisdiction without adequate inclusion of American Indian¶ Tribes; and¶ Whereas, the Congress and the Administration seek transportation project¶ decision making that is certain and predictable, such goals can only be achieved when¶ adequate consultation with American Indian Tribes occurs; and¶ Whereas, Congress and the Administration are proposing to reaut horize the¶ Transportation Equity Act of the 21st Century; and whereas, transportation infrastructure expansion into American Indian Tribes’ Usual,¶ Accustomed and Stationed Areas, pose potential threats to the cultural and historic resources of¶ American Indian tribes; and¶ Whereas, preserving historic properties of religious and cultural significance along¶ with American Indian Tribal practices are of utmost importance to American Indian Tribes; and¶ Whereas, American Indian Tribes deem it important to ensure that the safety of the¶ traveling public is maintained while protecting the cultural rights of tribes, and those objectives¶ can be achieved when American Indian Tribes are adequately consulted according to the ir¶ existing Tribal processes and protocol in dealing with these matters during the transportation¶ decision making process under NEPA; and¶ Whereas, the proposed Tribal NEPA-106 Consultation Process is consistent with the¶ NCAI’s position on re-authorization of TEA-21.¶ Now therefore be it resolved, that the NCAI does hereby call on Congress¶ and the Administration to provide support and funding for development of a Tribal Consultation¶ Process as required by NEPA for transportation projects that may be used by other tribes as a¶ means to ensure the protection of American Indian Tribal cultural, historic and religious resources¶ while ensuring much needed transportation projects are delivered in a timely fashion; and¶ Be it further resolved, that the NCAI supports Tribal efforts, such as those at¶ The Tulalip Tribes, to develop this process.
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Megacities

**Megacities cause terrorist attacks that turn the case**

**MRMRG no date** (Munchener RUck Munich Re Group, research group, "Megacities - Megarisks: Trends and challenges for insurance and risk management," www.preventionweb.net/files/646\_10363.pdf CM)

From the economic point of view, the ever-increasing global interdependence of ﬂows of goods, ﬁnance and information – especially in world cities which are also economic centres – harbours major risks. Depending on the degree of networking involved, a business interruption in an Asian metropolis can lead to production losses in Australia or Europe. And megacities are also particularly exposed to one of the biggest risks of our time – terrorism. Attacks on utility companies or infrastructure can have fatal repercussions, while an attack on a nuclear power plant located near a major city, with all its consequences, is no longer inconceivable.

Escalates to a full nuclear war

Ayson 10 (Robert Ayson, Professor of Strategic Studies and Director of the Centre for Strategic Studies: New Zealand at the Victoria [University of](http://the3nr.com/2010/07/14/excellent-new-terrorism-impact-card/) Wellington, 2010 “After a Terrorist Nuclear Attack: Envisaging Catalytic Effects,” Studies in Conflict & Terrorism, Volume 33, Issue 7, July, [Available](http://the3nr.com/2010/07/14/excellent-new-terrorism-impact-card/) Online to Subscribing Institutions via InformaWorld)

But these two nuclear worlds—a non-state actor nuclear attack and a catastrophic interstate nuclear exchange—are not necessarily separable. It is just possible that some sort of terrorist attack, and especially an act of nuclear terrorism, could precipitate a chain of events leading to a massive exchange of nuclear weapons between two or more of the states that possess them. In this context, today’s and tomorrow’s terrorist groups might assume the place allotted during the early Cold War years to new state possessors of small nuclear arsenals who were seen as raising the risks of a catalytic nuclear war between the superpowers started by third parties. These risks were considered in the late 1950s and early 1960s as concerns grew about nuclear proliferation, the so-called n+1 problem.

The plan causes investors to take interest in megacities – Chinese megacities prove

Moavenzadeh 7 (Fred, president of Masdar Institute, MIT Professor, Moving Millions: Transport Strategies for Sustainable Development in Megacities, book, print)JFS

<note: Guangzhou is a Chinese megacity>

Until recently, Guangzhou’s primary sources of funding for transportation and telecommunications infrastructure were the municipal budget, direct state investment, and domestic bank loans. This distribution of funding sources was not sufficient to meet the growing need for new infrastructure, and strained the city's budget. Initially the city sought to supplement these sources with loans from lending institutions such as the Wodd Hanlt and the Asian Development Bank.” In recent years (I996-2001]. however. these international development banks have increasingly focused on ‘soft’ projects in health, education, and the environment. Concurrently. the national government has shifted its attention westward to develop more evenly the country's resources. In I996. Guangzhou published a new strategy for transportation ﬁnancing as part of Guangzou Agenda for the 21st Century. The new strategy sought to develop a multi-channel‘ and "multi-form investment system. Those projects that were capable of generating revenue were to be funded through multiple channels including private investors and foreign lenders. The government would thus be able to use its limited investment capacity for only those projects that promote social beneﬁts without corresponding ﬁnancial returns. To help attract foreign investment, the city sought to relax restrictive policies related to foreign capital investment in and ownership of transportation infrastructure assets (Leading Ollice of Guangzhou’: Agenda for the Zlst Century I996]. With this initiative, Guangzhou’s transportation projects were established as ﬁnancially self-sustaining enterprises that had to seek funding from private ﬁnancial institutions. Foreign bank loans, bonds, foreign joint ventures, and user fees were the new vehicles for project finance in Guangzhou. Currently (at the time of this research) the corporatized municipal bus and ferry operators are able to generate enough revenue to cover operating expenses and depreciation, but they are insufficiently proﬁtable to improve service or invest in major system expansion. Studies of the user fee levels that are needed to recover full costs indicate that the necessity charges would be generally affordable. However, further examination of the exact geographic distribution of income and the levels of demand and in elasticity would be required to verify feasibility case-by-ease. The percentage of those who would be left without affordable access to public transit must also be determined before implementing substantial rate hikes (MVA Asia Limited I995).

Private investment key to megacity development – the plan rakes in the dollars

EIU 9 (Economist Intelligence Unit, in coordination with MRC McLean Hazel and Siemens Scientific Organization, http://www.siemens.com/entry/cc/features/urbanization\_development/all/en/pdf/study\_megacities\_en.pdf)JFS

Megacities prioritize economic competitiveness and employment. When asked which issues drive decision-making, 81% of stakeholders involved in city management cite the importance of the economy and employment. There is a strong focus on creating jobs, with unemployment emerging as the top economic challenge for survey respondents from Emerging and Transitional cities. Competitiveness in the global economy is another important consideration. Six in ten stakeholders think that their cities place a high importance on making themselves competitive to attract private investment when deciding on infrastructure issues. The environment matters, but may be sacrificed for growth. Stakeholders throughout the survey place a high importance on environmental issues. They see air pollution as the most significant environmental challenge, followed by congestion issues. Six in ten stakeholders believe their city’s leadership recognizes the vital role that infrastructure decisions can play in protecting the environment. Environmental issues also feature prominently in the thinking of the infrastructure specialists in the survey: those in transport predict an emphasis on mass transit solutions, and those in the energy sector show a strong inclination for solutions based on renewables. But if a choice has to be made between the environment and economic growth, it is the latter that often wins out. This is particularly so in the developing world, where 55% of stakeholders predict that their cities will sacrifice environmental considerations for the sake of increased capacity, compared with only 14% respondents in Mature cities who believe that this will happen. Transport overtakes all other infrastructure concerns. Transportation emerges as the top megacity infrastructure challenge by a large margin. It is the one infrastructure area that stakeholders believe has the biggest impact on city competitiveness. They are also highly aware of its environmental impact (for example, air pollution) and are keen to move to greener mass transit solutions. It is not surprising therefore to find that transport also emerges as the top priority for investment. Stakeholders acknowledge that the four other infrastructure sectors covered by this study – water, electricity, healthcare and safety & security — are also in need of investment. Interestingly, they are less likely to see a strong link between spending in these areas and improved competitiveness, despite the fact that each has an important impact on the overall attractiveness of the city for investment.

Obviously America has a huge TI network now, but the plan beefs it up to allow megacity development

Economist 13 (Magazine, March, http://www.economist.com/blogs/freeexchange/2013/03/economic-geography)JFS

It isn't surprising that emerging markets are typically much more ambitious that advanced economies when investing in new infrastructure. Advanced economies already have a large infrastructure base while emerging markets are building up from very little. Urban population growth is slower in advanced economies because the rural-to-urban population shift has occurred. But just because there is less scope for investment in such infrastructure and resulting increase in market potential doesn't mean that there is no room for improvement. Census data show that the country's largest cities continue to add population. The population of America's ten largest metropolitan areas rose by 800,000 people, just from 2011 to 2012. In many of America's large metro areas, rising populations coincide with increasing rents and home prices, suggesting that housing supply is failing to keep pace with growing demand. If it were possible to raise housing supply growth in such places, in other words, the rate of population growth might also rise. Allowing for more interaction and exchange. There are two ways to raise housing supply growth in growing cities. You can remove barriers to construction of housing, like zoning and height limits. And you can invest in transport infrastructure that increases access to these metropolitan markets. You can also do both, and allow for greater population density around and along new transport lines, the former providing a market for (and financing for) the latter.

Ogallala aquifier is on the brink right now

Pew 8 [“Putting Meat on the Table: Industrial Farm Animal Production in America,” A Project of The Pew Charitable Trusts and Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, [www.pewtrusts.org/uploadedFiles/wwwpewtrustsorg/Reports/Industrial\_Agriculture/PCIFAP\_FINAL.pdf](http://www.pewtrusts.org/uploadedFiles/wwwpewtrustsorg/Reports/Industrial_Agriculture/PCIFAP_FINAL.pdf), pg. 27]

Like other aspects of ifap (such as manure disposal), crop production for animal feed places enormous demand on water resources: 87% of the use of freshwater in the US is used in agriculture, primarily irrigation (Pimentel et al., 1997). For example, it takes nearly 420 gallons of water to produce one pound of grain-fed broiler chicken (Pimentel et al., 1997). ifap operations in arid or semiarid regions are thus of particular concern because of their high water demand on the limited supply of water, much of it from aquifers that may have limited recharge capacity. The 174,000-square-mile Ogallala aquifer, for example, is a fossil aquifer that dates back to the last ice age and underlies parts of Nebraska, Kansas, Colorado, Oklahoma, New Mexico, and Texas. Irrigation has reduced the Ogallala by more than half, and current depletion rates exceed 3.3 feet per year of water table level (McMichael, 1993; Soule and Piper, 1992). Because the aquifer’s very slow recharge rate is vastly outstripped by irrigation and other human needs, the aquifer is at risk of being fully depleted, threatening not only agriculture but drinking water supplies for a huge area of the United States.

American megacity development devastates the Ogallala aquifier

Fornos 98 (president of the Population Institute, a non-profit advocating for resource issues, http://www.texnews.com/1998/opinion/pop0322.html)JFS

As world population soars towards six billion, available land in rural areas is overplowed and overpumped. For many people in developing countries, the countryside offers only hardships brought on by high fertility rates, environmental degradation and diminishing resources. These problems are not confined to the developing world. Population growth and migration within the United States have caused dramatic changes in western states such as Texas. These areas will face serious challenges of balancing population and economic growth with environmental sustainability. But Texas is better equipped to handle these pressures than many developing countries. Some of the world's cities are growing so large, due primarily to high fertility rates and rural-to-urban migration, that a new urban category has been designated for them. Cities with populations over eight million are now called "megacities." The most crowded megacities are expected to have populations between 18 and 27 million by 2015. Of crucial concern are the 27 megacities located in developing countries already struggling to provide their populations with the most basic services. High fertility rates account for two-thirds of the population growth of developing world cities. Only one-third is a result of rural to urban migration as people abandon the countryside seeking economic opportunity in the city. As residents of one of the fastest growing states, Texans understand some of the stresses population growth can have on the environment and living conditions. In north Texas, the gradual loss of the Ogallala aquifer is a textbook example of an imbalance between population and resources. Urban leaders around the world have learned hard lessons about the stress a large city can put on the environment. Without sanitation systems and pollution controls, cities spew pollutants into the air and water, leading to health problems among people near and far, and harming the environment as well. Currently, 2.6 billion people worldwide do not have adequate sanitation. In addition, forests are being transformed by urban expansion and by people seeking the resources they need for survival. Forests provide 70 percent of developing world families with their only source of fuel. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations reports the loss of continuous forest coverage is occurring most rapidly in Brazil and Asia, where eight of the top 10 megacities will be located by 2015. Unsustainable population increases in the developing world place tremendous pressures on countries like the United States that face a steady influx of immigrants, both legal and illegal, searching for a better life. Texas has been subjected to these pressures as a result of its long border with Mexico. Texas is the third (after California and New York) most popular destination for immigrants annually. Despite its sheer enormity, the state of Texas is becoming more densely populated, with its population per square mile increasing from 36.4 people in 1960 to 64.9 in 1990 and 71.2 in 1996. Texas may not be in danger of running out of space, but its increasing population will severely drain some of the state's natural resources, such as the Ogallala aquifer. Many world leaders acknowledge the need for universal access to voluntary family planning information, education and services. In fact, 82 countries have stated in official government positions that their birth rates are too high. According to the World Fertility Survey, 400 million women did not want their last child, wanted more spacing between their children or do not want another child, yet lack access to family planning information, education and services. On this small planet, we all must share natural resources such as water, air, fuel and food and realize we are susceptible to the same infectious diseases. As citizens of the world, the problems of overpopulated megacities in seemingly faraway places are also our own.

Collapse of the aquifier causes a global food crisis – nobody can fill in

Villiers 1

[Marq, veteran journalist, magazine editor and writer, who has worked as a foreign correspondent in Moscow, South Africa, and other places, Water: The Fate of Our Most Precious Resource, Pg 161-162]

The problem, though, is that the bankrupting of agriculture in the region will affect more than a few farmers, or even a few states.  Irrigation has made this second-rate farmland one of the world's breadbaskets.  A significant proportion of American grain exports come from the Ogallala states, and almost half of America's beef.  If, as is widely expected, China's water crisis drives it to the world market for grain, and if that increasing demand occurs when either the Ogallala Aquifer is exhausted or water becomes too expensive to pump, that could precipitate a global food crisis.  No one- not Argentina, Canada, or Australia- would be able to produce enough to make up the shortfall.  Of course, the future is unreadable and forecasting the future a game for the foolhardy, but it's easy to see that a calamity could possibly follow.  It's the human and political- the geopolitical- consequences that constitute water's most potent crisis.

American agriculture failure triggers mass death globally

Sircus 10 (Mark, director of agriculture news, “agricultural apocalypse 2010,” http://agriculture.imva.info/food-prices/agricultural-apocalypse-2010)JFS

The world faces “mass starvation” following North America’s next major crop failure. And it could even happen before year’s end. So says Chicago-based Don Coxe, who is one of the world’s leading experts on agricultural commodities, so much so that Canada’s renowned BMO Financial Group named the fund after him. A crop failure in North America will have particularly dire consequences for major overseas markets that are highly reliant on U.S. crop imports. Scientists in England are warning that a “perfect storm” of food shortages and water scarcity now threatens to unleash public unrest and conflict, the government’s chief scientist, Professor John Beddington, has warned.[[i]](file:///C:\Documents%20and%20Settings\Usuario\Desktop\Mark%20Sircus\Agricultural_Apocalypse_Update_2009%20CORRECTED.doc#_edn1) “People do not quite realise the scale of the issue,” said Professor Mike Bevan. “This is one of the most serious problems that science has ever faced.” In Britain the lives of hundreds of thousands of people will be threatened by food shortages. The repercussions of food shortages for any society are devastating. The world faces “mass starvation” following more major crop failures in the United States and other places around the globe. According to Chicago-based Don Coxe, who is one of the world’s leading experts on agricultural commodities, so much so that Canada’s renowned BMO Financial Group named the fund after him, this mind boggling event could happen before year’s end. We are facing a problem that literally has never been faced in human history. Surging population and food demand, food inflation, diminishing world food stocks, drought, flooding, cold, diminished credit, infestations, soil erosion, industrial farming, factory farm pollution, aquifers/wells going dry, relocation of produce for energy production are all slamming into a global financial and economic crisis. And in some places like the United States they don’t have enough farmers. Then on top of everything else we have desertification, which is one of the world’s most pressing environmental issues. New deserts are growing at a rate of 20,000 square miles (51,800 square kilometers) a year. Desertification leads to famine, mass starvation and human migration. According to Eric de Carbonnel, “There is overwhelming, undeniable evidence that the world will run out of food next year. The 2010 Food Crisis is going to be different. It is the crisis that will make all doomsday scenarios come true. Early in 2009, the supply and demand in agricultural markets went badly out of balance. The world experienced a catastrophic fall in food production as a result of the financial crisis (low commodity prices and lack of credit) and adverse weather on a global scale. Normally food prices should have already shot higher months ago, leading to lower food consumption and bringing the global food supply/demand situation back into balance. This never happened because the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), instead of adjusting production estimates down to reflect decreased production, adjusted estimates upwards to match increasing demand from china. In this way, the USDA has brought supply and demand back into balance (on paper) and temporarily delayed a rise in food prices by ensuring a catastrophe in 2010.”[[ii]](file:///C:\Documents%20and%20Settings\Usuario\Desktop\Mark%20Sircus\Agricultural_Apocalypse_Update_2009%20CORRECTED.doc#_edn2) According to the United States Department of Agriculture U.S. farmers produced the largest corn and soybean crops on record in 2009. And there are people who believe that anyone who believes government figures on anything concerning the economy or anything else is a total moron. Very few people in the US have given any serious consideration to the question of food security. This essay should convince people that its time to start. For the most part, we’re not aware of the problem but if we look hard at the ‘hidden’ news we see that the handwriting is on the wall for an unimaginable crisis that will come on us as early as this year. More than 2.1 million hectares of grain have been destroyed by drought in 2009 in Russia, Agriculture Minister Yelena Skrynnik said. A total of 616,000 hectares have been destroyed in the region, or 70% of the total amount planted.[[iii]](file:///C:\Documents%20and%20Settings\Usuario\Desktop\Mark%20Sircus\Agricultural_Apocalypse_Update_2009%20CORRECTED.doc#_edn3) “The world is blissfully unaware that the greatest economic, financial and political crisis ever is a few months away. It takes only the tiniest bit of research to realize something is going critically wrong in the agricultural market. All someone needs to do to know the world is headed for food crisis is to stop reading USDA’s crop reports predicting a record soybean and corn harvests and listen to what else the USDA is saying.

**Food crises cause nuclear war**

Cribb 10 (Julian, Julian Cribb is a science communicator, journalist and editor of several newspapers and books. His published work includes over 7,000 newspaper articles, 1,000 broadcasts, and three books and has received 32 awards for science, medical, agricultural and business journalism. He was Director, National Awareness, for Australia's science agency, CSIRO, foundation president of the Australian Science Communicators, and originated the CGIAR's Future Harvest strategy. He has worked as a newspaper editor, science editor for "The Australian "and head of public affairs for CSIRO. He runs his own science communication consultancy, “The coming famine: the global food crisis and what we can do to avoid it,” p. 26)

This is the most likely means by which the coming famine will affect all citizens of Earth, both through the direct consequences of refugee floods for receiving countries and through the effect on global food prices and the cost to public revenues of redressing the problem. Coupled with this is the risk of wars breaking out over local disputes about food, land, and water and the dangers that the major military powers may be sucked into these vortices, that smaller nations newly nuclear-armed may become embroiled, and that shock waves propagated by these conflicts will jar the global economy and disrupt trade, sending food prices into a fresh spiral. Indeed, an increasingly credible scenario for World War III is not so much a confrontation of superpowers and their allies as a festering, self-perpetuating chain of resource conflicts driven by the widening gap between food and energy supplies and peoples' need to secure them.

d-rule

Watson 77 (Richard, Professor of Philosophy @ Washington U, World Hunger and Moral Obligation, p. 118-119)JFS

These arguments are morally spurious. That food sufficient for well-nourished survival is the equal right of every human individual or nation is a specification of the higher principle that everyone has equal right to the necessities of life. The moral stress of the principle of equity is primarily on equal sharing, and only secondarily on what is being shared. The higher moral principle is of human *equity per se*. Consequently, the moral action is to distribute all food equally, whatever the consequences. This is the hard line apparently drawn by such moralists as Immanuel Kant and Noam Chomsky—but then, morality is hard. The conclusion may be unreasonable (impractical and irrational in conventional terms), but it is obviously moral. Nor should anyone purport surprise; it has always been understood that the claims of morality—if taken seriously—supersede those of conflicting reason. One may even have to sacrifice one’s life or one’s nation to be moral in situations where practical behavior would preserve it. For example, if a prisoner of war undergoing torture is to be a (perhaps dead) patriot even when reason tells him that collaboration will hurt no one, he remains silent. Similarly, if one is to be moral, one distributes available food in equal shares (even if everyone then dies). That an action is necessary to save one’s life is no excuse for behaving unpatriotically or immorally if one wishes to be a patriot or moral. No principle of morality absolves one of behaving immorally simply to save one’s life or nation. There is a strict analogy here between adhering to moral principles for the sake of being moral, and adhering to Christian principles for the sake of being Christian. The moral world contains pits and lions, but one looks always to the highest light. The ultimate test always harks to the highest principle—recant or die—and it is pathetic to profess morality if one quits when the going gets rough. I have put aside many questions of detail—such as the mechanical problems of distributing food—because detail does not alter the stark conclusion. If every human life is equal in value, then the equal distribution of the necessities of life is an extremely high, if not the highest, moral duty. It is at least high enough to override the excuse that by doing it one would lose one’s life. But many people cannot accept the view that one must distribute equally even in f the nation collapses or all people die. If everyone dies, then there will be no realm of morality. Practically speaking, sheer survival comes first. One can adhere to the principle of equity only if one exists. So it is rational to suppose that the principle of survival is morally higher than the principle of equity. And though one might not be able to argue for unequal distribution of food to save a nation—for nations can come and go—one might well argue that unequal distribution is necessary for the survival of the human species. That is, some large group—say one-third of present world population—should be at least well-nourished for human survival. However, from an individual standpoint, the human species—like the nation—is of no moral relevance. From a naturalistic standpoint, survival does come first; from a moralistic standpoint—as indicated above—survival may have to be sacrificed. In the milieu of morality, it is immaterial whether or not the human species survives as a result of individual behavior.

Consult the Tribes

Specifically, not consulting violates rights given to indigenous people under international law

Ward 11 (Northwestern Law Journal of International Human Rights, http://www.law.northwestern.edu/journals/jihr/v10/n2/2/index.html)JFS

What becomes clear in this analysis is the size of the gap between the norms being developed within international human rights jurisprudence and State practice. If FPIC, as stated earlier, is intended as a way to ensure meaningful engagement with indigenous peoples with regard to their lands, territories, and resources, then stronger legally binding obligations are required. The cases of both the Lubicon Cree and the Mayan Communities of Sipakapa and San Miguel Ixtahuacan demonstrate that consultations cannot simply be considered administrative procedures, but rather must be implemented with the understanding that consultations are an expression of the right to self-determination. In the case of the Lubicon Cree, their rights to consultation regarding oil and gas exploitation have largely been ignored because of a land dispute with the Canadian government. It is the failure to have their land rights recognised which has further caused their right to consultation to be violated. The Mayan Communities of Guatemala have clearly articulated their struggle against the Marlin Mine as a violation of their rights to both consultation and FPIC. In this case, no significant attempt was made on the part of the Guatemalan government to undertake consultations of any kind, nor to ensure that the mining company undertook meaningful, informed, and culturally appropriate consultations prior to either the exploration or exploitation of resources within the Mayan territories. The outcome in both cases is that the Lubicon Cree and the Mayan Communities of Sipakapa and San Miguel Ixtahuacan have had their participation rights violated. In the end, this has resulted in the ongoing exploitation of resources within traditional territories without the collective consent of the affected indigenous peoples. These cases highlight the need for clear domestic legislation modeled after international norms to implement appropriate and meaningful consultations and give adequate protection to indigenous peoples. The cases also demonstrate the need to further develop the standards being applied by the Inter-American System with regard to the three safeguards as developed in the *Saramaka People v. Suriname*case.**[273](http://www.law.northwestern.edu/journals/jihr/v10/n2/2/index.html" \l "note273)**

Violation of indigenous human rights is a d-rule

Dean B. **Suagee, 1992** (J.D., University of North Carolina, University of Michigan Law School,

University of Michigan Journal of Law Reform, 25 U. Mich. J.L. Reform 671, Lexis, Accessed July 6, 2009)

Although some indigenous peoples do not face imminent threats to their survival as distinct peoples, many do, and the forces that threaten them are largely beyond their control. To a large extent, the peoples of the industrialized (and industrializing) world have the power to decide whether indigenous peoples will survive. Utilitarian reasons can be advanced for ensuring indigenous peoples' survival. For instance, we can learn from their experience in balancing human needs with environmental preservation and from their knowledge of herbal medicine. To do this, however, we need to take some time to appreciate the subtleties of teachings which have been handed down over countless generations since mythic time. At another level, however, one can argue that we should not be governed by utilitarian thinking alone. We should act instead on principle. **Indigenous peoples are part of the human family and we should treat them as such**. We should recognize that they are entitled to human rights under international law **as a matter of principle.**

Only the CP solves – it educates federal officials on proper consultation, solving future interactions.

Pata and Dossett 09

Jacqueline Johnson Pata, NCAI Executive Director and John Dossett, NCAI General Counsel, “White House Meeting with Tribal Leaders¶ Background Paper on Tribal Consultation and Tribal Sovereignty”¶ August 25, 2009 <http://www.ncai.org/attachments/Consultation_WGKjwfnREGrEXaaxDYQlEUJvmUkRZviFQZnkppvWzAPHlzwuXYC_Meeting%20Notice%20and%20Background%20Paper%20on%20Tribal%20Consultation%20and%20Tribal%20Sovereignty.pdf>

To address the first concern, tribal leaders should consider asking President Obama to refocus the Executive Order to emphasize its substantive requirements of respecting tribal sovereignty and the trust responsibility. Too often, federal agency officials do not read the Executive Order beyond the word “consultation” in the title, and view it as only a procedural requirement -- another hoop to jump through. This misunderstanding undermines the effectiveness of the Executive Order.¶ Section 3 of the Executive Order contains substantive “Policymaking Criteria” that lie at the heart of the federal-tribal relationship: “Agencies shall respect Indian tribal self-government and sovereignty, honor tribal treaty and other rights, and strive to meet the responsibilities that arise from the unique legal relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribal governments.” Section 3 specifically supports tribal self-government, directing federal agencies to “defer to Indian tribes to establish standards,” and “preserve the prerogatives and authority of Indian tribes.”¶ Refocusing the Executive Order on its action components would educate federal officials that tribal consultation is a tool that is used to implement larger policy goals -- respect for tribal sovereignty and the federal trust responsibility. In a Nation-to-Nation relationship, tribal consultation should be redefined as a process of decision-making that works in a cooperative process toward reaching a consensus before a decision is made or action is taken. The goal of consultation is to reach a mutually agreeable understanding and decisions that acknowledge the interests of both the federal and tribal governments.¶ Further, the Executive Order should also acknowledge the fundamental purpose of tribal self-determination and the federal trust responsibility as longstanding agreements intended to assure that Indian tribes will maintain their cultures and viability as distinct groups of people. An understanding of the values of tribal cultures is needed in order to instill meaning into what are otherwise abstract principles.

The perm doesn’t solve – only genuine and binding consultation preserves native rights

Haskew, 2000

Derek C. Haskew, 2000 (Managing Attorney, DNA-People's Legal Services, American Indian Law Review, 24 Am. Indian L. Rev. 21; Lexis)

The proliferation of tribal consultation requirements in federal statutes and policies n3 is arguably a laudable first step toward a mature understanding by the [\*22] [\*23] federal government of the sovereignty of Native American tribes. n4 Indeed, successful consultations between tribal liaisons and federal decision makers--far beyond the halls of Congress--can contribute to the creation of more enlightened, better constructed, and more effective federal policies, projects, and regulations. n5 However, "consultation" remains an ill-defined term in the context of recent (fashionable) use by Congress, the President, and other federal policymakers. Consultation requirements vest tribes with uncertain benefits and create an unsettled set of responsibilities for federal stewards, most prominently the Secretary of the Interior and Assistant Secretary of Indian Affairs. A useful definition of "meaningful consultation" is found in Lower Brule Sioux Tribe v. Deer, n6 which explains what potentially takes place during the formal process of consultations between federal agencies and tribal government officials. The typical consultation described in Lower Brule Sioux would have taken place between the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) and the tribe: consultation comprised a one to two hour meeting, not more than one half day, during which meeting the [BIA] superintendent notifies the Council of the BIA's proposed action, justifying his reasoning. The Tribal Council may either issue a motion or [\*24] resolution of support for the decision, or reject the decision. The tribe recognizes that the BIA need not obey the Council's decision. Meaningful consultation means tribal consultation in advance with the decision maker or with intermediaries with clear authority to present tribal views to the BIA decision maker. The decision maker is to comply with BIA and administration policies. n7 This definition omits all the procedures that would precede any such meeting, such as notice and response, which are generally understood to be a part of the consultation process. n8 But more importantly, while this definition is perhaps a useful starting point, it fails to note the larger perspective, more subtle meanings, and contentious issues that are at the heart of federal-tribal consultations as they have come to be practiced. This article explores the problematic social and political dynamics and legal issues that underlie the obvious meaning of "consultation." A. The Importance of Tribal Consultations The image of an Indian and a white man meeting to talk is evocative of the romanticized negotiations of yesteryear. This image in turn is inextricably linked to lore of the Indian, defeated by fate yet participating in good faith, and the white man's subsequent betrayals. I will not examine the lore, n9 but offer the image as a starting point for the argument that consultations may be one method by which that betrayal is perpetrated today. By this view, the purpose of consultation requirements is to satisfy the desires of Native Americans to be involved in decisions that affect them, while not binding the government to anything resembling a commitment. Consultations, therefore, may confuse the real consent of Indian communities to federal actions with the procedural illusion of participation, in which Indian consent is never really asked for, and advice is never really heeded. A more savory view of consultations is that government recognizes the wisdom of considering the unique perspectives of Native Americans during policy debate, and is making every effort to incorporate those views and interests in federal planning.

Prior consultation key

Pata and Dossett 09

Jacqueline Johnson Pata, NCAI Executive Director and John Dossett, NCAI General Counsel, “White House Meeting with Tribal Leaders¶ Background Paper on Tribal Consultation and Tribal Sovereignty”¶ August 25, 2009 <http://www.ncai.org/attachments/Consultation_WGKjwfnREGrEXaaxDYQlEUJvmUkRZviFQZnkppvWzAPHlzwuXYC_Meeting%20Notice%20and%20Background%20Paper%20on%20Tribal%20Consultation%20and%20Tribal%20Sovereignty.pdf>

There is sometimes a Catch-22 in the consultation process that exists with tribal governments, and with any effort by the federal government to consult with outside entities. The dilemma is that most of the opportunities for sharing information and views happen very early in the decision-making process, long before any specific proposal has been committed to paper. But it is difficult to hold a consultation on a proposal that has not been written down. At the other end of the scale, once a large bureaucracy like the federal government has begun to formulate written proposals, it is easy to hold a consultation meeting, but decisions have already been made on the most fundamental questions regarding the need for action and the scope of issues to be considered. In sum, it becomes more and more difficult to influence federal government decisions if you wait until they are ready for a formal consultation.

“Increase” is certain and immediate

Rogers 5 (Judge, STATE OF NEW YORK, ET AL., PETITIONERS v. U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, RESPONDENT, NSR MANUFACTURERS ROUNDTABLE, ET AL., INTERVENORS, 2005 U.S. App. LEXIS 12378, \*\*; 60 ERC (BNA) 1791, 6/24, lexis)

 [\*\*48]  Statutory Interpretation. [HN16](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=1fe428155fdfc9074f3623f0dae9d78a&docnum=14&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAW&_md5=0ebd338d6a7793de8561db53b915effd&focBudTerms=term%20increase&focBudSel=all#clscc16)While the CAA defines a "modification" as any physical or operational change that "increases" emissions, it is silent on how to calculate such "increases" in emissions. [42 U.S.C. § 7411(a)(4)](http://www.lexis.com/research/buttonTFLink?_m=8541fbf7a7f5554ca588059b132acd17&_xfercite=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b367%20U.S.%20App.%20D.C.%203%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_butType=4&_butStat=0&_butNum=103&_butInline=1&_butinfo=42%20U.S.C.%207411&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=14&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAW&_md5=1f89a0e47b1996a5400e8d865d8da08a). According to government petitioners, the lack of a statutory definition does not render the term "increases" ambiguous, but merely compels the court to give the term its "ordinary meaning." See [Engine Mfrs.Ass'nv.S.Coast AirQualityMgmt.Dist., 541 U.S. 246, 124 S. Ct. 1756, 1761, 158 L. Ed. 2d 529(2004)](http://www.lexis.com/research/buttonTFLink?_m=8541fbf7a7f5554ca588059b132acd17&_xfercite=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b367%20U.S.%20App.%20D.C.%203%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_butType=3&_butStat=2&_butNum=104&_butInline=1&_butinfo=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b541%20U.S.%20246%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=14&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAW&_md5=48f016ea3eabfdb898b67b348b11662c); [Bluewater Network, 370 F.3d at 13](http://www.lexis.com/research/buttonTFLink?_m=8541fbf7a7f5554ca588059b132acd17&_xfercite=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b367%20U.S.%20App.%20D.C.%203%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_butType=3&_butStat=2&_butNum=105&_butInline=1&_butinfo=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b370%20F.3d%201%2cat%2013%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=14&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAW&_md5=78fdfe9d48c7b91d7659b90c0198707e); [Am. Fed'n of Gov't Employees v. Glickman, 342 U.S. App. D.C. 7, 215 F.3d 7, 10 [\*23]  (D.C. Cir. 2000)](http://www.lexis.com/research/buttonTFLink?_m=8541fbf7a7f5554ca588059b132acd17&_xfercite=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b367%20U.S.%20App.%20D.C.%203%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_butType=3&_butStat=2&_butNum=106&_butInline=1&_butinfo=%3ccite%20cc%3d%22USA%22%3e%3c%21%5bCDATA%5b342%20U.S.%20App.%20D.C.%207%5d%5d%3e%3c%2fcite%3e&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=14&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVlz-zSkAW&_md5=fb18ff0b92931ac00621d88dae997e67). Relying on two "real world" analogies, government petitioners contend that the ordinary meaning of "increases" requires the baseline to be calculated from a period immediately preceding the change. They maintain, for example, that in determining whether a high-pressure weather system "increases" the local temperature, the relevant baseline is the temperature immediately preceding the arrival of the weather system, not the temperature five or ten years ago. Similarly,  [\*\*49]  in determining whether a new engine "increases" the value of a car, the relevant baseline is the value of the car immediately preceding the replacement of the engine, not the value of the car five or ten years ago when the engine was in perfect condition.

**Investment is certain**

**Malik 8** **(**Mahnaz Malik, International Institute for Sustainable Development, Nov, 2008, “Recent Developments in the Definition of

Investment in International Investment Agreements”, PDF, KENTUCK)

The definition of investment in a large number of IIAs includes a requirement that the investment must be made in accordance with the laws and the regulations of the host state. This phrase prevents investments that would be illegal under the host state law from receiving protection under the treaty. A growing number of tribunals have reflected on this provision, and the limits to its scope have also emerged. In particular, tribunals have rejected host state arguments that the assets claming to be an investment under the treaty should be considered an investment according to local laws and regulations.

Investment has to be immediate

**CBO, 91** – Congressional Budgeting Office (“How Federal Spending for Infrastructure and Other Public Investments Affects the Economy – Trends in Investment,” CBO publication, July 1991, p. ix, available via google)

Investment, or capital spending, may be defined broadly as the expenditure of current resources to produce income or other benefits over some period in the future. Investment is distinguished from outlays for consumption, which are intended to provide immediate benefits. The federal budget and most other accounting systems treat all government outlays, even purchases of long-lived assets, as consumption because the purchases cannot clearly be shown to produce income as officially measured. Yet some federal expenditures clearly seem to be investments: like private investments, they produce a stream of economic benefits over time. The conventional definition of investment thus might reasonably be extended to include federal spending for physical infrastructure, some human resource programs, and research and development.

Substantial means certain and immediate

Words and Phrases 64 (40 W&P 759)

The words “outward, open, actual, visible, substantial, and exclusive,” in connection with a change of possession, mean substantially the same thing. They mean not concealed, not hidden; exposed to view; free from concealment, dissimulation, reserve, or disguise; in full existence; denoting that which no merely can be, but is opposed to potential, apparent, constructive, and imaginary; veritable; genuine; certain; absolute; real at present time, as a matter of fact, not merely nominal; opposed to form; actually existing; true; not including, admiring, or pertaining to any others; undivided; sole; opposed to inclusive.

“should” means certain and immediate

Summer ’94 [Justice Summer, Oklahoma Supreme Court, “Kelsey v. Dollarsaver Food Warehouse of Durant”, 1994, http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker3fn14]

¶4 The legal question to be resolved by the court is whether the word "should"[13](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287" \l "marker3fn13) in the May 18 order connotes futurity or may be deemed a ruling in praesenti.[14](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287" \l "marker3fn14) The answer to this query is not to be divined from rules of grammar;[15](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287" \l "marker3fn15) it must be governed by the age-old practice culture of legal professionals and its immemorial language usage. To determine if the omission (from the critical May 18 entry) of the turgid phrase, "and the same hereby is", (1) makes it an in futuro ruling - i.e., an expression of what the judge will or would do at a later stage - or (2) constitutes an in in praesenti resolution of a disputed law issue, the trial judge's intent must be garnered from the four corners of the entire record. [CONTINUES – TO FOOTNOTE] [13](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker2fn13) "*Should*" not only is used as a "present indicative" synonymous with *ought* but also is the past tense of "shall" with various shades of meaning not always easy to analyze. See 57 C.J. Shall § 9, Judgments § 121 (1932). O. JESPERSEN, GROWTH AND STRUCTURE OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE (1984); St. Louis & S.F.R. Co. v. Brown, 45 Okl. 143, 144 P. 1075, 1080-81 (1914). For a more detailed explanation, see the Partridge quotation infra note 15. Certain contexts mandate a construction of the term "should" as more than merely indicating preference or desirability. Brown, supra at 1080-81 (jury instructions stating that jurors "should" reduce the amount of damages in proportion to the amount of contributory negligence of the plaintiff was held to imply an *obligation* *and to be more than advisory*); Carrigan v. California Horse Racing Board, 60 Wash. App. 79, [802 P.2d 813](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/deliverdocument.asp?box1=802&box2=P.2D&box3=813) (1990) (one of the Rules of Appellate Procedure requiring that a party "should devote a section of the brief to the request for the fee or expenses" was interpreted to mean that a party is under an *obligation* to include the requested segment); State v. Rack, 318 S.W.2d 211, 215 (Mo. 1958) ("should" would mean the same as "shall" or "must" when used in an instruction to the jury which tells the triers they "should disregard false testimony"). [14](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/DeliverDocument.asp?CiteID=20287#marker2fn14) In praesenti means literally "at the present time." BLACK'S LAW DICTIONARY 792 (6th Ed. 1990). In legal parlance the phrase denotes that which in law is *presently* or immediately effective, as opposed to something that will or would become effective in the future *[in futurol*]. See Van Wyck v. Knevals, [106 U.S. 360](http://www.oscn.net/applications/oscn/deliverdocument.asp?box1=106&box2=U.S.&box3=360), 365, 1 S.Ct. 336, 337, 27 L.Ed. 201 (1882).