# Free Trade

**Ports are being upgraded now**

**AP 12** by RUSS BYNUM and BRUCE SMITH (“Charleston and other Southeast, Gulf port cities need deeper waterways; Corps of Engineers,” 6/22/12, http://www.postandcourier.com/article/20120622/PC05/120629718/1010/charleston-and-other-southeast-gulf-port-cities-need-deeper-waterways-corps-of-engineers)

¶ The deepening projects singled out by the Army Corps represent just a fraction of the money U.S. ports are spending to upgrade their docks, ship-to-shore cranes and other infrastructure. The American Association of Port Authorities released a survey last week showing U.S. ports plan to spend at least $46 billion on improvements in the next five years.¶ Still, the Corps’ report cautioned that “uncertainty will persist” for several years after the Panama Canal expansion is finished as to how many supersized ships will call on U.S. ports, which ones they’ll frequent and how full their cargo decks will be.¶ Giant ships sailing through Egypt’s Suez Canal have already begun making trips to the East Coast, where high tides give them enough of a boost to reach ports such as Savannah and Charleston.¶ The budget crisis has made federal funding for port projects extremely tight, especially since Congress and President Barack Obama for the past two years have sworn off so-called “earmark” spending that was used to fund such projects in the past.¶ The Army Corps report said current funding levels for port improvements won’t cover all the projects that should be done. If Congress won’t increase the agency’s funding for harbor projects, the report said, then perhaps state governments and private companies such as shipping lines should be required to pay a greater share.

# Navy

**Reliance on the Navy is inevitable  
Whiteneck 2010** (Daniel Whiteneck • Michael Price • Neil Jenkins •Peter Swartz, CNA Analysis & Solutions, “The Navy at a Tipping Point: Maritime Dominance at Stake?” March,<http://www.public.navy.mil/usff/documents/navy_at_tipping_point.pdf>)

In the future, the demand for the Navy will continue to be part of an activist US foreign policy. There is no end in sight for coalition leadership, counter-terrorism on a global scale, or the use of U.S. forces to demonstrate commitment and resolve in areas of interest. The importance of access secured by continuous Department of Defense and Department of State efforts with partners will support this global presence. U.S. interests in securing the global commons (sea, air, space, cyber) will remain in place, and the U.S. will remain the guarantor of security for democratic nations through its near monopoly on high-end military power and defensive systems. Continued demand for active peacetime engagement by the U.S. military will be met by maritime diplomacy to support administration priorities and to support security cooperation activities by COCOMs.

#### Navy prevents security alliance collapse and South China Sea conflicts

#### Snyder 96, Asia Specialist at the United States Institute of Peace’s Research and Studies Program, 96 (Scott, “The South China Sea Dispute: Prospects for Preventive Diplomacy,” August, Special Report Number 18, http://www.usip.org/pubs/specialreports/early/snyder/South\_China\_Sea2.html)

Many specialists believe a leading U.S. role in trying to resolve the Spratly Islands dispute is likely to complicate matters by adding another contentious issue to the already-overloaded agenda of U.S.-Chinese relations. Such a role would also be perceived by China as interference by a nonclaimant in an attempt to internationalize the issue. At the same time, the fact that China responded at the ARF meeting in Brunei to the major U.S. concerns highlighted in its May 10, 1995, statement on the Spratly Islands suggests that the United States may be able to indirectly influence the claimants to be active in constructive directions while also taking actions to diminish the possibility that intimidation tactics might be used as part of a negotiation process. The U.S. naval presence in the region is essential in implementing the second aspect of U.S. policy toward the South China Sea by deterring the use of military force by any of the disputants. A regular U.S. naval presence in the South China Sea area underscores the nation's interest in stability and reinforces the prevailing interpretation that a significant part of the South China Sea outside of the immediate area of the Spratly Islands is categorized as high seas, where no party exercises territorial jurisdiction. In the event of destabilizing unilateral actions by any party to the Spratly Islands dispute, the U.S. Navy has an interest in playing its balancing role in the Asia-Pacific area by undertaking an augmented presence in international waters proportional to the severity of any unilateral provocation. Such a response would underscore the U.S. commitment to seeing the dispute resolved nonviolently, while avoiding taking sides in or becoming a party to the conflict. The recent U.S. naval response to Chinese missile exercises in the Taiwan Straits show that a stepped-up U.S. military presence in response to aggressive unilateral actions may be important in reassuring Asian allies that the United States maintains the political will to deter aggressive or destabilizing unilateral actions that threaten the status quo in Asia. Some analysts have suggested that the United States support greater transparency in the South China Sea by using satellite reconnaissance to actively monitor and make public reports on activities in the area. Another possibility--if such information were made available to a nongovernmental mediator respected by all sides in the Spratly Islands dispute--would be to find a way to provide technical support for South China Sea "proximity" negotiations by using satellite imagery similar to that provided by the Defense Mapping Agency for the Bosnian proximity talks. The likelihood is slim that direct U.S. intervention will be useful or accepted in resolving the Spratly Islands dispute. After all, there is a range of mechanisms that might be used to bring about a peaceful settlement of the issue without U.S. involvement. The most constructive role for the United States may be in urging the parties to muster the political will necessary to find peaceful solutions while continuing to discourage a military resolution of future disputes. Most important, the United States might support preventive diplomacy by the parties involved by underscoring positive precedents such as the decision by Great Britain and Argentina to enter into negotiations over Falkland Islands boundaries without prejudice to the claims made by the disputants themselves. A steady U.S. policy of "active neutrality"--combined with a "forward-leaning" posture to deter potentially destabilizing military aggression and stepped-up support for an expeditious and peaceful resolution of the parties' conflicting claims consistent with the Law of the Sea--is the surest sign of support for preventive diplomacy that the United States can offer to deter potential conflict in the South China Sea.

**That conflict causes extinction**

**Cheong 2k** – East Asia Correspondent (Ching Cheong, The Straits Times, “No one gains in war over Taiwan,” 6-25-2000, Lexis-Nexis Universe)

A cross-strait conflict, even at the lowest end of the intensity scale, will suffice to truncate, if not to reverse, the steep GNP growth trends of the past few years.Other than the quantifiable losses from disrupted trade flows, there is also the longer-term damage to consider.¶For example, it took Taiwan almost three decades to establish itself as the third largest producer of information technology (IT) products in the world. It is now the island's single largest foreign exchange earner.The Sept 21 earthquake last year demonstrated the risk involved in Taiwan's dependence on the IT industry.A few days of power blackouts disrupted chip-manufacturing operations on the island, which in turn sent prices of these components soaring worldwide.Not surprisingly, a scramble followed for alternative sources of supply.¶A blockade lasting three months will devastate the industry in Taiwan.Similarly, it has taken China more than two decades to establish itself as the second largest recipient of private direct investment.In recent years, such investment has amounted to more than 20 per cent of China's total capital formation.A capital outflow will follow if there is trouble across the strait.Other than China and Taiwan, Japan's economy is likely to be hurt too if the blockade disrupts its "life-line" -the sea lane through which flows its supplies of oil and other commodities.Though no physical loss will be incurred, the blockade will force up prices across the board as Japan is so dependent on this sea lane.The Asean region stands to gain in the short run.Those with strong IT industries, like Singapore and Malaysia, will carve a big slice from what was previously Taiwan's share.Similarly, as investment flees China, the Asean countries might be able to intercept this flow and benefit thereby.¶Politically, the blockade is likely to provoke Sino-phobia in the region.Japan's rightwing forces will seize this golden opportunity to demand a revision of the post-war Constitution prohibiting its rearmament.Asean countries having territorial disputes with Beijing in the South China Sea will beef up their defence budgets.Ethnic Chinese population in these countries may have to contend with increased suspicion or worse as Sino-phobia rises.The US stands to gain. So long as its stays on the sidelines, it does not lose the Chinese market. At the same time its defence industry gains as countries in the region start stocking up on arms in anticipation of trouble.DESTROYING THE TAIWAN MILITARYTHE medium intensity scenario postulates a situation in which Beijing wages a war against Taiwan.The objective here is to obliterate its military capability which is seen as underpinning its independence movement.The outcome: Taiwan is brought to its knees but only after widespread death and destruction have been inflicted on the island and the coastal provinces of China.In this scenario, the US while feeling obliged to supportTaiwan militarily is not party to a full-scale war with China.Washington's primary concern would be to keep it to a "limited war" to prevent hostilities from spinning out of control. Limited though it may be, the war will set back the economies of China and Taiwan by at least two to three decades.All the short-term gains enjoyed by the Asean countries in the low-intensity scenario will be nullified as the conflict intensifies.In this medium-intensity scenario, no one gains.Politically, all countries are forced to take sides.This decision is particularly hard to make in those countries having a sizeable ethnic-Chinese population.THE DOOMSDAY SCENARIO THE high-intensity scenario postulates a cross-strait war escalating into a full-scale war between the US and China. If Washington were to conclude that splitting China would better serve its national interests, then a full-scale war becomes unavoidable.Conflict on such a scale would embroil other countries far and near and -horror of horrors -raise the possibility of a nuclear war.Beijing has already told the US and Japan privately that it considers any country providing bases and logistics support to any US forces attacking China as belligerent parties open to its retaliation.¶In the region, this means South Korea, Japan, the Philippines and, to a lesser extent, Singapore.If China were to retaliate, east Asia will be set on fire.And the conflagration may not end there as opportunistic powers elsewhere may try to overturn the existing world order.¶With the US distracted, Russia may seek to redefine Europe's political landscape. The balance of power in the Middle East may be similarly upset by the likes of Iraq.In south Asia, hostilities between India and Pakistan, each armed with its own nuclear arsenal, could enter a new and dangerous phase.Will a full-scale Sino-US war lead to a nuclear war?According to General Matthew Ridgeway, commander of the US Eighth Army which fought against the Chinese in the Korean War, the US had at the time thought of using nuclear weapons against China to save the US from military defeat.In his book The Korean War, a personal account of the military and political aspects of the conflict and its implications on future US foreign policy, Gen Ridgeway said that US was confronted with two choices in Korea -truce or a broadened war, which could have led to the use of nuclear weapons.If the US had to resort to nuclear weaponry to defeat China long before the latter acquired a similar capability, there is little hope of winning a war against China 50 years later, short of using nuclear weapons.The US estimates that China possesses about 20 nuclear warheads that can destroy major American cities. Beijing also seems prepared to go for the nuclear option.A Chinese military officer disclosed recently that Beijing was considering a review of its "non first use" principle regarding nuclear weapons.Major-General Pan Zhangqiang, president of the military-funded Institute for Strategic Studies, told a gathering at the Woodrow Wilson International Centre for Scholars in Washington that although the government still abided by that principle, there were strong pressures from the military to drop it.He said military leaders considered the use of nuclear weapons mandatory if the country risked dismemberment as a result of foreign intervention.Gen Ridgeway said that should that come to pass, we would see the destruction of civilisation.There would be no victors in such a war. While the prospect of a nuclear Armaggedon over Taiwan might seem inconceivable, it cannot be ruled out entirely, for China puts sovereignty above everything else.

**Collapse of security alliances causes nuclear war**

#### Millot 94 (Marc Dean, Analyst Rand Summer, The Washington Quarterly, “Facing the Emerging Reality of Regional Nuclear Adversaries”)

The lack of credible security assurances will push allies of the United States toward nuclear arsenals of their own to restore the military equilibrium upset by their local nuclear adversaries or by more general regional nuclear instabilities. These allies may well see a realization of their virtual nuclear arsenal as the only alternative to losing all influence over their own national security. This development, however, would lead down a worrisome path, with dangerous implications for regional stability and ultimately for the security of the United States itself. ¶One lesson U.S. defense decision makers should take from the growing understanding of U.S.-Soviet crises is that nuclear stability is not automatic. By the end of the Cold War nuclear stability was practically an institution; in the beginning it was barely a concept. As historians report their findings on such events as the Cuban missile crisis, it is becoming apparent that the superpowers learned to create stability on the basis of trial and error. n62 Reading the results of this research it is difficult not conclude that, particularly in the early days of U.S.-Soviet competition, luck played an uncomfortably significant role in avoidance of nuclear war. ¶It is possible that the new nuclear powers will learn from the history of U.S.-Soviet nuclear crises, just as they have learned to take advantage of U.S. technological innovations in the development of their own nuclear weapons programs. Perhaps the relatively rapid development of a stable regional nuclear balance is feasible. On the other hand, U.S. leaders should be concerned that nations with widely varying values, thought processes, and cultures may go through the learning experience without their own good fortune. It is hard to know where any nuclear war might end, or what lessons onlookers will take away from it. ¶It is doubtful that anyone is eager to run a real world experiment on the universality of the superpowers' nuclear logic. Indeed the vision of experimental failure on a massive scale has probably influenced U.S. decision makers to give prevention its privileged role in the national response to the proliferation threat. But now that regional adversaries of the United States are going nuclear, the experiment will begin if U.S. allies follow suit. As perhaps several of these experiments play themselves out, the odds increase that one will lead to nuclear war.

# India

# Inherency

**Status quo fails – expeditious funding is key**  
**Natale 1-31**-13 (We Need $30.2 Billion by 2020¶ By Patrick J. Natale, P.E.¶ P.E., Executive Director, American Society of Civil Engineers, <http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2013/01/ports-matter-too.php>)

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers estimates that over 95 percent of overseas trade produced or consumed by the United States moves through our nation’s 300 commercial ports. Yet, our ports are in danger of losing their competitive advantage due to the slow and very complex process of critical dredging projects. Wednesday’s hearing by the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee on the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund and the status of the nation's ports put a giant spotlight on that alarming fact. This issue is made all the more critical due to the looming arrival of new, larger container ships that will begin to pass through America’s ports once upgrades to the Panama Canal are completed in 2015. To accommodate this new traffic, U.S. seaports and inland waterways will need an investment of $30.2 billion by 2020 according to [a report](http://www.asce.org/failuretoact/) by the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE). In *Failure to Act: The Economic Impact of Current Investment Trends in Airports, Inland Waterways, and Marine Ports Infrastructure, ASCE finds that* only $14.4 billion in inland waterway and seaport funding is anticipated by 2020, creating a funding gap of $15.8 billion. This funding gap will have many consequences. Congestion and delays in our ports lead to goods sitting on the docks and in warehouses for shipment. These delays increase transportation costs for businesses, and then these costs are passed on to American families at the checkout counter. According to the ASCE study, if we do not invest in our nation’s ports and inland waterways systems, we are on a target to lose 738,000 jobs in 2020 and nearly $1 trillion in personal disposable income over next seven years. The good news is that with the additional investment between now and 2020, the nation can eliminate this potential drag on our economy. Unless America’s infrastructure investment gaps are filled, transporting goods will become costlier, prices will rise, and the United States will become less competitive in the global market. The nation’s seaports and inland waterways are critical links that make international commerce possible, and they deserve our attention.

**Ports won’t get enough money – internal competition**

**Schwartz 12** (John Schwartz, New York Times, August 20, 2012, “Panama Canal’s Growth Prompts U.S. Ports to Expand,” The New York Times, <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/08/21/us/us-ports-seek-to-lure-big-ships-after-panama-canal-expands.html?partner=rss&emc=rss>)

BALTIMORE — The four cranes rise grandly over the port here, 14 stories high. Just off the boat from China and now being prepared for operations, the $40 million machines are part of this city’s gamble that when supersize container ships start coming through the expanded Panama Canal in 2015, Baltimore will be one of the few ports on the East Coast ready for their business. “We think it’s going to be a major win for us,” said James J. White, the executive director of the Maryland Port Administration. This sense that the new set of locks now being built to allow giant ships through the canal will bring riches 1,000 miles or more to the north is shared by industry and government officials along the East Coast and the Gulf of Mexico, who have been promoting multimillion- — and in some cases multibillion- — dollar port projects for years. The Obama administration has now moved to speed up the review process for developing and deepening the harbors for several of these ports, including those of New York and New Jersey; Charleston, S.C.; Savannah, Ga.; Jacksonville, Fla.; and Miami. The initiative “will help drive job growth and strengthen the economy,” President Obama said in announcing it last month. But some who are following the efforts have begun to express skepticism about the hope and money going into dredging mud and raising steel. With so many ports competing for a share of the bounty, experts are questioning how big that bounty will be. “Everybody is trying to go after it — there are going to be few beneficiaries, in my judgment,” said William D. Ankner, a former official of the [Port Authority of New York and New Jersey](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/p/port_authority_of_new_york_and_new_jersey/index.html?inline=nyt-org) and a former secretary of transportation for Louisiana.The big ships — known as “Post-Panamax” and even “Super-Post-Panamax” — are already in heavy use worldwide, making up 16 percent of the container fleet but accounting for 45 percent of its capacity, [according to a July report](http://www.iwr.usace.army.mil/portandwaterways/) by the Army Corps of Engineers. And “those numbers are projected to grow significantly over the next 20 years,” said Maj. Gen. Michael J. Walsh, deputy commanding general for civil and emergency operations for the corps, in announcing the report.In the race that began when plans for the expansion were first announced in 2006, some winners have already emerged. The Port of Virginia, in Norfolk, is ready to receive the big ships today. And New York is also prepared, thanks to [a massive dredging project](http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9905EFD8163EF930A15752C1A9629C8B63&pagewanted=all) that began 13 years ago. But nearly every port in the game still faces major challenges and expenses — including the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, which plans to spend $1 billion to raise the Bayonne Bridge roadway by 64 feet to allow the giant ships through on their way to to Newark and Elizabeth, N.J.

# Solvency

**No impact to container shortages – don’t affect trade and exports**

**Tarnef 10** – Chubb Marine Underwriters, AVP at Chubb Insurance (Barry, “Container Shortage”, July 2010, <http://www.cargocover.com/pdfs/en_ContainerShortage.pdf>, page 1-2)

While the reports on this topic have been consistent over the past days, some freight forwarders have asserted that while cargo volumes have increased they are in line with seasonal expectations and space can still be found on vessels. Furthermore, the container shortage has yet to have an impact. Shippers could stay in close contact with their transportation providers and intermediaries and devise contingency plans that might include looking at different ports if bottlenecks or equipment issues arise and modal options such as ocean-air and air. Whether or not the ocean container shortage is fact or fiction, shippers should continue carefully inspecting the equipment for suitability prior to loading their cargo into the boxes. A few minutes can make the difference between loss-free delivery and a cargo claim. A quick walk around the container and stepping inside (being sure to close the doors to detect any light entering) allow you to identify defects and damages that need repair or require the container to be replaced.

**Status quo solves rails**

**Matsuda 12** [ STATEMENT OF DAVID T. MATSUDA MARITIME ADMINISTRATOR MARITIME ADMINISTRATION BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE SUBCOMMITTEE ON COAST GUARD AND MARITIME TRANSPORTATION The Maritime Administration’s Fiscal Year 2013 Budget Request March 7, 2012, <http://republicans.transportation.house.gov/Media/file/TestimonyCGMT/2012-03-07-Matsuda.pdf>]

Ports and Marine Highways are critical to MARAD’s mission and to economic competitiveness. The Nation’s ports are central to the economy. The America’s Marine Highway Program focuses on increasing the use of water transportation within the U.S. to supplement road and rail where it is feasible. Demonstration Projects funded in 2010 are beginning to come to fruition. For example, a Marine Highway grant awarded to expand an operation between the Ports of Norfolk and Richmond in Virginia has doubled their service frequency and volume and sailing full each trip, supporting exports from the region and relieving congestion on Interstate 64. To support the Department’s strategic goal for economic competitiveness, existing programs like the Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) Discretionary grants and Assistance to Small Shipyard Grants are targeting federal resources to help improve the Nation’s port infrastructure. The President’s FY 2013 budget requests a total of $500 million for TIGER. To date, TIGER grants have funded 17 port and maritime-related projects, totaling more than $276 million in Federal dollars and supplemented by State and local funds. Thirteen of these projects are underway, and more than $82 million has already been expended. These grants are modernizing and adding capacity to ports, improving connections to inland markets such as adding rail lines between the dock and existing corridors, and improving the overall efficiency of freight movement. A fourth round of TIGER Grants is currently in progress, offering the promise of additional maritime support. In addition, $153 million in Small Shipyard Grants has been awarded to 133 projects across the country to support capital improvements at shipyards, improving their ability to compete for domestic and international ship construction.

# T-In the U.S.

**WE meet we only dredge ports – we say squo invests in Panama canal and that changes trade**

# Heg Add-on (TD)

#### Resolving the deficit is key to hegemony

#### Steil 06, Sr. Fellow of Economics-CFR (http://www.cfr.org/publication/11293/why\_deficits\_matter.html)

First among these measures—and the one meaningful action the Administration and Congress can undertake in short order—is to forge a serious and workable plan to reduce the federal budget deficit over the next five years, and the trajectory of future deficits going further forward. This, of course, is easier said than done. Political forces arrayed against spending cuts and tax increases remain very strong.¶ The impact of budget cuts on the trade deficit is difficult to measure precisely – studies find that every $100 in budget deficit reduction yields from $20 to $50 in trade deficit reduction. Yet budget deficit reduction is the only lever available to cut America’s dependence on imported capital that is both economically sensible and under the US government’s direct control. Many commentators have pointed to America’s low and declining private savings rate as an important target, but decades of government tax incentives to boost private savings have yielded little more than windfalls to those wealthy enough to be able to shuffle their existing savings toward whatever tax carrots are dangled before them.¶ Broad-scale protectionism as an answer is so demonstrably self-defeating that it must be resisted through vigorous public diplomacy. Schumer-Graham tariffs of 27.5% on Chinese goods would become this century’s Smoot-Hawley disaster. The trade deficit is ultimately determined by national saving and investment: protectionism does not increase production and, absent an outright banning of trade, does not even affect the trade balance. With China feverishly pursuing new bilateral trade agreements around the globe, America can ill-afford this short-sighted domestic political pacifier. America must, to the contrary, seek to bolster the multilateral trading system, which is the country’s only effective bulwark against contagious global protectionism in times of political stress.¶ The Administration can continue to look for help from abroad by pressing Western Europe and Japan ever more firmly to boost their growth rates. Better growth among America’s richest trading partners will fuel U.S. exports and bring down the trade deficit. But the Europeans will be slow or worse to eliminate disincentives to work and job creation, and the Japanese will remain disinclined to consume as long as they continue to doubt their government’s ability and commitment to carry on providing for the retired while creating opportunity for the young. Thus the policy burden is necessarily on America to reverse its growing fiscal imbalance. A painful period of world economic adjustment appears inevitable without firm and immediate action on the budget deficit, and it will have serious implications for America’s power in the world. A plunging dollar accompanied by rapidly rising interest rates and a weakening American economy will make other nations less deferential to American wishes at the International Monetary Fund, at the World Bank, and in trade negotiations. Oil-producing Arab states will become even more resistant to American pressures for reform of their political and economic systems, and turn increasingly to Europe and Asia to place their investments and to garner political support. It will become ever more difficult for the United States to afford military action abroad. As it is, the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq are costing the U.S. over $70 billion annually. That high a level will soon become politically and economically unsupportable, and it will become clear both to Americans and to others that the U.S. will hesitate to act even where future threats appear to be dire. America’s standing in the world very directly hinges on what others believe the country can give to them or withhold from them. Washington can prevent a dollar-driven decline of U.S. global power by demonstrating that it has the political leadership and will to make the hard decisions necessary to sustain American economic strength. This must be grounded in restored budgetary responsibility. America is, at this moment, effectively an economic diabetic. Its insulin is fiscal rectitude. It will not cure the trade gap on its own, but it will allow the world to live with it by preserving the dollar as the bedrock of world commerce and finance.

**That solves great power war**

**Kagan 12**, Senior Fellow at Brookings (Robert, 3/14/12 “America has made the world freer, safer and wealthier” CNN,[http://us.cnn.com/2012/03/14/opinion/kagan-world-america-made/index.html?hpt=hp\_c1](http://us.cnn.com/2012/03/14/opinion/kagan-world-america-made/index.html?hpt=hp_c1" \t "_blank))

We take a lot for granted about the way the world looks today -- the widespread freedom, the unprecedented global prosperity (even despite the current economic crisis), and the absence of war among great powers. In 1941 there were only a dozen democracies in the world. Today there are more than 100. For four centuries prior to 1950, global GDP rose by less than 1 percent a year. Since 1950 it has risen by an average of 4 percent a year, and billions of people have been lifted out of poverty. The first half of the 20th century saw the two most destructive wars in the history of mankind, and in prior centuries war among great powers was almost constant. But for the past 60 years no great powers have gone to war. This is the world America made when it assumed global leadership after World War II. Would this world order survive if America declined as a great power? Some American intellectuals insist that a "Post-American" world need not look very different from the American world and that all we need to do is "manage" American decline. But that is wishful thinking. If the balance of power shifts in the direction of other powers, the world order will inevitably change to suit their interests and preferences. Take the issue of democracy. For several decades, the balance of power in the world has favored democratic governments. In a genuinely post-American world, the balance would shift toward the great power autocracies. Both China and Russia already protect dictators like Syria's Bashar al-Assad. If they gain greater relative influence in the future, we will see fewer democratic transitions and more autocrats hanging on to power. What about the free market, free trade economic order? People assume China and other rising powers that have benefited so much from the present system would have a stake in preserving it. They wouldn't kill the goose that lays the golden eggs. But China's form of capitalism is heavily dominated by the state, with the ultimate goal being preservation of the ruling party. Although the Chinese have been beneficiaries of an open international economic order, they could end up undermining it simply because, as an autocratic society, their priority is to preserve the state's control of wealth and the power it brings. They might kill the goose because they can't figure out how to keep both it and themselves alive. Finally, what about the long peace that has held among the great powers for the better part of six decades? Many people imagine that American predominance will be replaced by some kind of multipolar harmony. But multipolar systems have historically been neither stable nor peaceful. War among the great powers was a common, if not constant, occurrence in the long periods of multipolarity in the 16th, 17th, and 18th centuries. The 19th century was notable for two stretches of great-power peace of roughly four decades each, punctuated, however, by major wars among great powers and culminating in World War I, the most destructive and deadly war mankind had known up to that point. The era of American predominance has shown that there is no better recipe for great-power peace than certainty about who holds the upper hand. Many people view the present international order as the inevitable result of human progress, a combination of advancing science and technology, an increasingly global economy, strengthening international institutions, evolving "norms" of international behavior, and the gradual but inevitable triumph of liberal democracy over other forms of government -- forces of change that transcend the actions of men and nations. But there was nothing inevitable about the world that was created after World War II. International order is not an evolution; it is an imposition. It is the domination of one vision over others -- in America's case, the domination of liberal free market principles of economics, democratic principles of politics, and a peaceful international system that supports these, over other visions that other nations and peoples may have. The present order will last only as long as those who favor it and benefit from it retain the will and capacity to defend it. If and when American power declines, the institutions and norms American power has supported will decline, too. Or they may collapse altogether as we transition into another kind of world order, or into disorder. We may discover then that the United States was essential to keeping the present world order together and that the alternative to American power was not peace and harmony but chaos and catastrophe -- which was what the world looked like right before the American order came into being.

# Chavez (FT)

**Multilateral trade key to contain Chavez’s influence in Latin America**

**Irwin 08, Robert E Maxwell Professor of Economics at Dartmouth University, (Douglas, July 31, “Trade Liberalization: Cordell Hull and the Case for Optimism” Council on Foreign Relations)**

The Challenge Today Many trade observers believe that today's difficulties are harder to overcome than the challenges of the past. This is said to be so for three reasons. First, the end of the Cold War is said to have deprived trade liberalization of its foreign policy impetus. Second, the bipartisan consensus that supported liberal trade policies for much of the postwar period has vanished, making congressional approval of trade agreements much more difficult. Third, the WTO now has over 150 members and has become unwieldy, it is argued, making it a dysfunctional organization, unable to operate effectively and secure an agreement. But each of these claims loses some of its force when we look at past experience. For example, it has often been said that the linkage between trade policy and foreign policy has broken down. As C. Fred Bergsten once wrote back in the early 1970s, "The economic argument was never sufficient by itself, however, to support a liberal trade policy for the United States. It was the foreign policy case that provided the real impetus for liberal trade policies in the United States in the postwar period. Today, neither the economic nor the foreign policy argument for liberal trade commands much support in the United States." Trade agreements continue to have important foreign policy implications. The United States may no longer be locked in the Cold War, but new threats of equal scale in both the Middle East and Latin America create new imperatives for action. The United States currently confronts challenges to its position in Latin America from the socialist, anti-American leadership of President Hugo Chavez of Venezuela. In the context of containing such figures as Chavez, Hull's methods continue to offer value. This spirit was evident in the recent congressional vote on the free trade agreement with Peru, which was passed with a fair degree of bipartisan support. Many members of Congress on both sides of the aisle argued that it was important to shore up relations with an important ally in Latin America. "There is a growing division in Latin America today," said Senator Chuck Grassley of Iowa, the ranking Republican on the Senate Finance Committee. "We ought to help countries like Peru that are not going the direction of Venezuela." These foreign policy concerns are also an issue in the free trade agreement with Colombia, where Venezuela has allegedly been arming antigovernment insurgents in an effort to destabilize the pro-American regime. Several piecemeal trade policies have also been used to promote economic development in some of the poorest regions of the world, including the Caribbean Basin Initiative (1982), the Andean Trade Preferences Act (1991), and the African Growth and Opportunity Act (2000). These unilateral and unreciprocated acts of opening the U.S. market (in a very modest but helpful way) aim to achieve specific regional objectives: to promote growth and stability in the Caribbean area, to shift Andean countries away from illegal drug production, and to foster economic development and poverty reduction in a desperately poor continent. Each of these initiatives involves the use of economic incentives to promote economic development and thereby indirectly further American foreign policy interests. Each has been renewed on many occasions with bipartisan support. There are several parts of the world in which trade and foreign policy are not yet linked to their fullest potential. Cuba today, as in Hull's time, is at a turning point. Opening trade with Cuba might be the fastest way of strengthening and empowering that country's private sector, and thereby indirectly promoting a more liberal political system by undermining the power of the communist government. Fostering economic reform in the Middle East is also a valuable component of U.S. foreign policy in the region because, despite its oil wealth, much of the area remains economically isolated or repressed. The United States has sought trade agreements to strengthen ties with moderate, pro-Western allies in the region, such as Jordan, Morocco, Bahrain, and Oman. In 2003, Congress gave bipartisan support for trade engagement with the region through the Middle East Trade and Engagement Act of 2003. Although these initiatives have not advanced very far, the creation of new commercial ties could help give businesses a stake in politically moderate, more open and tolerant governments. One problem with this bilateral and regional approach is that it departs from Hull's hope for a world free of discriminatory trade policies. Although Hull also used bilateral trade agreements under the RTAA in the 1930s, he was insistent that they be concluded with the unconditional most-favored nation (MFN) clause. Under unconditional MFN, all tariff reductions reached bilaterally or under the GATT would be generalized to all other countries eligible for MFN treatment. However, recent U.S. bilateral and regional free trade agreements discriminate against nonparticipating countries. Although current advocates of this approach argue that such agreements are necessary when large multilateral rounds have stalled, economists such as Jagdish Bhagwati note that departing from unconditional MFN has both economic and political costs. Resolving this conflict between multilateral and bilateral agreements is one of the many challenges facing the world trading system.

**Extinction**

**Manwaring 05, General Douglas MacArthur Chair and Professor of Military Strategy at the U.S. Army War College and Adjunct Professor of International Politics at Dickinson College, (Max, October, “ Venezuela’s Hugo Chavez, Bolivarian Socialism, and Asymmetric Warfare” www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/PUB628.pdf)**

At the same time, President Chávez’s approach to Latin American security and stability requires a realignment from capitalist and “neo-liberal” economics and politics to his socialism for the 21st century. That realignment will likely generate instability, conflict, and probably exacerbate the processes of state failure in important parts of the hemisphere. Thus, the corollary at this level must address questions associated with “peacekeeping,” “stability operations,” “nation-building,” and “state failure.” The implications are straightforward. In the contemporary security environment, international organizations such as the UN and the OAS, and individual national powers, increasingly are being called on to respond to conflict generated by all kinds of material instabilities and human destabilizers. Likewise, the global community increasingly is being asked to respond to failing and failed states. In these terms, it is important to remember that state failure is a process, not an outcome. It is a process by which a state loses the capacity and/or the will to perform its essential legitimizing governance and security functions. In either case, the associated question is “How should the processes of state failure be addressed before they run their courses and achieve conflict and/or crisis proportions?” Conclusions from the Four Levels of Analysis. Chávez understands that every player in the international community from small powers to the U.S. superpower must cope simultaneously with four separate and potentially grave types of contemporary threat. These threats include, first, traditional and lingering boundary and territorial disputes, as well as balance of power concerns. Second, each protagonist must deal with the very real possibility that transnational and internal nonstate actors can be used by one nation-state to play serious roles in destabilizing and taking down another. Additionally, destabilizing nontraditional internal public and personal security threats can been seen all over the hemisphere in ungoverned territories, urban criminal gangs, more conventional terrorism, and insurgency. At the same time, real threats to effective sovereignty exist, stemming from chronic poverty, disease, and other “root causes” of conflict. Accordingly, all of the above types of threats are seen as methods of choice—or areas for exploitation—for various commercial (narco-traffickers and organized criminals), ideological (insurgencies such as Peru’s Sendero Luminoso) movements, and caudillos like Chávez who are completely and ruthlessly dedicated to achieving control or radical change in a given nation-state. Nevertheless, rather than considering each level of conflict as an independent form of warfare, Chávez finds that it is more useful to think of them as parts within his concept of total war, a people’s war, or a super insurgency.56 The questions associated with the corollaries and implications of each of the above levels of analysis, thus, imply no easy set of tasks. However, if the United States and the other countries of the Americas ignore what is happening in the region, that inaction could destroy the democracy, free market economies, and prosperity that has been achieved, and place the posterity of the hemisphere at serious risk. Some Final Thoughts On Chávez’s Asymmetrical Conflict As A Challenge To Hemispheric Security Chávez may be a military caudillo, but he is no “nut case.” He is, in fact, what Ralph Peters calls a “wise competitor.”57 He will not even attempt to defeat his enemies on their terms. Rather, he will seek to shift the playing field away from conventional military confrontations and turn to nontraditional forms of assault on a nation’s stability and integrity. Thus, it appears that this astute warrior is prepared to destabilize, to facilitate the processes of state failure, and thus to “destroy in order to rebuild” in true revolutionary fashion.58 As a consequence, it is important to understand that Chávez considers three issues to be key to success (or failure) in contemporary asymmetric conflict. They are closely related to his security scheme, social programs, and communications efforts. First, he understands the sophistication and complexity of war as a whole. He also understands the value of facilitating the processes of state failure to achieve the objectives of bolivarianismo. Finally, Chávez understands the centrality of relative moral legitimacy in conflict— and the critical importance of creating popular perceptions that his cause is morally correct, and will lead to a better life. These are the bases of power—all else, to him, is illusion. The Sophistication and Complexity of War as a Whole. Chávez understands that contemporary nontraditional war is not a kind of appendage (a lesser or limited thing) to the more comfortable conventional military attrition and maneuver warfare paradigms. It is a great deal more. Again, it may be military or nonmilitary, lethal or nonlethal, or a mix of everything within a state’s or a coalition of states’ array of instruments of power. As such, it may be a zerosum game in which only one winner emerges or, in a worst-case scenario, no winner. It is, thus, total. That is to say, the “battlefield” is extended to everyone, everything, and everywhere.59 To give the mind as much room as possible to contemplate the sophistication and complexity—and the totality—of contemporary conflict, two Chinese colonels, Liang and Xiangsui, have provided a scenario that is instructive and sobering: If the attacking side secretly musters large amounts of capital without the enemy nation being aware of this, and launches a sneak attack against its financial markets, then after causing a financial crisis, buries a computer virus and hacker detachment in the opponent’s computer system in advance, while at the same time carrying out a network attack against the enemy so that the civilian electricity network, traffic dispatching network, financial transaction network, telephone communications network, and mass media network are completely paralyzed, this will cause the enemy nation to fall into social panic, street riots, and a political crisis.There is finally the forceful bearing down by the army, and military means are utilized in gradual stages until the enemy is forced to sign a dishonorable peace treaty.60 Chávez understands all this. He understands that war is no longer limited to using military violence to bring about desired political change. Rather, all means that can be brought to bear on a given situation must be used to compel a targeted government to do one’s will. This caudillo will tailor his campaign to his adversaries’ political and economic vulnerabilities, and to their psychological precepts. And this is the basis of Chávez’s instruction to the Venezuelan armed forces (at the “1st Military Forum on Fourth Generation War and Asymmetric War” in 2004) to develop a doctrinal paradigm change from conventional to people’s war.61 The Issue of State Failure. President Chávez also understands that the process leading to state failure is the most dangerous long-term security challenge facing the global community today. The argument in general is that failing and failed state status is the breeding ground for instability, criminality, insurgency, regional conflict, and terrorism. These conditions breed massive humanitarian disasters and major refugee flows. They can host “evil” networks of all kinds, whether they involve criminal business enterprise, narco-trafficking, or some form of ideological crusade such as Bolivarianismo. More specifically, these conditions spawn all kinds of things people in general do not like such as murder, kidnapping, corruption, intimidation, and destruction of infrastructure. These means of coercion and persuasion can spawn further human rights violations, torture, poverty, starvation, disease, the recruitment and use of child soldiers, trafficking in women and body parts, trafficking and proliferation of conventional weapons systems and WMD, genocide, ethnic cleansing, warlordism, and criminal anarchy. At the same time, these actions are usually unconfined and spill over into regional syndromes of poverty, destabilization, and conflict.62 Peru’s Sendero Luminoso calls violent and destructive activities that facilitate the processes of state failure “armed propaganda.” Drug cartels operating throughout the Andean Ridge of South America and elsewhere call these activities “business incentives.” Chávez considers these actions to be steps that must be taken to bring about the political conditions necessary to establish Latin American socialism for the 21st century.63 Thus, in addition to helping to provide wider latitude to further their tactical and operational objectives, state and nonstate actors’ strategic efforts are aimed at progressively lessening a targeted regime’s credibility and capability in terms of its ability and willingness to govern and develop its national territory and society. Chávez’s intent is to focus his primary attack politically and psychologically on selected Latin American governments’ ability and right to govern. In that context, he understands that popular perceptions of corruption, disenfranchisement, poverty, and lack of upward mobility limit the right and the ability of a given regime to conduct the business of the state. Until a given populace generally perceives that its government is dealing with these and other basic issues of political, economic, and social injustice fairly and effectively, instability and the threat of subverting or destroying such a government are real.64 But failing and failed states simply do not go away. Virtually anyone can take advantage of such an unstable situation. The tendency is that the best motivated and best armed organization on the scene will control that instability. As a consequence, failing and failed states become dysfunctional states, rogue states, criminal states, narco-states, or new people’s democracies. In connection with the creation of new people’s democracies, one can rest assured that Chávez and his Bolivarian populist allies will be available to provide money, arms, and leadership at any given opportunity. And, of course, the longer dysfunctional, rogue, criminal, and narco-states and people’s democracies persist, the more they and their associated problems endanger global security, peace, and prosperity.65
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**Perm – Do Both**

**The counterplan results in the entirety of the Plan – that justifies Perm do the counterplan, their model of competition justifies consult and conditions counterplans that make it impossible to be aff**

**And it means we focus on trivial net-benefits that don’t teach us anything, debating about the Plan teaches us what infrastructure to build**

**Counterplan links to politics and the US would say no**

Rosen & Hanemann 11 – professor at Columbia University, Fellow with the Peterson Institute for International Economics, and Senior Advisor for International Economic Policy at the White House National Economic Council and National Security Council, AND\* is Research Director at the Rhodium Group, specializing in China’s macroeconomic development and the implications for global trade and investment flows (Daniel & Thilo, “An American Open Door?: Maximising the Benefits of Chinese Foreign Direct investment”, May 2011, http://www.ogilvypr.com/files/anamericanopendoor\_china\_fdi\_study.pdf)

The other gatekeeper to approval for investing in America, however, is national politics more broadly, especially the Congress. Politicians’ power to threaten to impose unacceptably high costs on potential investments gives them an ability to almost veto specific deals for reasons not limited to true national security. Such politicization, in an era of general anxiety about China’s rise, presents a very serious threat to the functioning of the direct investment screening process. Chinese investors, though attracted by the United States’ wealthy consumer base, skilled labor, sound regulatory environment, and impressive technology and knowhow, are confused and cynical about the relationship between policy and politics. The bulk of Chinese investments go through without a problem today; most obviously do not require a review for national security, or they are greenfields, and those that do require review almost always get a fair hearing. But the signals from Washington are mixed, and do not come just from CFIUS. Within the national security community, voices are advocating for a more onerous screening. The politicization in a handful of prominent cases has left the impression that Chinese investment is not welcome in the United States (see Box 4). The consequences of the mixed signals between our two American doormen are not so acute now, but they certainly will be in the future.

**PTX link proves U.S. will say no**

**Links to politics—**

**Budnick ‘11,** Andew Budnick, et al., the Princeton Task Force on Chinese Investment in the United States, “Economic Patriotism: How to Deal with Chinese Investment,” Woodrow Wilson School of International Affairs, Princeton University, December [http://www.princeton.edu/~smeunier/Princeton\_Task\_Force\_Report\_Final\_2011]

For one, **Chinese companies are predominately state-controlled**. In many countries, a company’s investment in the U.S. would be a purely commercial decision. When the state owns a controlling interest in a variety of FDI-seeking companies, however, **it is easy to suspect** that **these companies are acting to fulfill strategic**, rather than profit-maximizing, **goals.** Some American **politicians,** such as former Republican Senate candidate Christine O’Donnell, **have suggested that Chinese firms**, on orders from the Chapter : Introduction Communist regime**, are bent on buying up America and pushing U.S. firms out of their own market** in a bid for strategic dominance. ¶ When viewed alongside China’s status as a military rival of the United States, **the issue turns into a hot political topic.** Unlike Japan, which has been an ally since 1945, **the** People’s Republic of China (**PRC**) **has always grated against the ideals of the U.S.** with its communist ideology. **In light of the possibility of future conflict, American policymakers are increasingly concerned about the motivation behind Chinese FDI and** about **what leverage these investments could provide a rival government.**

**Obama says no—Executive will backlash to Chinese involvement—and current chilling effect means companies will pull out of agreements**

**Pace ‘12**. Julie, Associated Press 9-28-12, Stephen Braun and Ted Bridis and Tim Fought in Portland, Ore., contributed to this report. “OBAMA BLOCKS CHINESE PURCHASE OF US WIND FARMS” [http://m.kitsapsun.com/news/2012/sep/28/obama-blocks-chinese-purchase-of-us-wind-farms/]

WASHINGTON (AP) — **Citing national security risks**, President Barack **Obama** on Friday **blocked a Chinese company from** **owning four wind farm projects in** northern **Oregon** near a Navy base where the U.S. military flies unmanned drones and electronic-warfare planes on training missions.¶ It was the first time in 22 years that a U.S. president has blocked such a foreign business deal.**¶** Obama's decision was likely to be another irritant in the increasingly tense economic relationship between the U.S. and China. It also comes against an election-year backdrop of intense criticism from Republican presidential challenger Mitt Romney, who accuses Obama of not being tough enough with China.**¶** In his decision, **Obama ordered Ralls Corp.,** a company owned by Chinese nationals, **to divest its interest** in the wind farms it purchased earlier this year near the Naval Weapons Systems Training Facility in Boardman, Ore.¶ **The case reached the president's desk after the Committee on Foreign Investments in the United States**, known as CFIUS, **determined there was no way to address the national security risks** posed by the Chinese company's purchases. **Only the president has final authority to prohibit a transaction.**¶ **The administration would not say what risks the wind farm purchases presented**. The Treasury Department said CFIUS made its recommendation to Obama after receiving an analysis of the potential threats from the Office of the Director of National Intelligence.¶ Morrow County planner, Carla McLane, said the projects had won county approval and construction was under way until CFIUS issued an order in July that halted construction. She said she does not know what the security concerns were.**¶** Each of the four projects consists of five turbines, each with a two-megawatt capacity, for a total of 10 megawatts per project, or a total of 40 for the four. As the crow flies, McLane said, the projects are about 10 miles from the bombing range — as it's known locally.**¶** The military has acknowledged that it used the Oregon Naval facility to test unmanned drones and the EA-18G "Growler." The electronic warfare aircraft accompanies U.S. fighter bombers on missions and protectively jams enemy radar, destroying them with missiles along the way.**¶** At the Oregon site, the planes fly as low as 200 feet and nearly 300 miles per hour.**¶** The last time a president used the law to block a transaction was 1990, when President George H.W. Bush voided the sale of Mamco Manufacturing to a Chinese agency.**¶** In 2006, President George W. Bush approved a CFIUS case involving the merger of Alcatel and Lucent Technologies.**¶** The Treasury Department said in a statement that Obama's decision is specific to this transaction and does not set a precedent for other foreign direct investment in the U.S. by China or any other country.**¶** China's trade advantage over the U.S. has emerged as a key issue in the final weeks of the presidential campaign. Romney accuses Obama of failing to stand up to Beijing, while the president criticizes the GOP nominee for investing part of his personal fortune in China and outsourcing jobs there while he ran the private equity firm Bain Capital.**¶** Both campaigns are running ads on China in battleground states, especially Ohio, where workers in the manufacturing industry have been hard-hit by outsourcing.**¶ Obama,** in an interview Wednesday with The Plain Dealer of Cleveland, **said the U.S. must push hard against Beijing** but "not go out of our way to embarrass" China.¶ "We're not interested in triggering an all-out trade war that would damage both economies," Obama said.**¶ The president has the power to void foreign transactions under the Defense Production Act. It authorizes the president to suspend or prohibit** certain **acquisitions of U.S. businesses** if there is credible evidence that the foreign purchaser might take action that threatens to impair national security.**¶** CFIUS is chaired by the treasury secretary. The secretaries of state, defense, commerce, energy and homeland security are also on the committee. The director of national intelligence is a non-voting member.**¶** Earlier this month, Ralls sued the national security panel, alleging CFIUS exceeded its authority when it ordered the company to cease operations and withdraw from the wind-farm developments it bought. Ralls asked for a restraining order and a preliminary injunction to allow construction at the wind farms to continue. The firm said it would lose the chance for a $25 million investment tax if the farms were not operable by Dec. 31.**¶** In a statement Friday, Tim Kia, a lawyer for Ralls, said the project posed no national security threat and said "the President's order is without justification, as scores of other wind turbines already operate in the area."**¶** Ralls dropped its request for a preliminary injunction this week after CFIUS allowed the firm to resume some pre-construction work. With the lawsuit, continuing, the firm's lawyers were expected to react quickly to the administration decision, said a person familiar with the lawsuit who insisted on anonymity because of the sensitive legal repercussions.**¶** Ralls' legal team includes Paul Clement and Viet Dinh, two top law veterans of President George W. Bush's administration. Both men were key players in Bush's aggressive national security operation.**¶** Clement, who was solicitor-general and argued administration positions before the Supreme Court, has since opposed the Obama administration's health care plan and defended the Defense of Marriage Act before the top court.**¶** Dinh, a former assistant attorney general who was the main architect of the Bush administration's anti-terror USA Patriot Act, has lately served as a director and legal adviser to Rupert Murdoch's News Corporation.**¶** A second Chinese firm stymied by CFIUS urged U.S. authorizes this week to investigate their firm to quell fears of ties to China's military. Huawei Technologies Ltd. announced in early September that it would unwind its purchase of U.S.-based computer firm 3Leaf Systems after the deal was rejected by CFIUS.**¶ Huawei**, one of the world's largest producers of computer network switching gear, **has repeatedly struggled to convince U.S. authorities** that **they can be trusted to oversee sensitive technology sometimes used in national security work.** In 2008, CFIUS **concerns led Huawei** and private equity firm Bain Capital **to abandon an $2.2 billion deal** to buy a firm that produces anti-hacking software for the U.S. military.

**Counterplan would never happen—massively unpopular with Congress**

**Mills 11** - \*MSc in Geological Sciences @ Cambridge

Robin, “Capturing Carbon: The New Weapon in the War Against Climate Change,” Google Book

CCS already labours under something of a public relations disadvan­tage, due to its association with the unpopular petroleum, coal and electricity industries. It needs only to attract support from politicians, lawyers and real-estate agents to be completely condemned. CCS might suffer from its promotion by the Bush-era initiative on the 'Asia-Pacific Partnership on Clean Development and Climate', widely (and rather accurately) perceived as a literal and metaphorical smokescreen for pol­luting countries and industries to escape mandatory carbon curbs8 and dismissed as 'a nice little PR ploy' by none other than former presiden­tial candidate John McCain.9 The debate is further clouded by 'clean coal', a term trotted out by industry groups such as the American Coa­lition for Clean Coal Electricity. Indeed, coal has become vastly cleaner in recent years in terms of non-greenhouse pollutants such as sulphur dioxide. But to be meaningful at all, 'clean coal' has to include carbon capture on at least 85-95% of its emissions. Otherwise, as in Joel and Ethan Coen's satirical adverts,10 'clean coal' becomes a byword for hype, empty spin and evading environmental responsibility. Such bad press leads the public to be suspicious of carbon capture's environmental and safety credentials. There is a natural cynicism when industry proposes a solution so convenient to itself, however solid the scientific arguments. Scrutiny is intensified when the oil and coal indus­tries take the lead in campaigning against climate change bills, as dur­ing August 2009,n and score PR own-goals such as forging letters opposing environmental legislation. Part of this lobbying is a reaction to elements of the proposed legislation, rather than to the idea of limit­ing carbon dioxide emissions per se, but the subtlety of this message can easily be lost. Carbon capture may come to be seen—indeed, is sometimes already seen—as just one more tactic from the energy industry to delay or avoid taking real action on climate change.12 The major elements of the fossil fuel industry, particularly in the USA, were so slow to acknowledge the reality of climate change, denied the science at every turn, and still continue to spread doubt and misinformation, even allegedly generating fraudulent grass-roots campaigns.1" By doing so, they set themselves up to be the villains of the piece. To some extent, the global debate over carbon capture (and, indeed, over climate change legislation) is now being held hostage by the ideological clash in the USA between left and right. In Europe, a few mavericks apart, business and environmentalism agree much more closely than they might realise on the science of climate change, and the key solutions. Such public opposition can lead to lengthy delays, lawsuits, planning inquiries, permitting challenges and direct protests, against new CCS power plants, carbon dioxide pipelines and storage sites. A backlash from taxpayers or electricity consumers might be caused by percep­tions that heavy subsidies or rising power prices are being used to sup­port carbon capture. The substantial government aid being given to renewable energy in many developed countries may be more popular. Government programmes, as with America's FutureGen, may be more vulnerable to cuts amid the fickle winds of political fortune than those led by companies planning for their future. Recovery from the financial crisis will, at some point, have to be paid for by spending cuts and tax increases, and this may crimp funding for new technologies, however environmentally vital.

**Chinese companies are only interested in direct economic and strategic returns—It’s their burden to prove port dredging yields this**

**Budnick 11** (Andew Budnick, et al., the Princeton Task Force on Chinese Investment in the United States, “Economic Patriotism: How to Deal with Chinese Investment,” Woodrow Wilson School of International Affairs, Princeton University, December 2011, http://www.princeton.edu/~smeunier/Princeton\_Task\_Force\_Report\_Final\_2011)

Commercial and Productivity Interests: **Rising competition in the domestic market forces profit-maximizing Chinese firms to look for earnings abroad.** Chinese corporations investing in developed countries can sell at steeper prices to accommodate higher consumer incomes, while they can hire workers in developing countries at lower wages. In sectors where Chinese firms do not have a comparative advantage, production can also be incentivized to occur closer to areas of resource obtainment. Furthermore, **by investing overseas** instead of relying on exports, **Chinese companies can circumvent existing and future trade barriers.** 8. Acquiring Technology and Strategic Assets: **In order to compete internationally** with multinational enterprises, **Chinese firms need to play catch-up by procuring advanced technology,** managerial know-how**, internationally recognized brands, and other strategic assets.** This would allow Chinese businesses, through OFDI, to clear several stages of development that would otherwise take decades to build up while providing access to new markets.

**US will say no—political interference and fearmongering**

**Rosen and Hanemann, 11** – professor at Columbia University, Fellow with the Peterson Institute for International Economics, and Senior Advisor for International Economic Policy at the White House National Economic Council and National Security Council, AND\* is Research Director at the Rhodium Group, specializing in China’s macroeconomic development and the implications for global trade and investment flows (Daniel & Thilo, “An American Open Door?: Maximising the Benefits of Chinese Foreign Direct investment”, May 2011, http://www.ogilvypr.com/files/anamericanopendoor\_china\_fdi\_study.pdf)//JKahn

We conclude that the recent growth of Chinese direct investment in the United States is proof of its great potential, but given the parade of political fearmongering seen so far, those benefits likely will be squandered if steps are not taken to restore clear thinking. Therefore, we offer a series of recommendations intended to alleviate the risk of diverting Chinese direct investment from the United States by maintaining the best possible security screening process, keeping America’s door open to the benefits of a China going global, and actively attracting the right investments from China so that the benefits for Americans are assured. We summarize these recommendations here and elaborate on them at the conclusion. 1. Send a clear and bipartisan message that Chinese investment is welcome. Though the annual numbers are doubling, there is a growing perception in China that the United States is not enthusiastic about Chinese investment. Washington must recapture the high ground on this topic by pointing to the healthy growth in those investment flows to date and by making clear that U.S. policy will remain accommodative. A bipartisan congressional–executive statement is needed to send an unequivocal message of support for increased investment from China. It is especially important that the U.S. Congress plays a positive role in this messaging given its oversight role and recent activism on foreign investment. 2. Systematize the promotion of FDI from China and elsewhere. A review of U.S. efforts to attract investment from China and other countries is needed. The current laissez-faire approach stems from an era when the United States dominated global FDI flows; it assumes that the United States remains unrivaled in its attractiveness and functions as though all foreign investors come from similar countries that do not need much on-theground assistance. That situation has changed. More proactive measures are needed, not just at the state and local level, where earnest efforts are afoot, but also at the national level, where formal and informal barriers to foreign investment arise 3. Protect the investment review process from interference. The formal U.S. process of screening for national security concerns is generally well designed, but it is in urgent need of protection from politicization. If political interference is not tempered, some of the benefits of Chinese investment catalogued in this study—such as job creation, consumer welfare, and even contributions to U.S. infrastructure renewal—risk being diverted to U.S. competitors. Some in China suggest that the United States publish a catalogue of open industries, just as the Chinese government does. While that suggestion is understandable in light of their recent experience, this approach is not suited to the United States. Within a given industry, there are acceptable and unacceptable investments, and it is impossible to anticipate all eventualities in advance. CFIUS is right to ask not whether China has hidden agendas and ambitions or whether a particular industry can be sensitive, but whether a specific deal constitutes an actual national security threat. In short, the existing U.S. review policy process is worth protecting. CFIUS should further improve the transparency of its decision-making process and find ways to offer even better assurance that it is keeping to its mandate of solely screening investment for national security threats. Calls to alter the review process in ways that would allow further interference—by allowing national economic security questions to be subject to review, for example—must be rejected. 4. Work to better understand Chinese motives. Many Americans—including many officials in Washington—believe that because China has so many state-owned enterprises, market forces and profit motives do not necessarily apply in that country. Therefore, they suspect that if a Chinese firm is coming to America, it must be for some political purpose rather than simply to make money. This conclusion is wrong, and if we are to maximize U.S. interests, such misapprehensions must be corrected. But making clear that behind all of the rhetoric of statism and central planning, China’s firms typically put self-interest and profit above else, is no easy task. The proponents and beneficiaries of Chinese investment in the United States—including deal makers, venture partners, sellers, and localities—need to bear more of the burden of demonstrating this market orientation. By issuing the kind of bipartisan statement suggested earlier, U.S. policy makers can contribute to this reappraisal of Chinese objectives. And, of course, economists and policy analysts must redouble their efforts to make China comprehensible to both U.S. leaders and the general public. 5. Communicate to China its share of the burden. China very much shares responsibility for the breadth of American misgivings. After all, at state executive summary related firms, especially the major state-owned enterprises, which make up almost half of all industrial assets, business decisions routinely are subjected to political considerations and executives are beholden to the dictates of the Chinese Communist Party. Even at private firms, nontransparent governance practices are common. And while this opacity may be about shrouding the profit streams of privileged individuals more than anything else, American screeners cannot discreetly avert their gaze as Chinese regulators and bureaucrats do. If China wants a more straightforward hearing for its firms in Washington, it must improve corporate governance at home. We recommend that U.S. officials reclaim the high road from commentators who allege that Washington is unfairly blocking foreign firms, and call for a major improvement in Chinese corporate transparency so that regulators can do their jobs more easily. Other measures can help as well. A clearer separation between Chinese regulators and the firms they oversee would help alleviate foreign suspicions. A consumer-oriented welfare test in China’s competition policy also would help ensure that market performance, not other state objectives, is the determinant of a given Chinese firm’s behavior. Of course, if China were to dismantle its system of state capitalism, U.S. officials would be far less worried about Chinese corporate intentions and the prospect of predatory intent from the firms under Beijing’s influence. But Americans should not expect China to change overnight. In the meantime, it should be clear that while Chinese investment is more than welcome, U.S. regulators have a legitimate interest in who is investing in the United States. 6. Remain open to “what if” scenarios. In terms of nontraditional economic threats, U.S. concerns that China could become a large enough economy to be a price maker instead of a price taker are legitimate. If China’s sheer size, combined with its artificial pricing structures (e.g., the cost of capital arising from financial repression) were to “poison” global markets in the future, as Chinese outflows make up an ever more influential share of world totals, then a subsidy-disciplining regime for global direct investment akin to that for trade would become necessary. We suspect that China’s existing statist preferences will break down prior to that point, but we cannot be sure. There is no consensus on how to assess “unfair” influence of one nation’s domestic capital costs on world prices. Therefore, we recommend an international effort to think through these questions now, because answers may well be needed in the near future. 7. Do not play the reciprocity game. The term “reciprocity” has been used too frequently in the context of Chinese investment— namely, if China is discriminatory against U.S. investment, the United States should reciprocate in kind. We recommend greater caution. China does maintain significant inward investment restrictions, but Beijing has been a leader in direct investment openness for decades, and the notion of withholding U.S. investment access for more access in China is both foolish and against American interests. Yes, U.S. negotiators must press China to open wider to U.S. investors. But it is emphatically in America’s interests to separate that effort from whether to permit cash to flow from China into the United States. The United States should welcome capital from China, regardless of what Beijing’s state planners have to say about foreign investment in China. For 30 years, China has grown stronger by opening its door wider to FDI, irrespective of overseas openness. The United States should do the same, or risk Chinese firms setting up plants in Ontario instead of Michigan, or Juarez instead of El Paso.

# Cap K

## 2AC

**Perm – Do the both, but don’t reject the aff**

**Simulation allows us to influence state policy AND is key to agency**

**Eijkman 12** (The role of simulations in the authentic learning for national security policy development: Implications for Practice / Dr. Henk Simon Eijkman. [electronic resource] <http://nsc.anu.edu.au/test/documents/Sims_in_authentic_learning_report.pdf>. Dr Henk Eijkman is currently an independent consultant as well as visiting fellow at the University of New South Wales at the Australian Defence Force Academy and is Visiting Professor of Academic Development, Annasaheb Dange College of Engineering and Technology in India. As a sociologist he developed an active interest in tertiary learning and teaching with a focus on socially inclusive innovation and culture change. He has taught at various institutions in the social sciences and his work as an adult learning specialist has taken him to South Africa, Malaysia, Palestine, and India. He publishes widely in international journals, serves on Conference Committees and editorial boards of edited books and international journal)

However, whether as an approach to learning, innovation, persuasion or culture shift, policy simulations derive their power from two central features: their combination of simulation and gaming (Geurts et al. 2007). 1. The simulation element: the unique combination of simulation with role-playing.The unique simulation/role-play mix enables participants to create **possible futures** relevant to the topic being studied. This is diametrically opposed to the more traditional, teacher-centric approaches in which a future is produced for them. In policy simulations, possible futures are much more than an object of tabletop discussion and verbal speculation. ‘**No other technique** allows a group of participants to engage in collective action in a safe environment to create and analyse the futures they want to explore’ (Geurts et al. 2007: 536). 2. **The game element:** the interactive and tailor-made modelling and design of the policy game. The actual run of the policy simulation is only one step, though a most important and visible one, in a collective process of investigation, communication, and evaluation of performance. In the context of a post-graduate course in public policy development, for example, a policy simulation is a dedicated game constructed in collaboration with practitioners to achieve a high level of proficiency in relevant aspects of the policy development process. To drill down to a level of finer detail, **policy development simulations**—as forms of interactive or participatory modelling— are particularly effective in developing participant knowledge and skills in the five key areas of the policy development process (and success criteria), namely: Complexity, Communication, Creativity, Consensus, and Commitment to action (‘the five Cs’). The capacity to provide effective learning support in these five categories has proved to be particularly helpful in strategic decision-making (Geurts et al. 2007). Annexure 2.5 contains a detailed description, in table format, of the synopsis below.

**Perm – Do the Plan and Occupy all transportation infrastructure**

**Capitalism isn’t the root cause of war**

**Dandeker** **92, Professor of Military Sociology in the Department of War Studies at King’s College London,**

**[Christopher , “The Causes of War and the History of Modern Sociological Theory,” Effects of War on Society, Edited by Giorgio Ausenda, Published by the Center for Interdisciplinary Research on Social Stress by Boydell & Brewer Ltd, p. 44-46]**

All these arguments presuppose two specious sociological contentions: first that capitalism, as the most historically developed and dynamic form of class exploitation, is the source of modern militarism, and second, that socialism, preferably on a world scale would involve the abolition of war. The deficiencies in these views, and indeed of those associated with the industrial society thesis discussed earlier, can be revealed by drawing on Machiavellian themes which can then be set out more explicitly in the next section. Despite the fact that industrial capitalism has produced two world wars, as Aron (1954) and more recently Michael Mann (1984) have argued, there is no ’special relationship’ between capitalism and militarism—or the tendency to war—only one of historical indifference. All the pre-dispositions of ‘capitalist states’ to use warfare calculatively as a means of resolving their disputes with other states predate the formation of capitalism as an economic system. Of course, it could be argued that capitalism merely changes the form of militarism. That is to say, pre-capitalist patterns of militarism were still expressions of class relations and modern capitalism has just increased the destructive power of the industrialised means of war available to the state. But this argument will not do. Socialist societies in their use of industrialised power show that the technological potential for war is transferable and can be reproduced under non-capitalist conditions. Furthermore, the military activities of socialist states cannot be explained in terms of a [end page 44] defensive war against capitalism or even an aggressive one, as national and geopolitical power motives are arguably just as significant in the determination of state behaviour. Furthermore, imperial expansion not only predates capitalism but it is also difficult to reduce the causes of wars then and now to the interests of dominant economic classes (Mann 1984:25-46). Meanwhile, modern attempts to explain patterns of military expenditure in terms of the imperatives of capital accumulation face major difficulties. The association between economic boom and military spending has been revealed as an empirical association not an inherent connection; indeed the evidence from Germany and Japan indicates that low levels of military spending might well be associated with economic performances superior to those of societies which commit more of their GNP to defence expenditure. Furthermore, the idea that war and the threat of war are weapons of national mythology used by dominant classes to confuse the working class and weaken their natural affinity with international socialism faces the problem that, as in the case of Europe in 1914, national enthusiasms were such that truly remarkable powers would have to be attributed to ruling classes in order to make sense of them while in any case alternative explanations are at hand (Howard 1976:108-15). The problems of economic determinism in Marxist social theory are compounded by two further difficulties. The first of these concerns is its emphasis on endogenous, unfolding models of social change. The tendency is to view state behaviour in terms of the imperatives of internal class relations with warfare being regarded as the externalisation of the contradictory nature of those relations.

**They obviously don’t solve because they can’t block infrastructure**

**They cause transition wars**

**Kliman 06** **-** **professor of economics, Pace University,**

[Andrew, “Not by Politics Alone,” Presentation at Left Forum Conference, March 11,

http://209.85.165.104/search?q=cache:W7WV0BP2LGoJ:akliman.squarespace.com/writings/not%2520by%2520politics%2520alone%25204.2.06.doc+alternative+to+capitalism&hl=en&ct=clnk&cd=128&gl=us]

There are several different issues that I’m thinking of when I use the term “sustainable.” One is that it is hard to imagine that a break with capitalism will emerge throughout the world all at once. This presents a very serious problem of sustainability, since history has shown, I believe, that socialism in one country is indeed impossible. What can be done to defend the break with capitalism in the meantime, against both the inevitable attempt at counter-revolution and capitalism’s totalizing tendency, its tendency to swallow up and incorporate everything within itself? I do not know. I do not know anyone who knows. But I do know that this is a question that needs to be thought through with extreme care – and now. It cannot be put off until “after the revolution.” To assume that there will be time, at that point, to think it through or time to work it out through experimentation, is wishful thinking at best. It is quite hard to believe that there will be any time at all before the counter-revolution and the tentacles of the capitalist system go to work. In referring to “sustainability,” I also have several economic problems in mind that must be confronted. If the emergent new society does not “deliver the goods,” and if it does not move towards elimination of alienated labor and reduction of working time, there will be no popular mandate for it – and indeed, no reason for its continued existence. At this point, it could be kept alive only through force, through suppression of mass opposition, so it would turn into its opposite.

**Grisworld and Seita proves capitalism is good because it creates economic interdependence between countries that prevent them from going to war because they perceive the costs of it as being too high**

#### Their Kritik is a form of asymmetrical warfare that seeks to undermine and collapse the United States – allows for Russian expansionism – our ev is specific to their MARXIST VALUES

#### Nyquist 09—BA in political science from UCI. Two years in a PhD program, in pol sci. Former high school and college prof. Regular geopolitical columnist for Financial Sense Online. Contracted with the U.S. Defense Intelligence Agency (J. R., The Sequence, <http://www.financialsensearchive.com/stormwatch/geo/pastanalysis/2009/0828.html>,)

In advance of any military campaign relying on tank divisions and nuclear rocket regiments, it is necessary to soften the United States through a series of clandestine and subversive moves: first, there was the use of narcotics trafficking as a weapon, which began in 1960. Prior to that, there was the infiltration of organized crime, the penetration of U.S. banks, and the introduction of the Peaceful Coexistence Struggle by Nikita Khrushchev. For those interested in the details of this, please refer to a book titled Red Cocaine, by Joseph D. Douglass. (It is based on the testimony of one of the highest-level Communsit defectors of all time, Jan Sejna.) The campaign involves the use of economic weapons, as well as educational weapons. Every civilization nourishes within itself various cults opposed to its values. That is basically what "Communism" represents. The specifics of ideology are unimportant, for what is represented is essentially anti-capitalism, anti-Christianity, anti-Western civilization. It can change its name, it rhetoric, its tactics, but the movement in opposition to civilization remains essentially the same in its determination to destroy what presently exists. Taking this into account, take a good look around and re-examine the former Cold War battlefield. Note the changes around the globe, and the changes in Washington. What do you think has been happening over the last 20 years? Robert Chandler has written a book titled Shadow World: Resurgent Russia, the Global New Left, and Radical Islam. What is valuable in Chandler's work relates to his firsthand interactions with Leftist organizers in the United States. According to Chandler, there is a vast network in America that aims to bring down the capitalist system, destroy the U.S. Constitution, and break up the federal system by getting control of the government. "The driving forces in this top network," wrote Chandler, "are the 'thought leaders' and other individuals in non-governmental organizations (NGOs), including anarcho-communists and anarcho-syndacalists." He noted that "leadingmembers are the Washington, D.C.-based revolutionary centers -- the institute for Policy Studies ... as well as the coopted mainstream media and politicians making up the Congressional Progressive Caucus and the 'Shadow Party' hiding inside the Democratic Party...." According to Chandler, "The radical Left" is engaging in a new form of political warfare in which the Left targeted "open spaces" in the American social structure; namely, schools and universities, government, churches and community organizations. The idea was, wrote Chandler, "to transform society and replace traditional American values and institutions with neo-Marxist values." At a Marxist conference that Chandler attended, one of the agenda items was openly listed as, "The Strange Pleasures of Destruction in Capitalist America." He relates that most of the participants "were university professors." In the course of this conference, purely by accident, he ran into Zapatista Subcommandante Marcos in an underground parking garage. According to Chandler, "Orthodox communsits warned conference participants about the dangers of wandering away from the basics of Marx and Lenin...." He further explained that everyone present at the conference agreed it was necessary to "destroy the state as a part of the coming socialist revolution. There simply was no other way to achieve socialist governance in the United States than to crush the existing capitalist system." Now the sequence should be clear. If the United States is bankrupt, politically divided and internally sabotaged by the radicals of the Left who have everywhere infiltrated the system, will there be a logistical support network for maintaining our tanks, bombers and ICBMS? What seems fantastic on first-hearing is actually everyday life for those who are paying attention. Look at the world around you. There are those who have been enriching themselves as they sabotage the economy and poison the culture. They pretend to care about the poor and downtrodden. But they live in mansions, collect enormous sums from government and business, advancing the foreign policy goals of enemy dictators. The organized Left is a business with access to billions of dollars. Its tendency is to serve as a fifth column. Now imagine the collapse of the dollar. Imagine the collapse of the U.S. federal system, the Constitution, and America's domestic tranquility. How will the country defend itself from Russian missiles when our missiles no longer work because they have fallen into disrepair after an economic collapse? Here is asymetrical warfare at its best. Here is the beginning of what I call "the sequence."

#### Russian expansionism triggers multiple scenarios for extinction

#### Blank 09, strategic Studies Institute's expert on the Soviet bloc and the post-Soviet world since 1989; former Associate Professor of Soviet Studies at the Center for Aerospace Doctrine, Research, and Education, Maxwell Air Force Base; B.A. in History University of Pennsylvania, and a M.A. and Ph.D. in History from the University of Chicago, (Stephen J., “RUSSIA AND ARMS CONTROL: ARE THERE OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE OBAMA ADMINISTRATION?”)

Proliferators or nuclear states like China and Russia can then deter regional or intercontinental attacks either by denial or by threat of retaliation.168 Given a multipolar world structure with little ideological rivalry among major powers, it is unlikely that they will go to war with each other. Rather, like Russia, they will strive for exclusive hegemony in their own “sphere of influence” and use nuclear instruments towards that end. However, wars may well break out between major powers and weaker “peripheral” states or between peripheral and semiperipheral states given their lack of domestic legitimacy, the absence of the means of crisis prevention, the visible absence of crisis management mechanisms, and their strategic calculation that asymmetric wars might give them the victory or respite they need.169 Simultaneously, The states of periphery and semiperiphery have far more opportunities for political maneuvering. Since war remains a political option, these states may find it convenient to exercise their military power as a means for achieving political objectives. Thus international crises may increase in number. This has two important implications for the use of WMD. First, they may be used deliberately to offer a decisive victory (or in Russia’s case, to achieve “intra-war escalation control”—author170) to the striker, or for defensive purposes when imbalances 67 in military capabilities are significant; and second, crises increase the possibilities of inadvertent or accidental wars involving WMD.171 Obviously nuclear proliferators or states that are expanding their nuclear arsenals like Russia can exercise a great influence upon world politics if they chose to defy the prevailing consensus and use their weapons not as defensive weapons, as has been commonly thought, but as offensive weapons to threaten other states and deter nuclear powers. Their decision to go either for cooperative security and strengthened international military-political norms of action, or for individual national “egotism” will critically affect world politics. For, as Roberts observes, But if they drift away from those efforts [to bring about more cooperative security], the consequences could be profound. At the very least, the effective functioning of inherited mechanisms of world order, such as the special responsibility of the “great powers” in the management of the interstate system, especially problems of armed aggression, under the aegis of collective security, could be significantly impaired. Armed with the ability to defeat an intervention, or impose substantial costs in blood or money on an intervening force or the populaces of the nations marshaling that force, the newly empowered tier could bring an end to collective security operations, undermine the credibility of alliance commitments by the great powers, [undermine guarantees of extended deterrence by them to threatened nations and states] extend alliances of their own, and perhaps make wars of aggression on their neighbors or their own people.172

**They can’t solve - their authors agree you can never change other people’s minds about capitalism**

Dr. Adrian **Johnston 04**, December 2004 (Research fellow of psychoanalysis @ Emory. “The cynic's fetish: Slavoj Zizek and the dynamics of belief.” Journal of Psychoanalysis, Culture and Society p.259)

Perhaps the absence of a detailed political roadmap in Zizek's recent writings isn't a major shortcoming. Maybe, at least for the time being, the most important task is simply the negativity of the critical struggle, the effort to cure an intellectual constipation resulting from capitalist ideology and thereby to truly open up the space for imagining authentic alternatives to the prevailing state of the situation. Another definition of materialism offered by Zizek is that it amounts to accepting the internal inherence of what fantasmatically appears as an external deadlock or hindrance (Zizek, 2001d, pp 22-23) (with fantasy itself being defined as the false externalization of something within the subject, namely, the illusory projection of an inner obstacle, Zizek, 2000a, p 16). From this perspective, seeing through ideological fantasies by learning how to think again outside the confines of current restrictions has, in and of itself, the potential to operate as a form of real revolutionary practice (rather than remaining merely an instance of negative/critical intellectual reflection). Why is this the case? Recalling the analysis of commodity fetishism, the social efficacy of money as the universal medium of exchange (and the entire political economy grounded upon it) ultimately relies upon nothing more than a kind of "magic," that is, the belief in money's social efficacy by those using it in the processes of exchange. Since the value of currency is, at bottom, reducible to the belief that it has the value attributed to it (and that everyone believes that everyone else believes this as well), derailing capitalism by destroying its essential financial substance is, in a certain respect**, as easy as dissolving the mere belief in this substance's powers**. The "external" obstacle of the capitalist system exists exclusively on the condition that subjects, whether consciously or unconsciously, "internally" believe in it--capitalism's life-blood, money, is simply a fetishistic crystallization of a belief in others' belief in the socio-performative force emanating from this same material. And yet, this point of capitalism's frail vulnerability is simultaneously the source of its enormous strength: its vampiric symbiosis with individual human desire, and the fact that the late-capitalist cynic's fetishism enables the disavowal of his/her de facto belief in capitalism, makes it highly unlikely that people can simply be persuaded to stop believing and start thinking (especially since, as Zizek claims, many of these people are convinced that they already have ceased believing). Or, the more disquieting possibility to entertain is that some people today, even if one succeeds in exposing them to the underlying logic of their position, might respond in a manner resembling that of the Judas-like character Cypher in the film The Matrix (Cypher opts to embrace enslavement by illusion rather than cope with the discomfort of dwelling in the "desert of the real"): faced with the choice between living the capitalist lie or wrestling with certain unpleasant truths, many individuals might very well deliberately decide to accept what they know full well to be a false pseudo-reality, a deceptively comforting fiction ("Capitalist commodity fetishism or the truth? I choose fetishism").

**Capitalism is progressive, self-correcting, and wealth-generating – ensures sustainability**

**Goklany 07**-Julia Simon Fellow @ the Political Economy Research Center [Indur, Reason.com, “Now for the Good News,” 3/23/2007, <http://reason.com/archives/2007/03/23/now-for-the-good-news>]

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. This brings about an environmental transition via the twin forces of economic development and technological progress, which begin to provide solutions to environmental problems instead of creating those problems. All of which is why we today find that the richest countries are also the cleanest. And while many developing countries have yet to get past the “green ceiling,” they are nevertheless ahead of where today’s developed countries used to be when they were equally wealthy. The point of transition from "industrial period" to "environmental conscious" continues to fall. For example, the US introduced unleaded gasoline only after its GDP per capita exceeded $16,000. India and China did the same before they reached $3,000 per capita. This progress is a testament to the power of globalization and the transfer of ideas and knowledge (that lead is harmful, for example). It's also testament to the importance of trade in transferring technology from developed to developing countries—in this case, the technology needed to remove lead from gasoline. This hints at the answer to the question of why some parts of the world have been left behind while the rest of the world has thrived. Why have improvements in well-being stalled in areas such as Sub-Saharan Africa and the Arab world? The proximate cause of improvements in well-being is a “cycle of progress” composed of the mutually reinforcing forces of economic development and technological progress. But that cycle itself is propelled by a web of essential institutions, particularly property rights, free markets, and rule of law. Other important institutions would include science- and technology-based problem-solving founded on skepticism and experimentation; receptiveness to new technologies and ideas; and freer trade in goods, services—most importantly in knowledge and ideas. In short, free and open societies prosper. Isolation, intolerance, and hostility to the free exchange of knowledge, technology, people, and goods breed stagnation or regression.

**Representations of capitalism as hegemonically dominant preclude the realization of actual social change**

**Gibson-Graham 06** – J.K., pen name shared by feminist economic geographers Julie Graham and Katherine Gibson (“The End of Capitalism (As We Knew It): A Feminist Critique of Political Economy”, pg 2-5)

The End of Capitalism (As We Knew It) problematizes "capitalism" as an economic and social descriptor.4 Scrutinizing what might be seen as throwaway uses of the term - passing references, for example, to the capitalist system or to global capitalism - as well as systematic and deliberate attempts to represent capitalism as a central and organizing feature of modern social experience, the book selectively traces the discursive origins of a widespread understanding: that capitalism is the hegemonic, or even the only, present form of economy and that it will continue to be so in the proximate future. It follows from this prevalent though not ubiquitous view that noncapitalist economic sites, if they exist at all, must inhabit the social margins; and, as a corollary, that deliberate attempts to develop noncapitalist economic practices and institutions must take place in the social interstices, in the realm of experiment, or in a visionary space of revolutionary social replacement. Representations of capitalism are a potent constituent of the anticapitalist imagination, providing images of what is to be resisted and changed as well as intimations of the strategies, techniques, and possibilities of changing it. For this reason, depictions of "capitalist hegemony" deserve a particularly skeptical reading. For in the vicinity of these representations, the very idea of a noncapitalist economy takes the shape of an unlikelihood or even an impossibility. It becomes difficult to entertain a vision of the prevalence and vitality of noncapitalist economic forms, or of daily or partial replacements of capitalism by noncapitalist economic practices, or of capitalist retreats and reversals. In this sense, "capitalist hegemony" operates not only as a constituent of, but also as a brake upon, the anticapitalist imagination.5 What difference might it make to release that brake and allow an anticapitalist economic imaginary to develop unrestricted?6 If we were to dissolve the image that looms in the economic foreground, what shadowy economic forms might come forward? In these questions we can identify the broad outlines of our project: to discover or create a world of economic difference, and to populate that world with exotic creatures that become, upon inspection, quite local and familiar (not to mention familiar beings that are not what they seem). The discursive artifact we call "capitalist hegemony" is a complex effect of a wide variety of discursive and nondiscursive conditions.7 In this book we focus on the practices and preoccupations of discourse, tracing some of the different, even incompatible, representations of capitalism that can be collated within this fictive summary representati n. These depictions have their origins in the diverse traditions of Marxism, classical and contemporary political economy, academic social science, modern historiography, popular economic and social thought, western philosophy and metaphysics, indeed, in an endless array of texts, traditions and infrastructures of meaning. In the chapters that follow, only a few of these are examined for the ways in which they have sustained a vision of capitalism as the dominant form of economy, or have contributed to the possibility or durability of such a vision. But the point should emerge none the less clearly: the virtually unquestioned dominance of capitalism can be seen as a complex product of a variety of discursive commitments, including but not limited to organicist social conceptions, heroic historical narratives, evolutionary scenarios of social development, and essentialist, phallocentric, or binary patterns of thinking. It is through these discursive figurings and alignments that capitalism is constituted as large, powerful, persistent, active, expansive, progressive, dynamic, transformative; embracing, penetrating, disciplining, colonizing, constraining; systemic, self-reproducing, rational, lawful, self-rectifying; organized and organizing, centered and centering; originating, creative, protean; victorious and ascendant; selfidentical, self-expressive, full, definite, real, positive, and capable of conferring identity and meaning.8 The argument revisited: it is the way capitalism has been "thought" that has made it so difficult for people to imagine its supersession.9 It is therefore the ways in which capitalism is known that we wish to delegitimize and displace. The process is one of unearthing, of bringing to light images and habits of understanding that constitute "hegemonic capitalism" at the intersection of a set of representations. This we see as a first step toward theorizing capitalism without representing dominance as a natural and inevitable feature of its being. At the same time, we hope to foster conditions under which the economy might become less subject to definitional closure. If it were possible to inhabit a heterogeneous and open-ended economic space whose identity was not fixed or singular (the space potentially to be vacated by a capitalism that is necessarily and naturally hegemonic) then a vision of noncapitalist economic practices as existing and widespread might be able to be born; and in the context of such a vision, a new anticapitalist politics might emerge, a noncapitalist politics of class (whatever that may mean) might take root and flourish. A long shot perhaps but one worth pursuing.

## A2: Environment

**No environment impact**

Ben **Ridder 08**, Phd School of Geography and Environmental Studies, University of Tasmania, “Questioning the ecosystem services argument for biodiversity conservation” Biodiversity and conservation yr:2008 vol:17 iss:4 pg:781

\*ES = environmental services

The low resilience assumption

Advocates of the conservation of biodiversity tend not to acknowledge the distinction between resilient and sensitive ES. This ‘low resilience assumption’ gives rise to, and is reinforced by the almost ubiquitous claim within the conservation literature that ES depend on biodiversity. An extreme example of this claim is made by the Ehrlichs in Extinction. They state that “all [ecosystem services] will be threatened if the rate of extinctions continues to increase” then observe that attempts to artificially replicate natural processes “are no more than partially successful in most cases. Nature nearly always does it better. When society sacrifices natural services for some other gain… it must pay the costs of substitution” (Ehrlich and Ehrlich 1982, pp. 95–96). This assertion—that the only alternative to protecting every species is a world in which all ES have been substituted by artificial alternatives—is an extreme example of the ‘low resilience assumption’. Paul Ehrlich revisits this flawed logic in 1997 i nhis response (with four co-authors) to doubts expressed by Mark Sagoff regarding economic arguments for species conservation (Ehrlich et al. 1997, p. 101). The claim that ES depend on biodiversity is also notably present in the controversial Issues in Ecology paper on biodiversity and ecosystem functioning (Naeem et al. 1999) that sparked the debate mentioned in the introduction. This appears to reflect a general tendency among authors in this field (e.g., Hector et al. 2001; Lawler et al. 2002; Lyons et al. 2005). Although such authors may not actually articulate the low resilience assumption, presenting such claims in the absence of any clarification indicates its influence. That the low resilience assumption is largely false is apparent in the number of examples of species extinctions that have not brought about catastrophic ecosystem collapse and decline in ES, and in the generally limited ecosystem influence of species on the cusp of extinction. These issues have been raised by numerous authors, although given the absence of systematic attempts to verify propositions of this sort, the evidence assembled is usually anecdotal and we are forced to trust that an unbiased account of the situation has been presented. Fortunately a number of highly respected people have discussed this topic, not least being the prominent conservation biologist David Ehrenfeld. In 1978 he described the ‘conservation dilemma’, which “arises on the increasingly frequent occasions when we encounter a threatened part of Nature but can find no rational reason for keeping it” (Ehrenfeld 1981, p. 177). He continued with the following observation: Have there been permanent and significant ‘resource’ effects of the extinction, in the wild, of John Bartram’s great discovery, the beautiful tree Franklinia alatamaha, which had almost vanished from the earth when Bartram first set eyes upon it? Or a thousand species of tiny beetles that we never knew existed before or after their probable extermination? Can we even be certain than the eastern forests of the United States suffer the loss of their passenger pigeons and chestnuts in some tangible way that affects their vitality or permanence, their value to us? (p. 192) Later, at the first conference on biodiversity, Ehrenfeld (1988) reflected that most species “do not seem to have any conventional value at all” and that the rarest species are “the ones least likely to be missed… by no stretch of the imagination can we make them out to be vital cogs in the ecological machine” (p. 215). The appearance of comments within the environmental literature that are consistent with Ehrenfeld’s—and from authors whose academic standing is also worthy of respect—is uncommon but not unheard of (e.g., Tudge 1989; Ghilarov 1996; Sagoff 1997; Slobodkin 2001; Western 2001). The low resilience assumption is also undermined by the overwhelming tendency for the protection of specific endangered species to be justified by moral or aesthetic arguments, or a basic appeal to the necessity of conserving biodiversity, rather than by emphasising the actual ES these species provide or might be able to provide humanity. Often the only services that can be promoted in this regard relate to the ‘scientific’ or ‘cultural’ value of conserving a particular species, and the tourism revenue that might be associated with its continued existence. The preservation of such services is of an entirely different order compared with the collapse of human civilization predicted by the more pessimistic environmental authors. The popularity of the low resilience assumption is in part explained by the increased rhetorical force of arguments that highlight connections between the conservation of biodiversity, human survival and economic profit. However, it needs to be acknowledged by those who employ this approach that a number of negative implications are associated with any use of economic arguments to justify the conservation of biodiversity.

**Capitalism solves the environment**

**Nordhaus & Shellenberger 07-**[Break Through: From the Death of Environmentalism to the Politics of Possibility, Ted & Michael, Managing Directors of American Environics, A social values research and strategy firm 15-17]

The politics we propose breaks with several widely accepted, largely unconscious distinctions, such as those between humans and nature, the community and the individual, and the government and the market. Few things have hampered environmentalism more than its longstanding position that limits to growth are the remedy for ecological crises. We argue for an explicitly pro-growth agenda that defines the kind of prosperity we believe is necessary to improve the quality of human life and to overcome ecological crises. One of the places where this politics of possibility takes concrete form is at the intersection of investment and innovation. There is simply no way we can achieve an 80 percent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions without creating breakthrough technologies that do not pollute. This is not just our opinion but also that of the United Nations International Panel on Climate Change, of Nicholas Stern, the former chief economist of the World Bank, and of top energy experts worldwide. Unfortunately, as a result of twenty years of cuts in funding research and development in energy, we are still a long way from even beginning to create these breakthroughs. The transition to a clean-energy economy should be modeled not on pollution control efforts, like the one on acid rain, but rather on past investments in infrastructure, such as railroads and highways, as well as on research and development - microchips, medi cines, and the Internet, among other areas. This innovation-centered framework makes sense not only for the long-term expansion of individual freedom, possibility, and choice that characterize modern democratic nations, but also for the cultural peculiarities of the United States. In 1840, Alexis de Tocqueville observed that "in the United States, there is no limit to the inventiveness of man to discover ways of increasing wealth and to satisfy the public's needs." Rather than *limiting* the aspirations of Americans, we believe that we should harness them in order to, in Tocqueville's words, "make new discoveries to increase the general prosperity, which, when made, they pass eagerly to the mass of people." The good news is that, at the very moment when we find ourselves facing new problems, from global warming to postmaterialist insecurity, new social and economic forces are emerging to overcome them. The new high-tech businesses and the new creative class may become a political force for a new, postindustrial social contract and a new clean-energy economy. One inspiring model for overcoming adversity can be found in the formation, after World War II, of what would later become the European Union. It was in the postwar years that the United States, France, Britain, and West Germany invested billions in the European Coal and Steel Community, which existed to rebuild war-torn nations and repair relations between former enemies, and which grew to become the greatest economic power the world has ever seen. Today's European Union wouldn't exist had it not been for a massive, shared global investment in energy. It's not hard to imagine what a similar approach to clean energy might do for countries like the United States, China, and India. But environmentalism has also saddled us with the albatross we call the politics of limits, which seeks to constrain human ambition, aspiration, and power rather than unleash and direct them.

## A2: V2L

**Life is a pre-requisite to value to life**

**There is an infinite value to life - their framework causes extinction and kills value to life**

**Kateb 92, Professor of Politics at Princeton University, (George, The Inner Ocean, pg. 144)**

To sum up the lines of thought that Nietzsche starts, I suggest first that it is epistemologically impossible for humanity to arrive at an estimation of the worth of itself or of the rest of nature: it cannot pretend to see itself from the outside or to see the rest, as it were, from the inside. Second, after allowance is made for this quandary, which is occasioned by the death of God and the birth of truth, humanity, placed in a position in which it is able to extinguish human life and natural life on earth, must simply affirm existence as such. Existence must go on but not because of any particular feature or group of features. The affirmation of existence refuses to say what worth existence has, even from just a human perspective, from any human perspective whatever. It cannot say, because existence is indefinite; it is beyond evaluating; being undesigned it is unencompassable by a defined and definite judgment. (The philosopher Frederick A. Olafson speaks of "the stubbornly unconceptualizable fact of existence.") The worth of the existence passed on to the unborn is not measurable but indefinite. The judgment is minimal: no human purpose or value within existence is worth more than existence and can ever be used to justify the risk of extinction. Third, from the moral point of view, existence seems unjustifiable because of the pain and ugliness in it, and therefore the moral point of view must be chastened if it is not to block attachment to existence as such. The other minimal judgment is that whatever existence is, it is better than nothing. For the first time, in the nuclear age, humanity can fully perceive existence from the perspective of nothing, which in part is the perspective of extinction.

## A2: Reps First

**focus on representations destroys social change by ignoring political and material constraints**

**Taft-Kaufman 95 (Jill, professor, Department of Speech Communication And Dramatic Arts, at Central Michigan University, Southern Communication Journal, Spring, proquest)**

The postmodern passwords of "polyvocality," "Otherness," and "difference," unsupported by substantial analysis of the concrete contexts of subjects, creates a solipsistic quagmire. The political sympathies of the new cultural critics, with their ostensible concern for the lack of power experienced by marginalized people, aligns them with the political left. Yet, despite their adversarial posture and talk of opposition, their discourses on intertextuality and inter-referentiality isolate them from andignore the conditions that have produced leftist politics--conflict, racism, poverty, and injustice. In short, as Clarke (1991) asserts, postmodern emphasis on new subjects conceals the old subjects, those who have limited access to good jobs, food, housing, health care, and transportation, as well as to the media that depict them. Merod (1987) decries this situation as one which leaves no vision, will, or commitment to activism. He notes that academic lip service to the oppositional is underscored by the absence of focused collective or politically active intellectual communities. Provoked by the academic manifestations of this problem Di Leonardo (1990) echoes Merod and laments: Has there ever been a historical era characterized by as little radical analysis or activism and as much radical-chic writing as ours? Maundering on about Otherness: phallocentrism or Eurocentric tropes has become a lazy academic substitute for actual engagement with the detailed histories and contemporary realities of Western racial minorities, white women, or any Third World population. (p. 530) Clarke's assessment of the postmodern elevation of language to the "sine qua non" of critical discussion is an even stronger indictment against the trend. Clarke examines Lyotard's (1984) The Postmodern Condition in which Lyotard maintains that virtually all social relations are linguistic, and, therefore, it is through the coercion that threatens speech that we enter the "realm of terror" and society falls apart. To this assertion, Clarke replies: I can think of few more striking indicators of the political and intellectual impoverishment of a view of society that can only recognize the discursive. If the worst terror we can envisage is the threat not to be allowed to speak, we are appallingly ignorant of terror in its elaborate contemporary forms. It may be the intellectual's conception of terror (what else do we do but speak?), but its projection onto the rest of the world would be calamitous....(pp. 2-27)  The realm of the discursive is derived from the requisites for human life, which are in the physical world, rather than in a world of ideas or symbols.(4) Nutrition, shelter, and protection are basic human needs that require collective activity for their fulfillment. Postmodern emphasis on the discursive without an accompanying analysis of how the discursive emerges from material circumstanceshides the complex task of envisioning and working towards concrete social goals (Merod, 1987). Although the material conditions that create the situation of marginality escape the purview of the postmodernist, the situation and its consequences are not overlooked by scholars from marginalized groups. Robinson (1990) for example, argues that "the justice that working people deserve is economic, not just textual" (p. 571). Lopez (1992) states that "the starting point for organizing the program content of education or political action must be the present existential, concrete situation" (p. 299). West (1988) asserts that borrowing French post-structuralist discourses about "Otherness" blinds us to realities of American difference going on in front of us (p. 170). Unlike postmodern "textual radicals" who Rabinow (1986) acknowledges are "fuzzy about power and the realities of socioeconomic constraints" (p. 255), most writers from marginalized groups are clear about how discourse interweaves with the concrete circumstances that create lived experience. People whose lives form the material for postmodern counter-hegemonic discourse do not share the optimism over the new recognition of their discursive subjectivities,because such an acknowledgment does not address sufficiently their collective historical and current struggles against racism, sexism, homophobia, and economic injustice. They do not appreciate being told they are living in a world in which there are no more real subjects. Ideas have consequences. Emphasizing the discursive self when a person is hungry and homeless represents both a cultural and humane failure. The need to look beyond texts to the perception and attainment of concrete social goals keeps writers from marginalized groups ever-mindful of the specifics of how power works through political agendas, institutions, agencies, and the budgets.

**Reps don’t shape reality – it’s objective**

**Kocher 2K** – Robert L., author, engineer working in the area of solid-state physics, and has done graduate study in clinical psychology (“Discourse on Reality and Sanity Part 1: What is Reality?” The Laissez Faire City Times, Vol. 4, No. 46, 11/13/00, http://web.archive.org/web/20040805084149/http://freedom.orlingrabbe.com/lfetimes/reality\_sanity1.htm)RK

The human senses seem remarkably able to discern a consistent and lawful reality. In the normal human being, mind and perception become so intimately connected as to produce a sense of unity with the world around us. This connection and sense of unity can be psychologically broken or regressed to primitive non-integrated levels through psychological trauma or regression, or through organic physical malfunction. For those who are in a normal functioning condition, behold, reality is all around you if you have courage to face it. Can I prove proof exists? No, I cannot. Not in the purely verbal world. Can I prove reality exists? No, not in the purely verbal world. Some things are too basic to be proven and must be accepted in day to day life. But in the purely verbal world, all things become philosophically doubtful when traced down to their primary premise, and that premise is then questioned. The World of Words While it is not possible to establish many proofs in the verbal world, and it is simultaneously possible to make many uninhibited assertions or word equations in the verbal world, it should be considered that reality is more rigid and does not abide by the artificial flexibility and latitude of the verbal world. The world of words and the world of human experience are very imperfectly correlated. That is, saying something doesn't make it true. A verbal statement in the world of words doesn't mean it will occur as such in the world of consistent human experience I call reality. In the event verbal statements or assertions disagree with consistent human experience, what proof is there that the concoctions created in the world of words should take precedence or be assumed a greater truth than the world of human physical experience that I define as reality? In the event following a verbal assertion in the verbal world produces pain or catastrophe in the world of human physical reality or experience, which of the two can and should be changed? Is it wiser to live with the pain and catastrophe, or to change the arbitrary collection of words whose direction produced that pain and catastrophe? Which do you want to live with? What proven reason is there to assume that when doubtfulness that can be constructed in verbal equations conflicts with human physical experience, human physical experience should be considered doubtful? It becomes a matter of choice and pride in intellectual argument. My personal advice is that when verbal contortions lead to chronic confusion and difficulty, better you should stop the verbal contortions rather than continuing to expect the difficulty to change. Again, it's a matter of choice. Philosophy is much like particle physics. Earlier in the 20th century the fundamental components of physical existence were considered to be the proton, the neutron, and the electron. As science developed atom smashers, and then more powerful atom smashers, these particles could be hit together and broken pieces of these components were found which might be assumed to be possible building blocks of the three primary particles. Well then, what are those building blocks made of? As more elaborate smashers are built and more discerning detection equipment is developed, perhaps still more kind of fragments or subparticles will be found. At some point in the process we will conclude that there is a material of some kind making up matter that just IS. It simply exists. Suppose the ultimate particle is found. The conclusion will be that it simply exists. There is no other conclusion possible or available. All systems of philosophy, of science, of religious theology, eventually can be traced down to one ultimate premise. There is something that exists. It exists, and that's all we know. Existence and reality exist. If an ultimate subparticulate material is found, in the world of chemistry, medicine, biology, engineering, and climbing stepladders; electrons, protons, and neutrons will still probably turn out to be the primary determining factors to be concerned about. That ignores some types of stuff like subparticle based propulsion system for future space ships or something similar in a highly specialized area. Philosophical questioning has long-since reached that parallel point of the ultimate particle or building material that just IS. There is something existent that just IS and will need to be accepted as being and following a consistent pattern of lawfulness. The fact is, the questions about proving whether reality exists, and proving proof exists are, or should be, meaningless to me beyond some degree of curiosity. I go on about my life without being able to prove proof or life exists. I can go on about my life without proving reality exists. The arguments asserted one way or another do not change how I need to live my life. Reality; A is A; what is, is; are equivalent to the protons, neutrons, and electrons of chemistry that must be accepted. Does the outcome of the philosophical question of whether reality or proof exists decide whether we should plant crops or wear clothes in cold weather to protect us from freezing? Har! Are you crazy? How many committed deconstructionist philosophers walk about naked in subzero temperatures or don't eat? Try creating and living in an alternative subjective reality where food is not needed and where you can sit naked on icebergs, and find out what happens. I emphatically encourage people to try it with the stipulation that they don't do it around me, that they don't force me to do it with them, or that they don't come to me complaining about the consequences and demanding to conscript me into paying for the cost of treating frostbite or other consequences. (sounds like there is a parallel to irresponsibility and socialism somewhere in here, doesn't it?). I encourage people to live subjective reality. I also ask them to go off far away from me to try it, where I won't be bothered by them or the consequences.

## O’Kane

**Democracy and economic liberalization checks their impacts**

**O’Kane 97  (“Modernity, the Holocaust, and politics”, Economy and Society, February, ebsco)**

Chosen policies cannot be relegated to the position of immediate condition (Nazis in power) in the explanation of the Holocaust.  Modern bureaucracy is not ‘intrinsically capable of genocidal action’ (Bauman 1989: 106).  Centralized state coercion has no natural move to terror.  In the explanation of modern genocides it is chosen policies which play the greatest part, whether in effecting bureaucratic secrecy, organizing forced labour, implementing a system of terror, harnessing science and technology or introducing extermination policies, as means and as ends. As Nazi Germany and Stalin’s USSR have shown, furthermore, those chosen policies of genocidal government turned away from and not towards modernity.  The choosing of policies,however, is not independent of circumstances.  An analysis of the history of each case plays an important part in explaining where and how genocidal governments come to power and analysis of political institutions and structures also helps towards an understanding of the factors which act as obstacles to modern genocide.  But it is not just political factors which stand in the way of another Holocaust in modern society.  Modern societies have not only pluralist democratic political systems but also economic pluralism where workers are free to change jobs and bargain wages and where independent firms, each with their own independent bureaucracies, exist in competition with state-controlled enterprises.  In modern societies this economic pluralism both promotes and is served by the open scientific method.  By ignoring competition and the capacity for people to move between organizations whether economic, political, scientific or social, Bauman overlooks crucial but also very ‘ordinary and common’ attributes of truly modern societies.  It is these very ordinary and common attributes of modernity which stand in the way of modern genocides.

## Owen

Prior questions are irrelevant and debilitate action—

Owen 02 (university of Southampton, David Owen, Reader of Political Theory at the Univ. of Southampton, Millennium Vol 31 No 3 2002 p. 655-7)

Commenting on the ‘philosophical turn’ in IR, Wæver remarks that ‘[a] frenzy for words like “epistemology” and “ontology” often signals this philosophical turn’, although he goes on to comment that these terms are often used loosely.4 However, loosely deployed or not, it is clear that debates concerning ontology and epistemology play a central role in the contemporary IR theory wars. In one respect, this is unsurprising since it is a characteristic feature of the social sciences that periods of disciplinary disorientation involve recourse to reflection on the philosophical commitments of different theoretical approaches, and there is no doubt that such reflection can play a valuable role in making explicit the commitments that characterise (and help individuate) diverse theoretical positions. Yet, such a philosophical turn is not without its dangers and I will briefly mention three before turning to consider a confusion that has, I will suggest, helped to promote the IR theory wars by motivating this philosophical turn. The first danger with the philosophical turn is that it has an inbuilt tendency to prioritise issues of ontology and epistemology over explanatory and/or interpretive power as if the latter two were merely a simple function of the former. But while the explanatory and/or interpretive power of a theoretical account is not wholly independent of its ontological and/or epistemological commitments (otherwise criticism of these features would not be a criticism that had any value), it is by no means clear that it is, in contrast, wholly dependent on these philosophical commitments. Thus, for example, one need not be sympathetic to rational choice theory to recognisethatit can provide powerful accounts of certainkinds of problems, such as the tragedy of the commons in which dilemmas of collective action are foregrounded. It may, of course, be the case that the advocates of rational choice theory cannot give a good account of why this type of theory is powerful in accounting for this class of problems (i.e., how it is that the relevant actors come to exhibit features in these circumstances that approximate the assumptions of rational choice theory) and, if this is the case, it is a philosophical weakness—but this does not undermine the point that, for a certain class of problems, rational choice theory may provide the best account available to us. In other words, while the critical judgement of theoretical accounts in terms of their ontological and/or epistemological sophistication is one kind of critical judgement, it is not the only or even necessarily the most important kind. The second danger run by the philosophical turn is that because prioritisation of ontology andepistemology promotes theory-construction from philosophical first principles, it cultivates a theory-driven rather than problem-driven approach to IR. Paraphrasing Ian Shapiro, the point can be put like this: since it is the case that there is always a plurality of possible true descriptions of a given action, event or phenomenon, the challenge is to decide which is the most apt in terms of getting a perspicuous grip on the action,

event or phenomenon in question given the purposes of the inquiry; yet, from this standpoint, ‘theory-driven work is part of a reductionist program’ in that it ‘dictates always opting for the description that calls for the explanation that flows from the preferred model or theory’.5 The justification offered for this strategy rests on the mistaken belief that it is necessary for social science because general explanations are required to characterise the classes of phenomena studied in similar terms. However, as Shapiro points out, this is to misunderstand the enterprise of science since ‘whether there are general explanations for classes of phenomenais a question for social-scientific inquiry, not to be prejudged before conducting that inquiry’.6 Moreover, this strategy easily slips into the promotion of the pursuit of generality over that of empirical validity. The third danger is that the preceding two combine to encourage the formation of a particular image of disciplinary debate in IR—what might be called (only slightly tongue in cheek) ‘the Highlander view’—namely, an image of warring theoretical approaches with each, despite occasional temporary tactical alliances, dedicated to the strategic achievement of sovereignty over the disciplinary field. It encourages this view because the turn to, and prioritisation of, ontology and epistemology stimulates the idea that there can only be one theoretical approach which gets things right, namely, the theoretical approach that gets its ontology and epistemology right. This image feeds back into IR exacerbating the first and second dangers, and so a potentially vicious circle arises.

# Urban Sprawl DA

#### Trade deficit destroys US-Sino relations

**Sester and Roubini, Research Associate in the Global Economic Governance Programme at University Collegem Oxford, Professor of Economics at New York University, 8-‘5 ( Council on Foreign Affairs, P.Nexis)**

There is little doubt that U.S. external debt and the current account deficit are eroding the appeal of the U.S. approach to economic policy, an important element of U.S. "soft power." Asian policymakers, in particular, view U.S. economic policy not as a model but as a problem: the United States' "exorbitant privilege"--Charles de Gaulle's term for Washington's ability to finance deficits by printing dollars-comes at their expense. The United States has a particularly delicate relationship with China, which is currently the single biggest buyer of U.S. debt. To date, disagreements on other issues have not prompted China to slow its accumulation of dollar reserves, but that is not to say that it could not happen in the future. The ability to send a "sell" order that roils markets may not give China a veto over U.S. foreign policy, but it surely does increase the cost of any U.S. policy that China opposes. Even if China never plays its financial card, the unbalanced economic relationship between the United States and China could add to the political tensions likely to accompany China's rise. Economic power usually flows to creditors, not debtors. While the United States roams the world looking to sweep up any spare savings to finance its huge deficits, China roams the world looking for new places to invest its surplus savings-including in oil and gas resources and in states that Washington has judged pariahs. This is a far cry from the early days of the Cold War, when the United States used its surplus savings to finance the reconstruction of its allies, cementing political alliances with strong economic ties.

#### Relations solve extinction

**Wenzhong 04, PRC Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2-7-2K4 (Zhou, “Vigorously Pushing Forward the Constructive and Cooperative Relationship Between China and the United States,” http://china-japan21.org/eng/zxxx/t64286.htm)**

China's development needs a peaceful international environment, particularly in its periphery. We will continue to play a constructive role in global and regional affairs and sincerely look forward to amicable coexistence and friendly cooperation with all other countries, the United States included. We will continue to push for good-neighborliness, friendship and partnership and dedicate ourselves to peace, stability and prosperity in the region. Thus China's development will also mean stronger prospect of peace in the Asia-Pacific region and the world at large. China and the US should, and can, work together for peace, stability and prosperity in the region. Given the highly complementary nature of the two economies, China's reform, opening up and rising economic size have opened broad horizon for sustained China-US trade and economic cooperation. By deepening our commercial partnership, which has already delivered tangible benefits to the two peoples, we can do still more and also make greater contribution to global economic stability and prosperity. Terrorism, cross-boundary crime, proliferation of advanced weapons, and spread of deadly diseases pose a common threat to mankind. China and the US have extensive shared stake and common responsibility for meeting these challenges, maintaining world peace and security and addressing other major issues bearing on human survival and development. China is ready to keep up its coordination and cooperation in these areas with the US and the rest of the international community. During his visit to the US nearly 25 years ago, Deng Xiaoping said, "The interests of our two peoples and those of world peace require that we view our relations from the overall international situation and a long-term strategic perspective." Thirteen years ago when China-US relations were at their lowest ebb, Mr. Deng said, "In the final analysis, China-US relations have got to get better." We are optimistic about the tomorrow of China-US relations. We have every reason to believe that so long as the two countries view and handle the relationship with a strategic perspective, adhere to the guiding principles of the three joint communiqués and firmly grasp the common interests of the two countries, we will see even greater accomplishments in China-US relations.

**No link – Plan doesn’t prevent transition to rural communities**

**Ecosystem redundancy prevents collapse**

**Davidson 2K** (Carlos, Conservation biologist with background in economics Economic Growth and the Environment: Alternatives to the Limits Paradigm 5-1)

Biodiversity limits. The original rivet metaphor (Ehrlich and Ehrlich 1981) referred to species extinction and biodiversity loss as a limit to human population and the economy. A wave of species extinctions is occurring that is unprecedented in human history (Wilson 1988, 1992, Reid and Miller 1989). The decline of biodiversity represents irreplaceable and incalculable losses to future generations of humans. Is biodiversity loss a case of limits, as suggested by the rivet metaphor, or is it a continuum of degradation with local tears, as suggested by the tapestry metaphor? In the rivet metaphor, it is not the loss of species by itself that is the proposed limit but rather some sort of ecosystem collapse that would be triggered by the species loss. But it is unclear that biodiversity loss will lead to ecosystem collapse. Research in this area is still in its infancy, and results from the limited experimental studies are mixed. Some studies show a positive relationship between diversity and some aspect of ecosy stem function, such as the rate of nitrogen cycling (Kareiva 1996, Tilman et al. 1996). Others support the redundant species concept (Lawton and Brown 1993, Andren et al. 1995), which holds that above some low number, additional species are redundant in terms of ecosystem function. Still other studies support the idiosyncratic species model (Lawton 1994), in which loss of some species reduces some aspect of ecosystem function, whereas loss of others may increase that aspect of ecosystem function. The relationship between biodiversity and ecosystem function is undoubtedly more complex than any simple metaphor. Nonetheless, I believe that the tapestry metaphor provides a more useful view of biodiversity loss than the rivet metaphor. A species extinction is like a thread pulled from the tapestry. With each thread lost, the tapestry gradually becomes threadbare. The loss of some species may lead to local tears. Although everything is linked to everything else, ecosystems are not delicately balanced, clocklike mechanisms in which the loss of a part leads to collapse. For example, I study California frogs, some of which are disappearing. Although it is possible that the disappearances signal some as yet unknown threat to humans (the miner's canary argument), the loss of the frogs themselves is unlikely to have major ecosystem effects. The situation is the same for most rare organisms, which make up the bulk of threatened and endangered species. For example, if the black toad (Bufo exsul) were to disappear from the few desert springs in which it lives, even careful study would be unlikely to reveal ecosystem changes. To argue that there are not limits is not to claim that biodiversity losses do not matter. Rather, in calling for a stop to the destruction, it is the losses themselves that count, not a putative cliff that humans will fall off of somewheredown the road.

**Dredging is safe and is key to wetlands**

**USACE 03** (US Army Corps of Engineers, “Deep Water Ports and Harbors: Value to the Nation,” http://www.spn.usace.army.mil/value\_to\_the\_nation/DeepWaterPorts.pdf)

Corps personnel consistently work to identify environmentally beneficial ways to use dredged material from harbor maintenance projects. For instance, dredged material has been used by the Corps to enhance wildlife habitats by creating nesting islands for waterfowl. Fisheries also have been improved by mounding dredged material to establish fish refuge habitats. One of the key uses of dredged material, though, is to create, preserve and restore wetlands. These projects are particularly important because of the crucial role wetlands play in our environment, providing homes for thousands of plants, fish and wildlife, including many species that are endangered. Wetlands also serve as rest stops for migratory birds, help prevent flooding and control erosion. Corps personnel carefully consider the environmental impact of each construction or dredging project they undertake. During the planning phase, we conduct computer modeling to project the potential impact of proposed changes and make adjustments as needed before work even begins. We also conduct dredging operations during “environmental windows“, which are time periods when disruption to marine species can be minimized.

**Wetlands are key to global bio-diversity**

**Article Myriad 11** (Article Myriad is an authoritative source for original and insightful articles and ideas on a broad range of topics related to the humanities, “An Extended Definition of Wetlands and the Impact of the Loss of Wetlands,” http://www.articlemyriad.com/extended-definition-loss-wetlands-impact/)

¶ Wetlands are critical to our biodiversity and the protection of wetlands is essential. Before examining the effects of the loss of wetlands, it is important to give a definition of wetlands and provide an overview of what they are, where wetlands exist, and why wetlands are important. With the exception of Antarctica, wetlands can be found nearly everywhere and are generally found in the form of bogs, swamps, marshes, and fens. Although wetlands can vary widely as a result of geological, climactic, and geographical differences, generally speaking, “wetlands are lands where saturation with water is the dominant factor determining the nature of soil development and the types of plant and animal communities living in the soil and on its surface” (EPA 1995).¶ ¶ These wetlands are home to large numbers of both terrestrial and amphibious organisms and are often key areas during breeding seasons as representative species from across the food chain are collected in the soil and marshy land. Several variations of plant life exist only in wetlands and many varieties of migratory birds breed and rest in these fertile areas. In wetlands, small shellfish, crabs, and other aquatic life thrive and serve as food to land-dwelling animals. In sum, wetlands serve as a mini-ecosystem and without such areas; populations of countless species would be threatened. The loss of wetlands poses dangers to wildlife as well as human populations both in terms of protection of terrain and in a broader economic sense. Although efforts to stop the rapid loss of wetlands have been a relatively recent development, it is vital that efforts continue or problems already faced could be made much worse. In any discussion about the loss of wetlands it should be stated that there is always going to be a chain reaction. The damage or loss of one aspect of wetlands does not just have an impact on that particular issue, but has more far-reaching consequences that have a great and often devastating effect on human and animal populations as well as the ecosystem as a whole.

#### Free trade is key to tech innovation

Alex Tabarrok 10, professor of economics at George Mason University, 12-16-10, “On The Importance of Trade and New Economic Growth,” The Daily Reckoning, http://dailyreckoning.com/author/kateincontrera/, ZM

The story of economic growth has changed. But when you say innovation, you also mean change, and that has two sides. Sometimes people are afraid of the change.¶ So during the Great Depression, in that crisis, there was definitely world retrenchment in trade. We had those things like the Smoot Holly Tariff, and trade just declined all over the world. Fortunately, in this last recession, we have not seen that to anywhere near the same extent. So that is an optimistic point. That is a good point. That is something that we have done right. We have not seen a lot of trade wars.¶ It’s something we need to be concerned about because, yes, any time other people start to get rich, people begin to wonder about their own position in the world. They begin to fear. But so far, I think we’ve been – I think we have learned actually some lessons from the past, and we have not cut down on trade as much as we have done in the past.¶ Trade is absolutely critical. Think about it this way. The reason trade is important is because it makes markets much larger, and that increases the incentive to do research and development. So I like to say, you know, if China and India were as rich as the United States is today, then the market for cancer drugs would be five or six times larger than it is now, and that means five or six times the purchasing power, the incentive to do research and develop new drugs.¶ So part of what we have to understand is that when other countries get rich, that is a benefit to us. That is not a cost. When other countries get rich, they start to contribute to the incentive to do research and development – to research and develop new drugs, new computers, new software, all kind of ideas. And this makes us rich as well.¶ Think about the world economy as a massive parallel computer. Well, for most of the last century, most of those processes were offline. We had more than a billion people in China and India not contributing. A processor being offline. Today those processes are coming back online and are finally contributing to the world economy.¶ Well, I’m really very optimistic about the future. And, really, for the very first time, in at least a 1000 years, the world economy is really operating almost on all four cylinders. Think about it this way. For well over a 100 years, most of the world economy has been driven by the United States, Britain, Japan, a few other countries. Today, we have China and India coming online.¶ So what I mean by this is that we have billions of people in these countries who have been cut off from the world economy, whether through communism or whether through abject poverty, they have basically been, simply, producing enough agriculture to feed themselves, sometimes not even that, and that’s it. They haven’t been part of the world economy.¶ Today that’s changing. Today, for the first time, we have billions of people in China and India who are beginning to contribute ideas, innovations, new discoveries, who are beginning to contribute to the world economy.

**Solves extinction**

**Kurzweil 08**—BS in Computer Science and Literature in 1970 from MIT, header of tons of entrepreneurial projects (Ray, 13 April 2008, Making the World A Billion Times Better, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/04/11/AR2008041103326.html>) ellipses in original

This exponential progress in the power of information technology goes back more than a century to the data-processing equipment used in the 1890 census, the first U.S. census to be automated. It has been a smooth -- and highly predictable -- phenomenon despite all the vagaries of history through that period, including two world wars, the Cold War and the Great Depression. I say highly predictable because, thanks to its exponential power, only technology possesses the scale to address the major challenges -- such as energy and the environment, disease and poverty -- confronting society. That, at least, is the major conclusion of a panel, organized by the National Science Foundation and the National Academy of Engineering, on which I recently participated. Take energy. Today, 70 percent of it comes from fossil fuels, a 19th-century technology. But if we could capture just one ten-thousandth of the sunlight that falls on Earth, we could meet 100 percent of the world's energy needs using this renewable and environmentally friendly source. We can't do that now because solar panels rely on old technology, making them expensive, inefficient, heavy and hard to install. But a new generation of panels based on nanotechnology (which manipulates matter at the level of molecules) is starting to overcome these obstacles. The tipping point at which energy from solar panels will actually be less expensive than fossil fuels is only a few years away. The power we are generating from solar is doubling every two years; at that rate, it will be able to meet all our energy needs within 20 years. Nanotechnology itself is an information technology and therefore subject to what I call the "law of accelerating returns," a continual doubling of capability about every year. Venture capital groups and high-tech companies are investing billions of dollars in these new renewable energy technologies. I'm confident that the day is close at hand when we will be able to obtain energy from sunlight using nano-engineered solar panels and store it for use on cloudy days in nano-engineered fuel cells for less than it costs to use environmentally damaging fossil fuels. It's important to understand that exponentials seem slow at first. In the mid-1990s, halfway through the Human Genome Project to identify all the genes in human DNA, researchers had succeeded in collecting only 1 percent of the human genome. But the amount of genetic data was doubling every year, and that is actually right on schedule for an exponential progression. The project was slated to take 15 years, and if you double 1 percent seven more times you surpass 100 percent. In fact, the project was finished two years early. This helps explain why people underestimate what is technologically feasible over long periods of time -- they think linearly while the actual course of progress is exponential. We see the same progression with other biological technologies as well. Until just recently, medicine -- like energy -- was not an information technology. This is now changing as scientists begin to understand how biology works as a set of information processes. The approximately 23,000 genes in our cells are basically software programs, and we are making exponential gains in modeling and simulating the information processes that cracking the genome code has unlocked. We also have new tools, likewise just a few years old, that allow us to actually reprogram our biology in the same way that we reprogram our computers. For example, when the fat insulin receptor gene was turned off in mice, they were able to eat ravenously yet remain slim and obtain the health benefits of being slim. They didn't get heart disease or diabetes and lived 20 percent longer. There are now more than a thousand drugs in the pipeline to turn off the genes that promote obesity, heart disease, cancer and other diseases. We can also turn enzymes off and on, and add genes to the body. I'm an adviser to a company that removes lung cells, adds a new gene, reproduces the gene-enhanced cell a million-fold and then injects it back into the body where it returns to the lungs. This has cured a fatal disease, pulmonary hypertension, in animals and is now undergoing human trials. The important point is this: Now that we can model, simulate and reprogram biology just like we can a computer, it will be subject to the law of accelerating returns, a doubling of capability in less than a year. These technologies will be more than a thousand times more capable in a decade, more than a million times more capable in two decades. We are now adding three months every year to human life expectancy, but given the exponential growth of our ability to reprogram biology, this will soon go into high gear. According to my models, 15 years from now we'll be adding more than a year each year to our remaining life expectancy. This is not a guarantee of living forever, but it does mean that the sands of time will start pouring in rather than only pouring out. What's more, this exponential progression of information technology will affect our prosperity as well. The World Bank has reported, for example, that poverty in Asia has been cut in half over the past decade due to information technologies and that at current rates it will be cut by another 90 percent over the next decade. That phenomenon will spread around the globe.

**Status quo solves biodiversity**

**Loki 12** 4/13/12 - media executive with 15 years experience in the private and non-profit sectors, Reynard is the co-founder of MomenTech (Reynard, “A Venture Capital Solution to for Biodiversity Loss” <http://www.justmeans.com/A-Venture-Capital-Solution-for-Biodiversity-Loss/53352.html>, PZ)

Governments seem to be unable to stem the tide. Could market-based conservation initiatives help? That's what a new biodiversity-focused fund supporting small sustainable businesses in Latin America hopes to do. The Multilateral Investment Fund (MIF), a member of the Inter-American Development Bank Group (IDB), the European Investment Bank (EIB), the Dutch Development Bank (FMO) and the Nature Conservancy, has launched the next stage of EcoEnterprises Fund II, a venture capital fund that aims to support biodiversity, preserve critical ecosystems and support local poor by directing capital to community-based sustainable businesses. The MIF is one of the biggest investors in microfinance and venture capital funds for small businesses in Latin America and the Caribbean. The fund "will provide expansion capital to small sustainable businesses, so they may generate livelihoods for rural communities and preserve ecosystems for future generations," according to an IDB press release.[4] The first EcoEnterprises fund, a joint-project of the MIF and the Nature Conservancy launched in 2000, invested $6.3 million in 23 Latin American and Carribbean sustainable companies that cover a wide array of eco-friendly products, including organic shrimp, organic spices, FSC-certified furniture, pesticide-free biodynamic flowers and acai palm berry smoothies. Together, these firms have created over 3,500 jobs, benefited almost 300 communities and conservation groups, generated more than $280 million in sales, leveraged $138 million in additional capital and—much to the delight of conservationists and environmentalists—conserved over 860,000 hectares of land (around 3,320 square miles, or about a third of the area of Massachusetts).[5]

**Population growth makes bio-diversity loss inevitable**

**Science Daily 11** 7/28/11(“Ongoing Global Biodiversity Loss Unstoppable With Protected Areas Alone” <http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2011/07/110728123059.htm>, PZ)

Continued reliance on a strategy of setting aside land and marine territories as "protected areas" is insufficient to stem global biodiversity loss, according to a comprehensive assessment published July 28 in the journal Marine Ecology Progress Series.

Despite impressively rapid growth of protected land and marine areas worldwide -- today totalling over 100,000 in number and covering 17 million square kilometers of land and 2 million square kilometers of oceans -- biodiversity is in steep decline. Expected scenarios of human population growth and consumption levels indicate that cumulative human demands will impose an unsustainable toll on Earth's ecological resources and services accelerating the rate at which biodiversity is being loss. Current and future human requirements will also exacerbate the challenge of effectively implementing protected areas while suggesting that effective biodiversity conservation requires new approaches that address underlying causes of biodiversity loss -- including the growth of both human population and resource consumption. Says lead author Camilo Mora of University of Hawaii at Manoa: "Biodiversity is humanity's life-support system, delivering everything from food, to clean water and air, to recreation and tourism, to novel chemicals that drive our advanced civilization. Yet there is an increasingly well-documented global trend in biodiversity loss, triggered by a host of human activities." "Ongoing biodiversity loss and its consequences for humanity's welfare are of great concern and have prompted strong calls for expanding the use of protected areas as a remedy," says fellow author Peter F. Sale, Assistant Director of the United Nations University's Canadian-based Institute for Water, Environment and Health. "While many protected areas have helped preserve some species at local scales, promotion of this strategy as a global solution to biodiversity loss, and the advocacy of protection for specific proportions of habitats, have occurred without adequate assessment of their potential effectiveness in achieving the goal." Drs. Mora and Sale warn that long-term failure of the protected areas strategy could erode public and political support for biodiversity conservation and that the disproportionate allocation of available resources and human capital into this strategy precludes the development of more effective approaches. The authors based their study on existing literature and global data on human threats and biodiversity loss. "The global network of protected areas is a major achievement, and the pace at which it has been achieved is impressive," says Dr. Sale. "Protected areas are very useful conservation tools, but unfortunately, the steep continuing rate of biodiversity loss signals the need to reassess our heavy reliance on this strategy." The study says continuing heavy reliance on the protected areas strategy has five key technical and practical limitations: Concludes Dr. Mora: "Given the considerable effort and widespread support for the creation of protected areas over the past 30 years, we were surprised to find so much evidence for their failure to effectively address the global problem of biodiversity loss. Clearly, the biodiversity loss problem has been underestimated and the ability of protected areas to solve this problem overestimated." The authors underline the correlations between growing world population, natural resources consumption and biodiversity loss to suggest that biodiversity loss is unlikely to be stemmed without directly addressing the ecological footprint of humanity. Based upon previous research, the study shows that under current conditions of human consumption and conservative scenarios of human population growth, the cummulative use of natural resources of humanity will amount to the productivity of up to 27 Earths by 2050. "Protected areas are a valuable tool in the fight to preserve biodiversity. We need them to be well managed, and we need more of them, but they alone cannot solve our biodiversity problems," adds Dr. Mora. "We need to recognize this limitation promptly and to allocate more time and effort to the complicated issue of human overpopulation and consumption." "Our study shows that the international community is faced with a choice between two paths," Dr. Sale says. "One option is to continue a narrow focus on creating more protected areas with little evidence that they curtail biodiversity loss. That path will fail. The other path requires that we get serious about addressing the growth in size and consumption rate of our global population.”

# PTX CIR – Add A2 I/L to Competitiveness

## A2: STEM

**Status quo solves STEM – solves their internal-link**

**Lowell 10** (B. Lindsay, director of policy studies at the Institute for the Study of International Migration of Georgetown University. His research interests are in immigration policy, labor force, and economic development. He recently co-edited Sending Money Home: Hispanic Remittances and Community Development. He received his PhD in sociology as a demographer from Brown University, A Long View of America’s Immigration Policy and the Supply of Foreign-Born STEM Workers in the United States, American Behavioral Scientist 53(7) 1029– 1044)

**This is not the place for elaborating on the hotly debated issues of the supply of natives, but suffice it to say that there are solid reasons to believe, pace concerns about the educational pipeline, that** America is producing a large crop of natives quite able to pursue STEM careers **(Lowell & Salzman, 2007). The same prestigious panels and futurists claim that there is a purportedly degraded STEM supply pipeline due to falling native interest in science and mathematics, poor performance on these subjects, and falling numbers of STEM graduates from U.S. colleges and universities. Yet,** even a casual glance at the data indicates substantial increases in the numbers of high school students with advanced science and math education and about one third who express interest in STEM education**. Compared to other industrial nations**, the United States also produces the largest number of secondary school students who perform in the upper quintiles on international science tests**. So** there are plenty of natives in the pipeline **and, in fact,** the number **of natives** completing BA, MA, and PhD degrees in STEM fields has increased over time**. Y**

**es, there may be specialized subfields that are not doing as well, but there are also surprises such as the increasing number of native PhDs in physics, a field that a few short years ago was believed to be in freefall. Do not also forget that there must have been a significant attrition from STEM jobs after 2001 or, in other words,** there are many natives with STEM training who have moved into non-STEM jobs**. It is unlikely that the critics of U.S. STEM policies will be convinced by these contrary claims, regardless of what the data say. And there are good reasons to be concerned about the state of play in U.S. STEM policies with regard to both the educational pipeline and immigration policy. Amazingly enough, and despite reaching different conclusions from the same data, there are several possible points of agreement. This article has argued that** there has been a robust supply of immigrants into the STEM workforce **coincident with assertions that the United States is restricting entry. Without entering into a universe of parallel argumentation as to why this state of affairs exists, once again, suffice it to say that the point, simply put, is that** the number of immigrants admitted under the current system appears quite sufficient to any objective assessment of demand as captured by trends in STEM employment and earnings**. It is arguable that policy makers and other stakeholders should be looking for the policy fixes to the regulations that govern the process of immigration. America should be** courting the “best and the brightest**,” and that will take carefully thought out and new admission processes. That goal** will not be met by insisting, given their evident ample supply, that ever more immigrants are required**.**

## 2AC Generic – IF CIR

**CIR creates a backlog – impossible to solve**

David **North 10**, former Assistant to the U.S. Secretary of Labor and Center for Immigration Studies Fellow, April 7, 2010, “Would Legalization Backlogs Delay Other USCIS Applications? Probably,” Center for Immigration Studies, http://cis.org/north/legalization-backlogs

An interesting question has arisen as a result of a congressional hearing: would a massive legalization program, as many advocates want, slow the processing of applications filed routinely by citizens and legal aliens wanting immigration benefits? The numbers are daunting. U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) currently faces six million applications a year according to one news story. The estimates of the number of illegal aliens in the nation runs to 11 or 12 million. Could USCIS handle both these multi-million caseloads with its current paper-based systems? There are many complaints that the backlogs are currently too long on the normal collection of six million cases a year. The government's expert on such things, Frank W. Deffer, Assistant Inspector General for Information Technology in the Department of Homeland Security, told a congressional committee on March 23: "adding 12 million more people to the system would be the **mother of all backlogs**. Clearly to us the systems **could not handle it** now."

**THERE IS NO connection between the bill their uniqueness evidence is hopeful of and the ideal legislation required to solve the internal link—**

**You should have the same threshold for this connection as you would apply to affirmative solvency evidence—**

**Obama isn’t using political capital, and if he did it would fail**

**Rothman 1-29** (Obama Says Nothing In Presser, Saves Immigration Reform by Noah Rothman, political analyst and journalist, analyst with Mediaite.com, a news and opinion blog covering politics and entertainment in the media industry as well as other issues. It is the flagship blog of Abrams Media, a ring of blogs run by ABC legal analyst Dan Abrams 5:23 pm, January 29th, 2013

CNN reported on Monday that the Congressional Hispanic Caucus specifically requested the White House to stand down and allow Republican Senators and Congressmen, warming to the possibility of a major deal on immigration reform, to entertain the proposals put forward by the Gang of Eight. “It’s a tricky thing. We want him to lead, but Republicans are in a difficult position,” one unnamed Democratic source told CNN. This time, the president complied. This is a major, though underreported, development. It may have preserved the political will that seems to exist in Congress for a broad reform package that includes a pathway to citizenship for many illegal immigrants while strengthening border security: My fears that the president did not truly want progress on immigration reform, but would rather seek to isolate his opponents and preserve their opposition to comprehensive reform as a political cudgel for his party’s electoral purposes, were not unfounded. Obama has set dubious precedent after precedent of wrenching legislative defeat from the jaws of victory. On July 25, 2011, with just days to go before the debt ceiling limit was reached on August 2 of that year, President Barack Obama delivered a prime time address to the nation warning of the consequences of the House Republican plan to avert the catastrophe of default on the nation’s debt. The president did not offer a concrete plan of his own to avert the crisis, but endorsed Sen. Harry Reid’s (D-NV) proposal which he knew was unpalatable to Republicans. The president’s speech hardened the positions of partisan members of Congress. The framework of a bipartisan deal was scuttled. What was ultimately passed was not favorable to the White House and amounted to a Republican victory – one that Obama’s supporters on the left were roiled over. The episode amounted to the most significant defeat of Obama’s presidency to date: The president had learned his lesson.

**Bridges and Nagle prove we’re key to competitiveness – we can’t sell our products at as low of a price as other countries can if we use Post-Panamax ships**

**Scientists already in the U.S. should be SUFFICIENT to solve their internal-link**

#### Winners win is key to democratic unity

Reuters 2-7

(<http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/02/07/usa-congress-obama-idUSL1N0B7IQZ20130207>)

Va. Feb 7 (Reuters) - Democrats in Congress have always had some gripes with their president, Barack Obama. He doesn't call. He doesn't schmooze. He's **not tough enough** with Republicans. But this year, the complaints, as well as the complainers, are fewer than ever, with some of his old critics confessing that they're starting to come around. That's the message from the annual retreat in suburban Virginia of Democratic members of the House of Representatives. "I really like this new man," said Democratic Representative Louise Slaughter of New York, one of those who during Obama's first term thought he was too compromising. "I've been a little hard on him, but he finally understands that Republicans really don't like him and tried to destroy him," Slaughter said. "He wants to get things done. So do I." Slaughter was referring to the aggressive agenda Obama has pursued since winning re-election in November, with immigration reform and gun violence, longtime favorites of the progressive base of the Democratic Party, at the top of the list. Liberals were critical of Obama during his first term for lack of action on both these issues as well as on climate change. Fiscally conservative Democrats criticized his nearly $800 billion economic stimulus plan in 2009. Moderates in the Senate - such as then Senators Evan Bayh of Indiana and Ben Nelson of Nebraska - thought him insufficiently attentive to the economy. He faced the broadest barrage from his own party in December 2010, when he **compromised** with Republicans by agreeing to extend the so-called Bush tax cuts, instead of letting them expire. That was the darkest moment for House Democrats, who had lost control of their majority in the mid-term election the month before, in part because of Obama's handling of the economy. Fresh from what Democrats see as an Obama triumph in this January's "fiscal cliff" showdown with Republicans, members gave the president a sustained ovation here on Thursday.

#### Democratic unity key to immigration

AP 2-6-13, Obama presses Senate Democrats on strategy for tough fights ahead at annual retreat, www.washingtonpost.com/business/obama-trying-to-sell-senate-democrats-at-annual-retreat-on-a-strategy-for-tough-fights-ahead/2013/02/06/c6f7ace8-7034-11e2-b3f3-b263d708ca37\_story.html

With a big to-do list at the start of his second term, President Barack Obama is trying to sell Democrats on his strategy for tackling immigration, gun control and a host of fiscal dilemmas. Obama met behind closed doors for more than two hours Wednesday with lawmakers from his own party at the Senate Democrats’ annual retreat at a hotel in Annapolis, Md. House Democrats will hear from Obama at their annual retreat Thursday in Leesburg, Va. Senate Democratic unity will be critical to Obama’s prospects for enacting the ambitious agenda he’s laid out for the start of his second term. Almost all the items he’s seeking face opposition from Senate Republicans — not to mention the even stronger opposition Obama is likely to run up against if and when the GOP-controlled House takes up those items. The White House said Obama spoke briefly, took questions from 10 of the senators assembled, then spent an hour chatting with them in smaller groups. Obama’s spokesman, Jay Carney said the session was focused on coordinating what Democratic senators are doing with the administration’s own efforts to promote Obama’s priorities. High on the agenda was immigration, where Carney said Obama would note the “significant progress” made toward a bipartisan deal. Obama is letting the Senate take the lead on crafting comprehensive immigration legislation, including a path to citizenship for 11 million illegal immigrants. But he is using all the power that the presidency affords to implore lawmakers to act without delay. A bipartisan Senate group has reached agreement on the broad outlines of such an overhaul, but a few thorny issues remain, including a possible guest-worker program and whether to delay steps toward citizenship until certain border-security measures are in place.

**Rubio supports dredging – Miami proves**

**FL Gov.com 11** (Governor Scott’s website, http://www.flgov.com/governor-rick-scott-announces-funding-plan-for-port-of-miami-dredge-project/)

Flanked by Senator Marco Rubio, Congressman Mario Diaz-Balart, Congressman David Rivera, and Colombian Ambassador Gabriel Silva, the Governor unveiled his intention to invest in the types of infrastructure projects that have long-term, permanent payoffs. The Port of Miami dredge project is projected to result in 30,000 new jobs for the region in the coming years.

#### Rubio’s key to immigration

Drucker and Trygstad 1-30 David M and Kyle, "Rubio Must Sell Immigration Changes to GOP, Grass Roots", 2013, www.rollcall.com/news/rubio\_must\_sell\_immigration\_changes\_to\_gop\_grass\_roots-222044-1.html?pos=hftxt

The fate of an immigration overhaul rests almost exclusively with Sen. Marco Rubio, the Florida Republican whose star power with conservatives is crucial to moving a bill through Congress.¶ President Barack Obama retains veto power, and Democrats hold the Senate floor. But no comprehensive immigration changes are likely to pass Congress without the healthy support of House Republicans. And Florida’s junior senator, perhaps more than any other Republican serving in Washington today, has the political credibility and communication skills to sell such complicated, sensitive legislation to skeptical conservative members, grass-roots voters and influential media commentators.¶ Rubio’s position is all the more unique because congressional Democrats and Obama need him, too, and appear to realize his importance to the legislative endgame.¶ Republicans warn that Obama and congressional Democrats could sink Washington’s immigration policy rewrite by attaching controversial social provisions or watering down the border enforcement and security measures included in the bipartisan Senate framework that Rubio helped negotiate. The Florida lawmaker has said he’ll pull his support from any bill if that occurs, and Republicans say comprehensive policy changes will fail to garner meaningful GOP support without Rubio’s backing.¶ “If Rubio signals any mistrust or misgivings, the whole thing collapses,” GOP pollster Brock McCleary said.

**Deal is inevitable – Gang of Eight and Hispanics – PC is irrelevent**

**Brownstein 1-30**-2013 National Journal, Ronald Brownstein “On Immigration, What Obama Can Learn From Bush's Failed Efforts”

[http://www.nationaljournal.com/columns/political-connections/on-immigration-what-obama-can-learn-from-bush-s-failed-efforts-20130131]

Even **in 2006**, something like the Senate plan likely could have attracted 218 votes in the House—but not a majority of Republicans. Faced with a collision between his two political imperatives—courting Hispanics and mobilizing conservatives—**Bush blinked, allowing House leaders to replace the Senate bill with enforcement-only legislation**, which he signed that fall. These choices began the GOP’s slide among Hispanics that continues unabated: **Hispanic support for Republican House candidates plummeted** from 44 percent in 2004 **to just 29 percent in 2006**, presaging Mitt Romney’s disastrous 27 percent showing among those voters in 2012.

**That slippage is one of the two most important differences in the political environment around immigration between 2006 and today. Back then**, as Bonjean notes, **hardly any House Republicans argued that the GOP needed to pass a plan attractive to minorities. But many GOP leaders now see that as self-preservation.** **“The political imperative has shifted the tectonic plates,”** says Frank Sharry, a key player in the 2006 debate who remains central as executive director of America’s Voice, which backs full citizenship for immigrants. **“Immigration was viewed as a wedge issue for Republicans in 2006. Now it’s viewed as a wedge issue for Democrats.” The “Gang of Eight”** proposal released this week **makes it likely** that, as in 2006, **the Senate will eventually pass a bipartisan immigration bill.** Once again, **there are probably 218 House votes for such a plan**, but not a majority of the majority Republicans. That raises another key difference from 2006: Hastert faced little pressure to consider the Senate bill, because Bush bit his tongue when the speaker buried it. If House Republicans shelve another bipartisan Senate plan in 2013, they should expect much more public heat, because Obama won’t be as deferential.

**Indian economic collapse causes Asian war and destroys democracy**

**Garten 95** Under Secretary of Commerce for International Trade Development (Jeffrey E., 3/7/95, “U.S. Policy Toward South Asia”, testimony before Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Federal News Service, Lexis)

For example, Lyndon Johnson launched the Indo-American Foundation to help stimulate education and consequently growth in India. He did so at a major black-tie dinner in Washington attended by Prime Minister Indira Gandhi. She accepted the offer -- which was later withdrawn -- with great grace and hope. In her remarks she presaged why the relationship between our two peoples was so important. She cited the special role of the United States in the world. Then she went on to say, "India's problems today are her own, but they are also the world's problems. India has a position in Asia which is an explosive position. India, if it is stable, united, democratic, I think can serve a great purpose. If India is not stable, or if there is chaos, if India fails, I think it is a failure of the whole democratic system. It is a failure of many of the values which you and we hold dear." Just a few years later, Pakistan came apart, India invaded what would later become Bangladesh, and the United States was contemplating intervention against the Indians. Indira Gandhi formalized India's relationship with the Soviet Union and exploded an atomic bomb. Later, Nixon and Kissinger would come to view these events and American actions as critical turning points of Cold War realpolitik. This situation wasn't helped when the United States moved even closer to Pakistan, nor when it normalized relations with China, thereby erasing the notion that India could be our counterfoil against the other Asian giant. Let historians debate whether the Cold War rifts between our two great nations were the result of genuine divergence of national interests which could not be avoided, or whether diplomacy failed -- or both. But today we can all be forgiven if we conclude that our obsession with the "great game" of our time, the global successor to Kipling's "great game" for South Asia, took an unnecessary toll on a relationship that deserved more than periodic infatuations. Now, of course, the Cold War is behind us. The Soviet Union no longer exists. India, too, has changed, embarking on a bold course of economic reforms that are having the effect of opening the enormous Indian market for the very first time. American businesspeople recognize the value of any market that size, but they also see the promise of India within Asia -- one of the two "elephants" among the tigers. By the year 2025, for instance, India is likely to be the world's most populous nation in the world's fastest growing region. The Foundation for Strong Indo-U.S. Ties The artificial barriers and discoloring lenses of Cold War politics now have fallen away. And our self-interest has motivated us to reexamine the relationship. There is nothing wrong with self- interest, of course. It helps both parties to define and to understand a relationship -- and it is more reliable than infatuation. But, when viewed in this new light -- this more honest, more revealing light we can see that there is a basis -- a very strong basis -- for a natural bond between us. India is, after all, the world's largest democracy. America is among the oldest. India will, within the next decade or so, become one of the worlds biggest and most important emerging markets. The United States will remain the world's most important and mature market. India and the United States are linked by many cultural values. We share a common language. We share the historical legacy of having been a colony of Britain. But that's not all. Ralph Waldo Emerson, the great American writer, was heavily influenced by the Bhagavad- gita, the great Hindu poem written sometime between 400 B.C. and 400 A.D. In 1947, Indian officials studied the American Declaration of Independence, our Constitution, and our Bill of Rights before drafting their first constitution. These are but two of many examples of shared values in our societies. Both of our countries are multicultural crucibles, struggling with the tensions cultural differences bring, but revelling in the richness they offer. We are both revolutionary societies, founded on disobedience to tyranny. In fact, one of the events leading to our struggle for independence, the Boston Tea Party, was a revolt against the tax which the British imposed on American imports of Indian tea! We are both preoccupied with the development of human resources in our countries -- including those who are living below the poverty level, those struggling to make a decent living, and those already possessing the most advanced scientific and technical skills. We both recognize the importance of traditional values in a time of change, but we face the challenge of not using these values as an excuse to resist change. We will both play a major role in the world, and are struggling to define that role. We both need one another in the new era ahead, where commercial ties and commercial enlargement will be at the core of our bilateral and global interests. A New Vision Recently, India's distinguished Ambassador, Siddhartha Shankar Ray, spoke of the U.S.-Indian relationship. He acknowledged that it would be fair to characterize our joint history to date as an era of "missed opportunities." But, knowing and admiring him as I do, I believe that he would be the first to underscore that what is missed is not necessarily forsaken. When Prime Minister Rao visited the U.S. last year, a new spirit was born. President Clinton in his remarks to the Prime Minister and in private remarks within the Administration has repeatedly emphasized that he hoped that we were entering a new era in our relationship, one in. which we were motivated by our great mutual interests to forge new, closer ties. Paramount among those interests are the commercial opportunities that are increasingly at the heart of the Clinton Administration's foreign policy. But it is impossible to separate those commercial interests from our broader interests. Economic reforms enable our companies to take advantage of the opportunities within the Indian market and enable Indian companies to better enter the global marketplace. Economic growth in India is a powerful stabilizing force in a region of the world where stability is of supreme.importance. Stability and growth in India are of enormous importance through southern Asia, from the Middle East to Indochina. Peace and prosperity in that part of the world are essential to the peace and prosperity of the world. The **survival of Indian democracy is an important message to those who doubt the value of democracy**, particularly in large, complex, emerging societies. India is a regional powerhouse. Home of the world's fourth largest navy. Home of a burgeoning space program. It would be hard to describe a nation that could be more central to our interests in the century ahead -- or one with whom the promise of cooperation and friendship is greater.

Asian war goes nuclear

Landay 2K

Jonathan S. Landay (national security and intelligence correspondent for the Contra Costa Times) March 10, 2000, Knight Ridder/Tribune News Service, “Top administration officials warn stakes for U.S. are high in Asian conflicts” Lexis

Few if any experts think China and Taiwan, North Korea and South Korea, or India and Pakistan are spoiling to fight. But even a minor miscalculation by any of them could destabilize Asia, jolt the global economy and even start a nuclear war. India, Pakistan and China all have nuclear weapons, and North Korea may have a few, too. And Asia lacks the kinds of organizations, negotiations and diplomatic relationships that helped keep an uneasy peace for five decades in Cold War Europe. "Nowhere else on Earth are the stakes as high and relationships so fragile," said Bates Gill, director of northeast Asian policy studies at the Brookings Institution, a Washington think tank. "We see the convergence of great power interest overlaid with lingering confrontations with no institutionalized security mechanism in place. There are elements for potential disaster." In an effort to cool the region's tempers, President Clinton, Defense Secretary William Cohen and National Security Adviser Samuel Berger all will hopscotch Asia's capitals this month. For America, the stakes could hardly be higher. There are 100,000 U.S. troops in Asia committed to defending Taiwan, Japan and South Korea, and the United States would instantly become embroiled if Beijing moved against Taiwan or North Korea attacked South Korea. And while Washington has no defense commitments to either India or Pakistan, a conflict between the two could end the global taboo against using nuclear weapons and demolish the already shaky international nonproliferation regime. In addition, globalization has made a stable Asia with its massive markets, cheap labor, exports and resources indispensable to the U.S. economy. Numerous U.S. firms and millions of American jobs depend on trade with Asia that totaled $600 billion last year, according to the Commerce Department.

**Democracy solves extinction**

**Diamond 95** (Larry, Promoting Democracy in the 1990s, "1. Why Promote Democracy?" [wwics.si.edu/subsites/ccpdc/pubs/di/1.htm](http://wwics.si.edu/subsites/ccpdc/pubs/di/1.htm), JMP)

OTHER THREATS ¶ This hardly exhausts the lists of threats to our security and well-being in the coming years and decades. In the former Yugoslavia nationalist aggression tears at the stability of Europe and could easily spread. The flow of illegal drugs intensifies through increasingly powerful international crime syndicates that have made common cause with authoritarian regimes and have utterly corrupted the institutions of tenuous, democratic ones. Nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons continue to proliferate. The very source of life on Earth, the global ecosystem, appears increasingly endangered. Most of these new and unconventional threats to security are associated with or aggravated by the weakness or absence of democracy, with its provisions for legality, accountability, popular sovereignty, and openness. ¶ LESSONS OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY ¶ The experience of this century offers important lessons. Countries that govern themselves in a truly democratic fashion do not go to war with one another. They do not aggress against their neighbors to aggrandize themselves or glorify their leaders. Democratic governments do not ethnically "cleanse" their own populations, and they are much less likely to face ethnic insurgency. Democracies do not sponsor terrorism against one another. They do not build weapons of mass destruction to use on or to threaten one another. Democratic countries form more reliable, open, and enduring trading partnerships. In the long run they offer better and more stable climates for investment. They are more environmentally responsible because they must answer to their own citizens, who organize to protest the destruction of their environments. They are better bets to honor international treaties since they value legal obligations and because their openness makes it much more difficult to breach agreements in secret. Precisely because, within their own borders, they respect competition, civil liberties, property rights, and the rule of law, democracies are the only reliable foundation on which a new world order of international security and prosperity can be built.¶

Obama losing immigration still results in high-skill reform – solves their turns the case arguments

Matthew Yglesias 1-15, Slate, 1-15-13, How the GOP Can Roll Obama on Immigration, www.slate.com/blogs/moneybox/2013/01/15/immigration\_reform\_will\_obama\_get\_rolled.html

Of the major policy issues under discussion in Washington, "immigration reform" stands out for having unusually undefined content. For the major immigration-advocacy groups, the goal is clear, a comprehensive bill that includes a path to citizenship for the overwhelming majority of unauthorized migrants already living in the United States. But many other aspects of immigration law are in the mix as part of a proposed deal, and it seems to me that there's a fair chance that a nimble Republican Party could essentially roll the Democratic coalition and pass an "immigration reform" bill that doesn't offer the path Latino advocacy groups are looking for. Elise Foley has the key line from her briefing on the administration's thinking about immigration, namely that a piecemeal approach "could result in passage of the less politically complicated pieces, such as an enforcement mechanism and high-skilled worker visas, while leaving out more contentious items such as a pathway to citizenship for undocumented immigrants." And indeed it could. But how can they stop it? The last House GOP effort to split the high-tech visas question from the path to citizenship question was an absurd partisan ploy. If Republicans want to get serious about it they should be able to make it work. The centerpiece would be something on increased immigration of skilled workers. That's something the tech industry wants very much, it's a great idea on the merits, and few influential people have any real beef with it. High tech visas will easily generate revenue to pay for some stepped-up enforcement. Then instead of adding on a poison pill so Democrats will block the bill, you need to add a sweetener. Not the broad path to citizenship, but something small like the DREAM Act. Now you've got a package that falls massively short of what Latino groups are looking for, but that I think Democrats will have a hard time actually blocking. After all, why would they block it? It packages three things—more skilled immigration, more enforcement, and help for DREAMers—they say they want. Blocking it because it doesn't also do the broad amnesty that liberals want and conservatives hate would require the kind of fanaticism that is the exact opposite of Obama's approach to politics.

#### XO solves

Nakamura 1-6 – David Nakamura and Tara Bahrampour, January 6th, 2013 "Obama using authority for immigrant issues," Washington Post, [www.journalgazette.net/article/20130106/NEWS03/301069950/1066/NEWS03](http://www.journalgazette.net/article/20130106/NEWS03/301069950/1066/NEWS03)

WASHINGTON - The Obama administration’s decision this week to ease visa requirements for hundreds of thousands of illegal immigrants represents its latest move to reshape immigration through executive action, even as the White House gears up for an uncertain political fight over a far-more-sweeping legislative package in the months ahead.¶ Immigration advocates on Thursday hailed a rule change at the Department of Homeland Security that would make it easier for many undocumented immigrants to stay in the United States as they seek permanent residency, saying it will improve the lives of relatives who could have been separated for years without the changes.¶ For President Obama – who has called the inability to achieve comprehensive immigration reform among the biggest regrets of his first term – the new policy is among a series of steps his administration has taken over the past year aimed in part at easing the pace of deportations, which have surged during his tenure. The steps also came amid a presidential campaign that included sharp disagreements over immigration policy and strong support among Latinos and Asians for Obama.¶ The centerpiece was Obama’s decision, announced last June, to stop deporting people who were brought to the country as children and have gone on to be productive and otherwise law-abiding residents.¶ “He is checking off every administrative box he can of what he can do with executive authority that comports with his overall view of immigration policy,” said Angela Kelley, an analyst at the Center for American Progress, a liberal think tank allied with the White House.¶ The latest policy change is focused on illegal immigrants who have a spouse, parent or child with U.S. citizenship. Currently, in order to become legal they must leave the United States and apply for a waiver forgiving their unlawful presence in the country. Only then can they apply for an immigrant visa. And if they don’t get a waiver, they are barred from returning to the United States for up to 10 years, depending on the case.¶ The specter of being barred deterred many from applying. But under the rule change finalized Wednesday, those who qualify will be able to apply for waivers from within the United States starting March 4. Applicants must return to their native country for a brief period for the consular immigrant visa process.¶ The new rule greatly reduces the risk inherent in applying for a waiver, as people whose applications are rejected would still be in the United States when they heard the news. Even for those whose applications are approved, the new rule will allow them to spend much less time outside the United States, as they will travel abroad with waivers in hand.

**Obama already announced his support for dredging in the summer – that should’ve triggered the link**

**LaHood pushes the Plan**

**The Post and Courier 11**—The Post and Courier editorial staff (“Another dredging cheerleader?”, 14 Dec 2011, Proquest, <http://search.proquest.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/docview/910864475)>

Georgia's deepening project for the Savannah River has a major out-of-state supporter with powerful political connections. No, not South Carolina Gov. Nikki Haley. U.S. Transportation Secretary Ray LaHood. Secretary LaHood has promised a meeting of stakeholders this month in Washington to work on ways to **expedite** the project, which recently received a permit from the S.C. Department of Health and Environmental Control board. In a meeting with Georgia officials last month, Mr. LaHood declared of the deepening project: "We'll figure out how to get the federal dollars to make this project happen. It has to happen."

**Coal lobby pushes the Plan**

**Wiest 12** (Nailene Chou,9-24, “King Coal Sails to Asia”, http://english.caixin.com/2012-09-24/100441659.html)

U.S. coal export to China rose from a minuscule amount to 4.9 million tons in 2011, and sales already reached 4.7 million tons in the first half of this year. With the U.S. economy struggling to regain growth, the benefits that come with creating jobs at the railroads and the ports are enticing. Local politicians are loath to take a stance on the issue of building coal terminals. Each of the two presidential candidates has tried to portray himself as a champion of coal in coal-producing states. The **rich and powerful coal lobby is mounting an aggressive PR campaign to make coal export a sensible economic policy** and downplay the environmental and health risks.

**That means 50 senators support the Plan**

**Reisinger 09** – JD, Attorney @ Ohio Environmental Council

Will, “RECONCILING KING COAL AND CLIMATE CHANGE: A REGULATORY FRAMEWORK FOR CARBON CAPTURE AND STORAGE,” Vermont Journal of Environmental Law, http://vjel.org/journal/pdf/VJEL10107.pdf

Princeton’s dispassionate assessment leads us to the conclusion that coal will not disappear as an energy source in the immediate future. Coal produces such a large percentage of electricity generation that other sources alone cannot meet the country’s demands in the short term. Coal-burning power plants currently provide half of the electricity produced in the U.S. and are responsible for one-fourth of global carbon emissions. 25 Cleaner, carbon-neutral sources such as wind and solar energy, or the more controversial expansion of nuclear power generation, have the potential to replace most or all coal-generated power in the future. But at present, the U.S. is not able to meet its base load power needs solely with renewable or carbon-neutral options. 26 The nation simply does not have the infrastructure to allow renewable energy sources such as wind and solar to replace fossil-fuel power generation in the near term. The expansion of nuclear generation faces still greater opposition across the political spectrum due to concerns over public health and national security. Coal has **strong political support** throughout the country as America’s only abundant domestic fossil energy resource. The coal industry is responsible for more than 80,000 jobs nationwide, contributing billions to the economies of coal-producing states. 27 Legislators from these regions will **fight** **vigorously** to ensure the continued viability of the coal industry. As Mike Morris, Chief Executive Officer of American Electric Power, has stated, “We have 25 ‘coal states.’ That’s **50 Senators whose states depend on this** economy.” 28

**Presidential leadership’s irrelevant**

**Jacobs and King 10** – University of Minnesota, Nuffield College, (Lawrence and Desmond, “Varieties of Obamaism: Structure, Agency, and the Obama Presidency,” Perspectives on Politics (2010), 8: 793-802)

But personality is not a solid foundation for a persuasive explanation of presidential impact and the shortfalls or accomplishments of Obama's presidency. Modern presidents have brought divergent individual traits to their jobs and yet they have routinely failed to enact much of their agendas. Preeminent policy goals of Bill Clinton (health reform) and George W. Bush (Social Security privatization) met the same fate, though these presidents' personalities vary widely. And presidents like Jimmy Carter—whose personality traits have been criticized as ill-suited for effective leadership—enjoyed comparable or stronger success in Congress than presidents lauded for their personal knack for leadership—from Lyndon Johnson to Ronald Reagan.7 Indeed, a personalistic account provides little leverage for explaining the disparities in Obama's record—for example why he succeeded legislatively in restructuring health care and higher education, failed in other areas, and often accommodated stakeholders. Decades of rigorous research find that impersonal, structural forces offer the most compelling explanations for presidential impact.8 Quantitative research that compares legislative success and presidential personality finds no overall relationship.9 In his magisterial qualitative and historical study, Stephen Skowronek reveals that institutional dynamics and ideological commitments structure presidential choice and success in ways that trump the personal predilections of individual presidents.10 Findings point to the predominant influence on presidential legislative success of the ideological and partisan composition of Congress, entrenched interests, identities, and institutional design, and a constitutional order that invites multiple and competing lines of authority. The widespread presumption, then, that Obama's personal traits or leadership style account for the obstacles to his policy proposals is called into question by a generation of scholarship on the presidency. Indeed, the presumption is not simply problematic analytically, but practically as well. For the misdiagnosis of the source of presidential weakness may, paradoxically, induce failure by distracting the White House from strategies and tactics where presidents can make a difference. Following a meeting with Obama shortly after Brown's win, one Democratic senator lamented the White House's delusion that a presidential sales pitch will pass health reform—“Just declaring that he's still for it doesn't mean that it comes off life support.”11 Although Obama's re-engagement after the Brown victory did contribute to restarting reform, the senator's comment points to the importance of ideological and partisan coalitions in Congress, organizational combat, institutional roadblocks, and anticipated voter reactions. Presidential sales pitches go only so far.

**XO proves the Plan is popular**

**Crabtree 12** – Washington Times reporter (Susan, “Port plan brings rare moment of unity for Obama, GOP,” The Washington Times, 7/24/2012, http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2012/jul/24/port-plan-brings-rare-moment-unity-obama-gop/?page=all#pagebreak)//HK¶ President Obama’s latest jobs initiative — a pledge to accelerate expansion plans for five ports along the Eastern seaboard — is getting rave reviews from an unexpected corner: a handful of Republicans usually sharply critical of the president but who have also fought hard in recent years for federal dollars to help ready their ports for the flood of shipping and commerce expected by the Panama Canal’s expansion.¶ At times, Republicans representing some of the East Coast ports in question have faced resistance from within their own party for requesting federal help.¶ But GOP lawmakers such as Sens. Lindsey Graham and Jim DeMint of South Carolina support the accelerated government approval schedule for the port projects, which they say will be a boon for their state’s struggling economy. Mr. DeMint, one of the chamber’s most conservative members, backs the president’s plan despite working in the past to kill attempts to earmark money for the Port of Charleston.¶ “This is very good news and a recognition the rest of the country now understands what we’ve known all along — Charleston Harbor deepening is a critical project for our state, region and national economy,” Mr. Graham said. “It is a vital economic engine which must be deepened so it can handle 24/7 the new, larger post-Panamax ships coming online.”¶ Chris Crawford, a spokesman for Rep. Jack Kingston, a Republican who represents Savannah, Ga., the home to another port-expansion project, also applauded the administration effort.¶ “We’re definitely happy to get the attention and hope this will help speed along any regulatory bumps we might run into along the way,” he said.¶ GOPRep. Joe Wilson of South Carolina, who famously heckled Mr. Obama in 2009 during a speech the president was giving on health care on the House floor, is also praising the president.¶ “The administration’s decision to help with the study is a step in the right direction,” a spokeswoman for Mr. Wilson said. “The sooner the expansion project is completed, and the lower the cost, the better.”¶ Even presumptive GOP presidential nominee Mitt Romney supports streamlining the port-renovation process, although a spokeswoman did say Mr. Obama failed to make the plan a priority until the middle of his re-election.¶ “Unfortunately, President Obama chose to spend his term wasting tens of billions of stimulus dollars on green energy projects and high-speed rail while allowing the most important infrastructure projects to languish,” she said.¶ Other Republicans appear reluctant to go on the record praising Mr. Obama’s ports initiative during a presidential election year but are privately pleased with the administration’s commitment to accelerate the renovation projects.