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**Perm – Do Both**

**Perm – Do the counterplan**

**[We’ll specify what ports we dredge for disads, not counterplans, solves their offense]**

**OR**

**[Cross-x checks, they should’ve asked what ports we dredge]**

**None of their evidence is about the word “Expeditious” in the Plan Text, that just means we dredge ports quickly**

**Free Dictionary.com** (http://www.thefreedictionary.com/expeditious)

Acting or done with speed and efficiency. See Synonyms at [fast](http://www.thefreedictionary.com/fast)1.

**Every port is key to solving**

**Williams 12** reporter for GlobalAtlanta, Atlanta's International Business News Source \*\*\*Aleman is a Panama Canal Authority CEO (Trevor, “Panama Canal CEO: Savannah, Charleston Ports Both Needed,” 2/14/12, [http://www.globalatlanta.com/articlevid/25345/1872/)](http://www.globalatlanta.com/articlevid/25345/1872/)//AM)

¶ The canal won't lose business if ports like Savannah aren't ready in 2014, but ports will face pressure from shipping lines and companies that want to get their products to market more quickly and cheaply, Mr. Aleman said.¶ West Coast ports oppose the expansion, reasoning that some ships that would've offloaded their containers in California and trucked cargo across the country will instead take all-water routes to the East Coast.¶ "I don't see that as a direct competition really. **I think every port, and I mean it, every port needs to improve in order to be competitive**. That's actually what should be looked at," Mr. Aleman said.¶ The canal expansion is about creating options, he said, noting that it will benefit shipping routes from the West Coast to Europe, which also make use of the canal. He also welcomed the development of new ports across the Americas. ¶

**Biodiversity is bad –**

**A. Makes ecosystems less stable and more prone to collapse**

**Heath, Elizabeth W. Gilloon Professor and Professor of Chemistry at the California Institute of Technology in Pasadena, California, 1999 (Jim, Orchids Australia, December, http://www.orchidsaustralia.com/whysave.htm)**

Some people say we can’t afford to lose any species, no matter what species they are. Everything needs everything else, they say, to make nature balance. If that were right, it might explain why the six orchid species should be saved. Alas, no. We could pour weedkiller on all the orchids in Australia and do no ecological damage to the rest of the continent’s biology. But wouldn’t the natural ecological systems then become less stable, if we start plucking out species - even those orchids? Not necessarily. Natural biological systems are hardly ever stable and balanced anyway. Everything goes along steadily for a time, then boom - the system falls apart and simplifies for no visible reason. **Diverse systems are usually more unstable than the less diverse ones**. **Biologists agree that in some places less diversity is more stable** (in the Arctic, for example). Also, monocultures - farms - can be very stable. Not to mention the timeless grass of a salt marsh. In other words, there’s no biological law that says we have to save the orchids because they add diversity, and that added diversity makes the biological world more stable.

**B. Increased biodiversity prevents resiliency and collapses the system**

**Naeem, Director of Science at Center for Environmental Research and Conservation (CERC), Professor and Chair of Columbia University Department of Ecology, Evolution and Environmental Biology, 2K2 (Shahid Naeem -, 07 March 2002, Nature Magazine, “Biodiversity: Biodiversity equals instability?,” pg. 23)**

Pfisterer and Schmid [3] studied biomass production in a combinatorial plant-diversity experiment, which consisted of an array of replicate grassland plots that varied both in their number of plant species (from 1 to 32) and in their combination of species. The authors used their results to test the venerable 'insurance' hypothesis of ecosystem stability. This hypothesis is one of several that have featured in the long-standing ecological debate over the relationship between complexity (diversity) and stability [4]. Over the course of this debate, the prevailing view has see-sawed between the thesis that diversity begets stability, and the antithesis that diversity either leads to instability or is irrelevant. Chief among the 'begets-stability' theories is the insurance hypothesis -- the impeccably logical notion that having a variety of species insures an ecosystem against a range of environmental upsets. For example, suppose an ecosystem faces a drought, then a flood, which in turn is followed by a fire. According to the insurance hypothesis, if that ecosystem is diverse -- if it has some species that can tolerate drought, some that are flood-resistant and some that are fire-tolerant -- then two scenarios are likely. The ecosystem may show resistance, remaining broadly unchanged, because its many species buffer it against damage. Or it may show resilience: if it does get hammered, it may bounce back to its original state quickly because the tolerant species ultimately drive the recovery process and compensate for the temporary loss of their less hardy compatriots. But Pfisterer and Schmid [3] found that, when challenged with an experimentally induced drought, **species-poor communities were both more resistant and more resilient** (as reflected by their ability to sustain and recover pre-drought biomass production) **than plots of higher diversity**. The higher-diversity plots were originally more productive, but their resistance and resilience -- that is, their stability -- was low (Fig. 1). This is the opposite of what the insurance hypothesis predicts. It also contrasts with what combinatorial 'microcosm' experiments have found [5, 6] and what theoretical models of biodiversity have claimed [4]. Pfisterer and Schmid's findings [3] appear to support those who claim that diversity does not lead to stability. But there's a twist, and those on each side of the debate run the risk of having their own pet theories turned against them. Pfisterer and Schmid suggest that the observed inverse association between diversity and stability is due to a theoretical mechanism known as niche complementarity. This mechanism, however, is the very same as that touted as the chief cause of the positive biodiversity-productivity relationships found in other combinatorial biodiversity experiments, such as those at Cedar Creek [7] and those run by the BIODEPTH consortium [8]. The central idea of niche complementarity is that a community of species whose niches complement one another is more efficient in its use of resources than an equivalent set of monocultures. For example, a uniform mixture of early- and late-season plants and shallow- and deep-rooting plants that are spread over 4 m2 will yield more biomass than combined 1-m2 monocultures of each species [7, 9]. So niche complementarity can explain why higher diversity tends to lead to higher productivity, and has also been adopted by those in the 'diversity leads to stability' camp because one would expect that more efficient communities would fare better in the face of stress. Those on the other side, however, feel that existing data better support a mechanism known as sampling, where diverse communities produce more biomass simply because they are more likely to contain productive species [10, 11]. In other words, we can't read too much into experiments in which higher diversity leads to greater productivity. What Pfisterer and Schmid suggest is that complementarity among species in a diverse plot could be its downfall when faced with perturbation. Niche complementarity is disrupted and so the whole community suffers. But this is not a problem for less diverse plots. So those in the 'diversity begets stability' camp risk being hoist on the petard of their own theory of niche complementarity. Meanwhile, although Pfisterer and Schmid's findings support the idea that diversity does not lead to stability, the authors reject a large role for sampling -- the theory generally favoured by the camp that disagrees with the idea that biodiversity leads to stability.

**Biodiversity causes instability – scientific consensus**

**Naeem et al, Director of Science at Center for Environmental Research and Conservation (CERC), Professor and Chair of Columbia University Department of Ecology, Evolution and Environmental Biology, 2K2 (Shahid Naeem - “Biodiversity and ecosystem functioning: synthesis and perspectives,” pg. 80)**

The early view that permeated ecology until the 1960s was that diversity (or complexity) begets stability. This view was formalized and theorized by people such as Odum (1953), MacArthur (1955) and Elton (1958) in the 1950s. Odum (1953) and Elton (1958) observed that simple communities are more easily upset than rich ones, i.e. they are more subject to destructive population oscillations and invasions. MacArthur (1955) proposed, using a heuristic model that the more pathways there are for energy to reach a consumer, the less severe is the failure of any one pathway. These conclusions were based on either intuitive arguments or loose observations, **but lacked a strong theoretical and experimental foundation**. Probably because they represented the conventional wisdom (‘don’t put all your eggs in one basket’) and the prevailing philosophical view of the ‘balance of nature’, they became almost universally accepted. This ‘conventional wisdom’ was seriously challenged in the early 1970s by theorists such as Levins (1970), Gardner and Ashby (1970), and May (1972, 1974), who borrowed the formalism of deterministic autonomous dynamical systems from Newtonian physics and showed that, in these model systems, the more complex the system, the less likely it is to be stable. Stability here was defined qualitatively by the fact that system returns to its equilibrium or steady state after a perturbation. This intuitive explanation for this destabilizing influence of complexity is that the more diversified and the more connected a system, the more numerous and the longer the pathways along which a perturbation can propagate within the system, leading to either its collapse or its explosion. This conclusion was further supported by analyses of one quantitative measure of stability, resilience (Table 7.1), in model food webs (Pimm and Lawton 1977; Pimm 1982). This theoretical work had a number of limitations. In particular, it was based on randomly constructed model communities. More realistic food webs incorporating thermodynamic constraints and observed patters of interaction strengths do not necessarily have the same properties (DeAngelis 1975; de Ruiter et al. 1990). Also, there have been few direct experimental tests of the theory, and many of the natural patterns that agree with theoretical predictions can be explained by more parsimonious hypotheses such as the trophic cascade model (Cohen and Newman 1985). Despite these limitations, the view that diversity and complexity beget instability, not stability, quickly became the new paradigm in the 1970s and 1980s because of the mathematical rigour of the theory.

**Failing to check biodiversity causes ecosystem collapse**

**Boulter, prof for paleobiology at the Natural History Museum and the University of East London, former editor to the Palaeontological Association, former secretary to the International Organization of Palaeobotany, and UK representative at the International Union of Biological Sciences, 2K2 (Michael, “Extinction: Evolution and the End of Man,” pg. 147)**

We know very little detail of such interactions between environmental biology and cell biology and how they hear on evolution. Here is one possible scenario. When a new group originates, with a small number of individuals successfully invading newly available territory and their new genome provides the biochemistry that best fits the new surroundings, diversification gathers pace. After a slow start, rapid diversification readies a clear peak, **followed by a slow, long fall in the range of diversity, leading to extinction**. It follows that for large clades with greater diversity at the time of maximum expansion, it will take longer for that clade to become extinct. Nevertheless, it is inevitable that **extinction will occur.**

Theories goes our way

Mertz et al, M.S & Ph.D in Biological Sciences and veteran freelance science writer, editor, and consultant, 2K3 (Leslie, Science in Dispute Vol. 2, “ Does greater species diversity lead to greater stability in ecosystems,” <http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_gx5204/is_2003/ai_n19124307/?tag=content;col1>)

The hypothesis that greater species diversity begets heightened ecosystem stability may seem correct at first glance. Most people intuitively assume that the pond ecosystem has a better chance of thriving from year to year—even in adverse conditions—if it has a wider variety of species living there. That assumption, however, is supported by little scientific proof. On the other hand, many studies provide compelling evidence that diversity does not promote stability and may even be to its detriment. Several studies also suggest that if species diversity does exist, it is based on ecosystem stability rather than vice versa.

2. No correlation between diversity and stability

Mertz et al, M.S & Ph.D in Biological Sciences and veteran freelance science writer, editor, and consultant, 2K3 (Leslie, Science in Dispute Vol. 2, “ Does greater species diversity lead to greater stability in ecosystems,” <http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_gx5204/is_2003/ai_n19124307/?tag=content;col1>)

Although these and other experiments indicate that diversity is not necessary for ecosystem stability, the discussion does not end there. A team of researchers from the University of Wisconsin-Madison determined that although diversity itself did not promote stability, the species-specific resilience of the community's residents might. Led by zoologist Anthony Ives, the team mathematically analyzed the consequences of environmental stress on various communities. After compiling the data, the team found that the characteristics of each species were more important than the number of species in conferring stability. The results showed that the most stable ecosystems—those that were both persistent and resilient—contained individual organisms that responded well to environmental stress. They did not show a correlation between stability and the sheer number of species in the ecosystem. The research team came to the conclusion that species richness alone does not generate ecosystem stability, and suggested that scientists should begin investigating the stress response of individual species rather than simply counting species.

**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.¶
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**Perm – Do 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.

**No root cause to war**

**Goldstein 01, Int’l Rel Prof @ American U, (Joshua, , 2001, War and Gender, p. 412)**

First, peace activists face a dilemma in thinking about causes of war and working for peace. Many peace scholars and activists support the approach, "if you want peace, work for justice." Then, if one believes that sexism contributes to war, one can work for gender justice specifically (perhaps among others) in order to pursue peace. This approach brings strategic allies to the peace movement (women, labor, minorities), but rests on the assumption that injustices cause war. The evidence in this book suggests that causality runs at least as strongly the other way. War is not a product of capitalism, imperialism, gender, innate aggression, or any other single cause, although all of these influence wars' outbreaks and outcomes. Rather, war has in part fueled and sustained these and other injustices.' So, "if you want peace, work for peace." Indeed, if you want justice (gender and others), work for peace. Causality does not run just upward through the levels of analysis, from types of individuals, societies, and governments up to war. It runs downward too. Enine suggests that changes in attitudes towards war and the military may be the most important way to "reverse women's oppression." The dilemma is that peace work focused on justice brings to the peace movement energy, allies, and moral grounding, yet, in light of this book's evidence, the emphasis on injustice as the main cause of war seems to be empirically inadequate."'

You should prefer pragmatic solutions—The alternative is impossible and ensures mass-suffering

Barnhizer ‘6—David R. Emeritus Professor at Cleveland State University’s Cleveland-Marshall College of Law; “Waking from Sustainability's "Impossible Dream": The Decisionmaking Realities of Business and Government.” 2006 Georgetown International Environmental Law Review. 18 Geo. Int'l Envtl. L. Rev. 595 L/N

We face a combination of ecological, social, and economic crises. These crises involve the ability to fund potentially conflicting obligations for the provision of social benefits, health care, education, pensions, and poverty alleviation. They also include the need for massive expenditures to "fix" what we have already broken. n59 Part of the challenge is that in the United States and Europe we have made fiscal promises that we cannot keep. We also have vast economic needs for [\*620] continuing wealth generation as a precondition for achieving social equity on national and global levels. Figuring out how to reduce some of those obligations, eliminate others, and rebuild the core and vitality of our system must become a part of any honest social discourse. Even Pollyanna would be overwhelmed by the choices we face. There will be significant pain and sacrifice in any action we take. But failing to take prompt and effective action will produce even more catastrophic consequences.

The scale of social needs, including the need for expanded productive activity, has grown so large that it cannot be shut off at all, and certainly not abruptly. It cannot even be ratcheted down in any significant fashion without producing serious harms to human societies and hundreds of millions of people. Even if it were possible to shift back to systems of local self-sufficiency, the consequences of the transition process would be catastrophic for many people and even deadly to the point of continual conflict, resource wars, increased poverty, and strife. What are needed are concrete, workable, and pragmatic strategies that produce effective and intelligently designed economic activity in specific contexts and, while seeking efficiency and conservation, place economic and social justice high on a list of priorities. n60

The imperative of economic growth applies not only to the needs and expectations of people in economically developed societies but also to people living in nations that are currently economically underdeveloped. Opportunities must be created, jobs must be generated in huge numbers, and economic resources expanded to address the tragedies of poverty and inequality. Unfortunately, natural systems must be exploited to achieve this; we cannot return to Eden. The question is not how to achieve a static state but how to achieve what is needed to advance social justice while avoiding and mitigating the most destructive consequences of our behavior.

Many developing country groups involved in efforts to protect the environment and resist the impacts of free trade on their communities have been concerned with the harmful effects of economic change. Part of the concern is the increased scale of economic activity. Some concerns relate to who benefits and who loses in the changing context imposed by globalization. These concerns are legitimate and understandable. So are the other deep currents running beneath their political positions, including those of resistance to change of any kind and a [\*621] rejection of the market approach to economic activities. In the system described inaccurately as free market capitalism, economic activity not only breaks down existing systems, it creates new systems and--as Joseph Schumpeter observed--continually repeats the process through cycles of "creative destruction." n61 This pattern of creative destruction unfolds as necessarily and relentlessly as does the birth-maturation-death-rebirth cycle of the natural environment. This occurs even in a self-sufficient or autarkic market system capable of managing all variables within its closed dominion. But when the system breaks out of its closed environment, the ability of a single national actor to control the system's dynamics erodes and ultimately disappears in the face of differential conditions, needs, priorities, and agendas.

Globalization's ability to produce wealth for a particular group simultaneously produces harms to different people and interests and generates unfair resource redistribution within existing cultures. This is an unavoidable consequence of globalization. n62 The problem is that globalization has altered the rules of operation of political, economic, and social activities, and in doing so multiplied greatly our ability to create benefit and harm. n63 While some understandably want the unsettling and often chaotic effects of globalization to go away, it can only be dealt with, not reversed. The system in which we live and work is no longer closed. There are few contexts not connected to the dynamics of some aspect of the extended economic and social systems resulting from globalization. This means the wide ranging and incompatible variables of a global economic, human rights, and social fairness system are resulting in conflicts and unanticipated interpenetrations that no one fully understands, anticipates, or controls. n64 Local [\*622] self-sufficiency is the loser in this process. It can remain a nostalgic dream but rarely a reality. Except for isolated cultures and niche activities, there is very little chance that anyone will be unaffected by this transformational process. Change is the constant, and it will take several generations before we return to a period of relative stasis. Even then it will only be a respite before the pattern once again intensifies.

The impact is lash out and extinction—

Kothari, 82 (professor of poli sci at U of Delhi, “Towards a Just Social Order,” p. 571)

Attempts at global economic reform could also lead to a world racked by increasing turbulence, a greater sense of insecurity among the major centers of power – and hence to a further tightening of the structures of domination and domestic repression – producing in their wake an intensification of the old arms race and militarization of regimes, encouraging regional conflagrations and setting the stage for an eventual global

holocaust.

These impacts matter—Don’t evaluate their ethics or scholarship in a vacuum

Isaac, 2002 (Jeffrey C., James H. Rudy professor of Political Science and director of the Center for the Study of Democracy and Public Life at Indiana University, Bloomington, “Ends, Means and politics,” *Dissent*, Spring)

As writers such as Niccolo Machiavelli,Max Weber, Reinhold Niebuhr, and HannahArendt have taught, an unyielding concern with moral goodness undercuts political responsibility.The concern may be morally laudable, reflectinga kind of personal integrity, but it suffersfrom three fatal flaws: (1) It fails to see that the purity of one’s intention does not ensure the achievement of what one intends. Abjuring violence or refusing to make commoncause with morally compromised parties may seem like the right thing; but if such tactics entail impotence, then it is hard to view them as serving any moral good beyond the clean conscience of their supporters; (2) it fails to see that in a world of real violence and injustice, moral purity is not simply a form of powerlessness; it is often a form of complicity in injustice. This is why, from the standpoint of politics—as opposed to religion—pacifism is alwaysa potentially immoral stand. In categorically repudiatingviolence, it refuses in principle tooppose certain violent injustices with any effect;and (3) it fails to see that politics is as much about unintended consequences as it is about intentions; it is the effects of action, rather than the motives of action, that is most significant. Just as the alignment with “good”may engender impotence, it is often the pursuit of “good” that generates evil. This is thelesson of communism in the twentieth century:it is not enough that one’s goals be sincere oridealistic; it is equally important, always, to askabout the effects of pursuing these goals andto judge these effects in pragmatic and historicallycontextualized ways. Moral absolutism inhibits this judgment. It alienates those who are not true believers. It promotes arrogance. And it undermines political effectiveness.

Market incentives are key—The status quo or any alternative they try to go for can’t overcome the link arguments

Barnhizer 6 -- Professor of Law, Cleveland State University. (David, Waking from Sustainability's "Impossible Dream": The Decisionmaking Realities of Business and Government, 18 Geo. Int'l Envtl. L. Rev. 595, Lexis)

Medieval alchemists sought unsuccessfully to discover the process that would enable them to turn base metal into gold--assigning the name "Philosopher's Stone" to what they sought. The quest was doomed to failure. Just as a "sow's ear" cannot become a "silk purse," a base metal cannot become gold. Sustainability is impossible for the same reasons. It asks us to be something we are not, both individually and as a political and economic community. It is impossible to convert humans into the wise, selfless, and nearly omniscient creatures required to build and operate a system that incorporates sustainability. Even if it were ultimately possible (and it is not), it would take many generations to achieve and we are running out of time.¶ There is an enormous gap among what we claim we want to do, what we actually want to do, and our ability to achieve our professed goals. I admit to an absolute distrust of cheap and easy proclamations of lofty ideals and commitments to voluntary or unenforceable codes of practice. The only thing that counts is the actor's actual behavior. For most people, that behavior is shaped by self-interest determined by the opportunity to benefit or to avoid harm. In the economic arena this means that if a substantial return can be had without a high risk of significant negative consequences, the decision will be made to seek the benefit. It is the reinvention of Hardin's Tragedy of the Commons. n1¶ This essay explores the nature of human decisionmaking and motivation within critical systems. These systems include business and governmental decisionmaking with a focus on environmental and social areas of emerging crisis where the consequence of acting unwisely or failing to act wisely produces large-scale harms for both human and natural systems. The analysis begins by suggesting that nothing humans create is "sustainable." Change is inevitable and [\*597] irresistible whether styled as systemic entropy, Joseph Schumpeter's idea of a regenerative "creative destruction," or Nikolai Kondratieff's "waves" of economic and social transformation. n2¶ Business entities and governmental decisionmakers play critical roles in both causing environmental and social harms and avoiding those consequences. Some have thought that the path to avoiding harm and achieving positive benefits is to develop codes of practice that by their language promise that decisionmakers will behave in ways consistent with the principles that have come to be referred to as "sustainability." That belief is a delusion--an "impossible dream." Daniel Boorstin once asked: "Have we been doomed to make our dreams into illusions?" n3 He adds: "An illusion . . . is an image we have mistaken for reality. . . . [W]e cannot see it is not fact." n4 Albert Camus warns of the inevitability of failing to achieve unrealistic goals and the need to become more aware of the limited extent of our power to effect fundamental change. He urges that we concentrate on devising realistic strategies and behaviors that allow us to be effective in our actions. n5¶ As companies are expected to implement global codes of conduct such as the U.N. Global Compact and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development's (OECD) Guidelines for Multinational Enterprises, n6 and governments [\*598] and multilateral institutions supposedly become more concerned about limiting the environmental and social impacts of business decisionmaking, it may be useful to consider actual behavior related to corporate and governmental responses to codes of practice, treaties, and even national laws. Unfortunately, business, government, and multilateral institutions have poor track records vis-a-vis conformity to such codes of practice and treaties.¶ Despite good intentions, empty dreams and platitudes may be counterproductive. This essay argues that the ideal of sustainability as introduced in the 1987 report of the Brundtland Commission and institutionalized in the form of Agenda 21 at the 1992 Rio Earth Summit is false and counterproductive. The ideal of sustainability assumes that we are almost god-like, capable of perceiving, integrating, monitoring, organizing, and controlling our world. These assumptions create an "impossible" character to the "dream" of sustainability in business and governmental decisionmaking.¶ Sustainability of the Agenda 21 kind is a utopian vision that is the enemy of the possible and the good. The problem is that while on paper we can always sketch elegant solutions that appear to have the ability to achieve a desired utopia, such solutions work "if only" everyone will come together and behave in the way laid out in the "blueprint." n7 Humans should have learned from such grand misperceptions as the French Enlightenment's failure to accurately comprehend the quality and limits of human nature or Marxism's flawed view of altruistic human motivation that the "if only" is an impossibly utopian reordering of human nature we will never achieve. n8¶ [\*599] A critical defect in the idea of sustainable development is that it continues the flawed assumptions about human nature and motivation that provided the foundational premises of Marxist collectivism and centralized planning authorities. n9 Such perspectives inject rigidity and bureaucracy into a system that requires monitoring, flexibility, adaptation, and accountability. But, in criticizing the failed Marxist-Leninist form of organization, my argument should not be seen as a defense of supposed free market capitalism. Like Marxism, a true free market capitalism does not really exist.¶ The factors of greed and self interest, limited human capacity, inordinate systemic complexity, and the power of large-scale driving forces beyond our ability to control lead to the unsustainability of human systems. Human self-interest is an insurmountable barrier that can be affected to a degree only by effective laws, the promise of significant financial or career returns, or fear of consequences. The only way to change the behavior of business and governmental decisionmakers is through the use of the "carrot" and the "stick." n10 Yet even this approach can only be achieved incrementally with limited positive effects.

Transition won’t solve the environment—

Dickinson 8 - Pete, “Will the downturn save the planet? – A green new deal?” Socialist Alternative, 12-24, http://www.socialistalternative.org/news/article19.php?id=981

On the face of it, these figures seem to indicate that there is, indeed, a possibility of serious reductions in greenhouse gasses due to the economic crisis, even if it is significantly less than the extreme example of Russia. A closer look, however, reveals that it is unlikely that an economic downturn will significantly mitigate climate change effects, particularly in the medium or long term, for several reasons. Firstly, Crutzen, in addition to predicting falling emissions due to the crisis, also made the point that the downturn could result in less being spent on research, which could make global warming worse, a fear that is already being justified. Latest figures show that global investment by firms in renewable technology has slumped, even before the current deepening of the crisis, falling 24% from the second to the third quarter of this year, from $5.8 billion to $4.4 billion (Financial Times, November 11). The markets clearly see no future in green technology in the short term, either, as various indices of share values in the sector have fallen from between 50-80% over the past twelve months. Market forces are now working strongly against renewables, with the fall in the price of oil undermining profitability projections and the credit crunch cutting off access to funding for new projects. In California, a leading renewables firm, Ausra, had plans to raise money to develop a promising new type of solar energy. This is called solar thermal power, that uses mirrors to concentrate the sun’s rays to heat water to use in turbines to generate electricity, which could turn out to be far cheaper than solar panels. Now, sources of finance have dried up. The second reason not to expect the crisis to solve global warming is that production in the Soviet Union was heavily biased to highly polluting "smokestack" industries, whereas in the G7 countries, which account for most of world production, output is much more oriented to services, IT and consumer goods. For this reason, any downturn will result in much smaller reductions in emissions, since these sectors are very significantly less energy intensive. Thirdly, the scale of a downturn is extremely unlikely to approach that of the Soviet catastrophe. To get a comparison, output in the USA in the Great Depression fell by about one third – significantly less in some countries such as Britain. On a world scale, the economy in the 1930s fell by a fraction of that in the Soviet Union in the 1990s. Also, while a slump rather than a recession may still happen today, the lessons that have been learnt by the bourgeoisie since mean that a downturn probably will not happen on a similar scale to the 1930s. For example, policy interventions in downturns since the second world war have resulted in world production falling only once, in 1975/76, and then only marginally. An uncertain factor is China, which has become the world’s biggest emitter of global warming gasses, partly by expanding energy intensive industries such as steel in the past seven years. There is some evidence now that a significant fall in production is taking place. If this is repeated across other previously rapidly expanding energy guzzling sectors in China, significant falls in greenhouse gasses could happen. However, the Chinese government has just launched a stimulus package, which has got massive accumulated resources to back it up, and which could significantly mitigate any overall fall in production in that country. Even if a deep slump unfortunately does occur, following the suffering and devastation, at some point an upturn will take place that will reverse ultimately any falls that had taken place in greenhouse gasses, if the capitalist system is allowed to continue. Also, whatever the severity of the economic crisis, there are enough global warming gasses trapped in the atmosphere already to drive global temperature rises for decades to come. The reality is that there is no way to deal with climate change except through the transformation of the mode of production, the global application of sustainable technologies (see Planning Green Growth, by Pete Dickenson, Socialist Publications and CWI, 2003).

Growth Does-and it’s sustainable—

Norberg 3 – Senior Fellow @ CATO, Johan In Defense of Global Capitalism, p.224-37

The notion that there has to be a conflict runs into the same problem as the whole idea of a race to the bottom: it doesn’t tally with reality. There is no exodus of industry to countries with poor environmental standards, and there is no downward pressure on the level of global environmental protection. Instead, the bulk of American and European investments goes to countries with environmental regulations similar to their own. There has been much talk of American factories moving to Mexico since NAFTA was signed. Less well known, however, is that since free trade was introduced Mexico has tightened up its environmental regula- tions, following a long history of complete nonchalance about environmental issues. This tightening up is part of a global trend. All over the world, economic progress and growth are moving hand in hand with intensified environmental protection. Four researchers who studied these connections found ‘‘a very strong, positive association between our [environmental] indicators and the level of economic development.’’ A country that is very poor is too preoccupied with lifting itself out of poverty to bother about the environment at all. Countries usually begin protecting their natural resources when they can afford to do so. When they grow richer, they start to regulate effluent emissions, and when they have still more resources they also begin regulating air quality.19 A number of factors cause environment protection to increase with wealth and development. Environmental quality is unlikely to be a top priority for people who barely know where their next meal is coming from. Abating misery and subduing the pangs of hunger takes precedence over conservation. When our standard of living rises we start attaching importance to the environment and obtaining resources to improve it. Such was the case earlier in western Europe, and so it is in the developing countries today. Progress of this kind, however, requires that people live in democ- racies where they are able and allowed to mobilize opinion; other- wise, their preferences will have no impact. Environmental destruction is worst in dictatorships. But it is the fact of prosperity no less than a sense of responsibility that makes environmental protection easier in a wealthy society. A wealthier country can afford to tackle environmental

problems; it can develop environ- mentally friendly technologies—wastewater and exhaust emission control, for example—and begin to rectify past mistakes. Global environmental development resembles not so much a race for the bottom as a race to the top, what we might call a ‘‘California effect.’’ The state of California’s Clean Air Acts, first introduced in the 1970s and tightened since, were stringent emis- sions regulations that made rigorous demands on car manufactur- ers. Many prophets of doom predicted that firms and factories would move to other states, and California would soon be obliged to repeal its regulations. But instead the opposite happened: other states gradually tightened up their environmental stipulations. Because car companies needed the wealthy California market, manufacturers all over the United States were forced to develop new techniques for reducing emissions. Having done so, they could more easily comply with the exacting requirements of other states, whereupon those states again ratcheted up their requirements. Anti-globalists usually claim that the profit motive and free trade together cause businesses to entrap politicians in a race for the bottom. The California effect implies the opposite: free trade enables politicians to pull profit-hungry corporations along with them in a race to the top. This phenomenon occurs because compliance with environ- mental rules accounts for a very small proportion of most compa- nies’ expenditures. What firms are primarily after is a good busi- ness environment—a lall iberal economy and a skilled workforce— not a bad natural environment. A review of research in this field shows that there are no clear indications of national environmental rules leading to a diminution of exports or to fewer companies locating in the countries that pass the rules.20 This finding under- mines both the arguments put forward by companies against environmental regulations and those advanced by environmental- ists maintaining that globalization has to be restrained for environ- mental reasons. Incipient signs of the California effect’s race to the top are present all over the world, because globalization has caused differ- ent countries to absorb new techniques more rapidly, and the new techniques are generally far gentler on the environment. Researchers have investigated steel manufacturing in 50 different countries and concluded that countries with more open economies took the lead in introducing cleaner technology. Production in those countries generated almost 20 percent less emissions than the same production in closed countries. This process is being driven by multinational corporations because they have a lot to gain from uniform production with uniform technology. Because they are restructured more rapidly, they have more modern machinery. And they prefer assimilating the latest, most environ- mentally friendly technology immediately to retrofitting it, at great expense, when environmental regulations are tightened up. Brazil, Mexico, and China—the three biggest recipients of foreign investment—have followed a very clear pattern: the more investments they get, the better control they gain over air pollu- tion. The worst forms of air pollution have diminished in their cities during the period of globalization. When Western compa- nies start up in developing countries, their production is consider- ably more environment-friendly than the native production, and they are more willing to comply with environmental legislation, not least because they have brand images and reputations to protect. Only 30 percent of Indonesian companies comply with the country’s environmental regulations, whereas no fewer than 80 percent of the multinationals do so. One out of every 10 foreign companies maintained a standard clearly superior to that of the regulations. This development would go faster if economies were more open and, in particular, if the governments of the world were to phase out the incomprehensible tariffs on environmentally friendly technology.21 Sometimes one hears it said that, for environmental reasons, the poor countries of the South must not be allowed to grow as affluent as our countries in the North. For example, in a compila- tion of essays on Environmentally Significant Consumption pub- lished by the National Academy of Sciences, we find anthropolo- gist Richard Wilk fretting that: If everyone develops a desire for the Western high-consumption lifestyle, the relentless growth in consumption, energy use, waste, and emissions may be disastrous.22 But studies show this to be colossal misapprehension. On the contrary, it is in the developing countries that we find the gravest, most harmful environmental problems. In our affluent part of the world, more and more people are mindful of environmental problems such as endangered green areas. Every day in the develop- ing countries, more than 6,000 people die from air pollution when using wood, dung, and agricultural waste in their homes as heating and cooking fuel. UNDP estimates that no fewer than 2.2 million people die every year from polluted indoor air. This result is already ‘‘disastrous’’ and far more destructive than atmo- spheric pollution and industrial emissions. Tying people down to that level of development means condemning millions to pre- mature death every year. It is not true that pollution in the modern sense increases with growth. Instead, pollution follows an inverted U-curve. When growth in a very poor country gathers speed and the chimneys begin belching smoke, the environment suffers. But when prosperity has risen high enough, the environmental indicators show an improvement instead: emissions are reduced, and air and water show progressively lower concentrations of pollutants. The cities with the worst problems are not Stockholm, New York, and Zu ̈rich, but rather Beijing, Mexico City, and New Delhi. In addition to the factors already mentioned, this is also due to the economic structure changing from raw-material-intensive to knowledge-intensive production. In a modern economy, heavy, dirty industry is to a great extent superseded by service enterprises. Banks, consulting firms, and information technology corporations do not have the same environmental impact as old factories. According to one survey of available environmental data, the turning point generally comes before a country’s per capita GDP has reached $8,000. At $10,000, the researchers found a positive connection between increased growth and better air and water quality.23 That is roughly the level of prosperity of Argentina, South Korea, or Slovenia. In the United States, per capita GDP is about $36,300. Here as well, the environment has consistently improved since the 1970s, quite contrary to the picture one gets from the media. In the 1970s there was constant reference to smog in American cities, and rightly so: the air was judged to be unhealthy for 100–300 days a year. Today it is unhealthy for fewer than 10 days a year, with the exception of Los Angeles. There, the figure is roughly 80 days, but even that represents a 50 percent reduction in 10 years.24 The same trend is noticeable in the rest of the affluent world—for example, in Tokyo, where, a few decades ago, doomsayers believed that oxygen masks would in the future have to be worn all around the city because of the bad air. Apart from its other positive effects on the developing countries, such as ameliorating hunger and sparing people the horror of watching their children die, prosperity beyond a certain critical point can improve the environment. What is more, this turning point is now occurring progressively earlier in the developing countries, because they can

learn from more affluent countries’ mistakes and use their superior technology. For example, air qual- ity in the enormous cities of China, which are the most heavily polluted in the world, has steadied since the mid-1980s and in several cases has slowly improved. This improvement has coin- cided with uniquely rapid growth. Some years ago, the Danish statistician and Greenpeace mem- ber Bjørn Lomborg, with about 10 of his students, compiled statistics and facts about the world’s environmental problems. To his astonishment, he found that what he himself had regarded as self-evident, the steady deterioration of the global environment did not agree at all with official empirical data. He found instead that air pollution is diminishing, refuse problems are diminishing, resources are not running out, more people are eating their fill, and people are living longer. Lomborg gathered publicly available data from as many fields as he could find and published them in the book The Skeptical Environmentalist: Measuring the Real State of the World. The picture that emerges there is an important corrective to the general prophesies of doom that can so easily be imbibed from newspaper headlines. Lomborg shows that air pollution and emissions have been declining in the developed world during recent decades. Heavy metal emissions have been heavily reduced; nitrogen oxides have diminished by almost 30 percent and sulfur emissions by about 80 percent. Pollution and emission problems are still growing in the poor developing countries, but at every level of growth annual particle density has diminished by 2 percent in only 14 years. In the developed world, phosphorus emissions into the seas have declined drastically, and E. coli bacteria concentrations in coastal waters have plummeted, enabling closed swimming areas to reopen. Lomborg shows that, instead of large-scale deforestation, the world’s forest acreage increased from 40.24 million to 43.04 million square kilometers between 1950 and 1994. He finds that there has never been any large-scale tree death caused by acid rain. The oft-quoted, but erroneous statement about 40,000 species going extinct every year is traced by Lomborg to its source—a 20-year-old estimate that has been circulating in environmentalist circles ever since. Lomborg thinks it is closer to 1,500 species a year, and possibly a bit more than that. The documented cases of extinction during the past 400 years total just over a thousand species, of which about 95 percent are insects, bacteria, and viruses. As for the problem of garbage, the next hundred years worth of Danish refuse could be accommodated in a 33-meter-deep pit with an area of three square kilometers, even without recycling. In addition, Lomborg illustrates how increased prosperity and improved technology can solve the problems that lie ahead of us. All the fresh water consumed in the world today could be produced by a single desalination plant, powered by solar cells and occupying 0.4 percent of the Sahara Desert. It is a mistake, then, to believe that growth automatically ruins the environment. And claims that we would need this or that number of planets for the whole world to attain a Western stan- dard of consumption—those ‘‘ecological footprint’’ calcula- tions—are equally untruthful. Such a claim is usually made by environmentalists, and it is concerned, not so much with emissions and pollution, as with resources running out if everyone were to live as we do in the affluent world. Clearly, certain of the raw materials we use today, in present- day quantities, would not suffice for the whole world if everyone consumed the same things. But that information is just about as interesting as if a prosperous Stone Age man were to say that, if everyone attained his level of consumption, there would not be enough stone, salt, and furs to go around. Raw material consump- tion is not static. With more and more people achieving a high level of prosperity, we start looking for ways of using other raw materials. Humanity is constantly improving technology so as to get at raw materials that were previously inaccessible, and we are attaining a level of prosperity that makes this possible. New innovations make it possible for old raw materials to be put to better use and for garbage to be turned into new raw materials. A century and a half ago, oil was just something black and sticky that people preferred not to step in and definitely did not want to find beneath their land. But our interest in finding better energy sources led to methods being devised for using oil, and today it is one of our prime resources. Sand has never been all that exciting or precious, but today it is a vital raw material in the most powerful technology of our age, the computer. In the form of silicon—which makes up a quarter of the earth’s crust— it is a key component in computer chips. There is a simple market mechanism that averts shortages. If a certain raw material comes to be in short supply, its price goes up. This makes everyone more interested in economizing on that resource, in finding more of it, in reusing it, and in trying to find substitutes for it. The trend over the last few decades of falling raw material prices is clear. Metals have never been as cheap as they are today. Prices are falling, which suggests that demand does not exceed supply. In relation to wages, that is, in terms of how long we must work to earn the price of a raw material, natural resources today are half as expensive as they were 50 years ago and one-fifth as expensive as they were a hundred years ago. In 1900 the price of electricity was eight times higher, the price of coal seven times higher, and the price of oil five times higher than today.25 The risk of shortage is declining all the time, because new finds and more efficient use keep augmenting the available reserves. In a world where technology never stops developing, static calculations are uninteresting, and wrong. By simple mathematics, Lomborg establishes that if we have a raw material with a hundred years’ use remaining, a 1 percent annual increase in demand, and a 2 percent increase in recycling and/or efficiency, that resource will never be exhausted. If shortages do occur, then with the right technology most substances can be recycled. One-third of the world’s steel produc- tion, for example, is being reused already. Technological advance can outstrip the depletion of resources. Not many years ago, everyone was convinced of the impossibility of the whole Chinese population having telephones, because that would require several hundred million telephone operators. But the supply of manpower did not run out; technology developed instead. Then it was declared that nationwide telephony for China was physically impossible because all the world’s copper wouldn’t suffice for installing heavy gauge telephone lines all over the country. Before that had time to become a problem, fiber optics and satellites began to supersede copper wire. The price of copper, a commodity that people believed would run out, has fallen continuously and is now only about a tenth of what it was 200 years ago. People in most ages have worried about important raw materials becoming exhausted. But on the few occasions when this has happened, it has generally affected isolated, poor places, not open, affluent ones. To claim that people in Africa, who are dying by the thousand every day from supremely real shortages, must not be allowed to become as prosperous as we in the West because we can find theoretical risks of shortages occurring is both stupid and unjust. The environmental question will not resolve itself. Proper rules are needed for the protection of water, soil, and air from destruc- tion. Systems of emissions fees are needed to give polluters an interest in not damaging the environment for others. Many envi- ronmental issues also require international regulations and agree- ments, which confront us with entirely new challenges. Carbon dioxide emissions, for example, tend to increase rather than dimin- ish when a country grows more affluent. When talking about the market and the environment, it is important to realize that efforts in this quarter will be facilitated by a freer, growing economy capable of using the best solutions, from both a natural and a human viewpoint. In order to meet those challenges, it is better to have resources and advanced science than not to have them. Very often, environmental improvements are due to the very capitalism so often blamed for the problems. The introduction of private property creates owners with long-term interests. Land- owners must see to it that there is good soil or forest there tomorrow as well, because otherwise they will have no income later on, whether they continue using the land or intend to sell it. If the property is collective or government-owned, no one has any such long-term interest. On the contrary, everyone then has an interest in using up the resources quickly before someone else does. It was because they were common lands that the rain forests of the Amazon began to be rapidly exploited in the 1960s and 1970s and are still being rapidly exploited today. Only about a 10th of forests are recognized by the governments as privately owned, even though in practice Indians possess and inhabit large parts of them. It is the absence of definite fishing rights that causes (heavily subsidized) fishing fleets to try to vacuum the oceans of fish before someone else does. No wonder, then, that the most large-scale destruction of environment in history has occurred in the communist dictatorships, where all ownership was collective. A few years ago, a satellite image was taken of the borders of the Sahara, where the desert was spreading. Everywhere, the land was parched yellow, after nomads had overexploited the common lands and then moved on. But in the midst of this desert environ- ment could be seen a small patch of green. This proved to be an area of privately owned land where the owners of the farm pre- vented overexploitation and engaged in cattle farming that was profitable in the long term.26

Cant overcome societal trends

Carolan, 4-

(Michael S., Departments of Sociology and Environmental Studies, Whitman College, “Ecological Modernization Theory: What About Consumption?,” Society & Natural Resources, Volume 17, Issue 3, pg. 247-260, Taylor and Francis, pdf)

While in some respects **our age** is a postmaterial one, it **is** in other respects still very much **the proverbial 800-pound material gorilla**. Few in this world are ready to give up on jewelry, cars, big-screen televisions, and computers, although many would like them produced in as ‘‘green’’ a manner as possible. And the billions that do not yet possess these items are far from giving up on the idea of one day having them in their possession (Renner and Sampat 2002). We must not base our hopes on a total dematerializing of the economy, for **such hope is a chimera**. Consumption will always be tied to the material world, to some extent, and as such consumption will always be tied to the environment. As noted by Michael Redclift (1996, 3), increased production requires increased consumption in ‘‘both volume and kind.’’

Consumption is inevitable

Wapner and Willoughby, 5-

(Paul, Associate Professor and Director of the Global Environmental Politics program, School of International Service at American University, and John, Professor of Economics at American University, Chair of the Department of Economics, “The Irony of Environmentalism: The Ecological Futility but Political Necessity of Lifestyle Change,” Ethics & International Affairs, Volume 19, Issue 3, December 2005, pg. 77-89, Wiley Online Library, pdf)

Considering what would happen if a group of environmentalists decided to cut back on their use of a key resource can also make this point. Let’s say, for example, that I reduce my water consumption in an effort to save fresh water. There is no question that this immediately reduces demand on water and thus helps to conserve a limited resource. But, in the act of doing so, I also pay less to the water utility provider, and thus have more discretionary income. **If I spend** the **money I save** by not consuming water **on other** resource-involved **goods** or activities, especially ones **that indirectly use water** (such as many manufactured goods), **the net environmental impact** of my decision **may be hard to discern**. If I invest my savings in conventional financial mechanisms, I will probably still end up inducing environmental harm. In short, resource restraint by some may not translate directly into a collective reduction in resource use. **This underlines** the **difﬁculty of protecting** the **environment through campaigns to change** individual **consumption patterns**.
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## A2: BioD

**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.

**Their evidence is from 2011 obvi be skeptical of uniqueness, this obviously isn’t a da**

**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]

**Plan = new money no link**

## 2AC

**Presidential Veto Checks Defunding**

**The Hill 11**

[The Hill Political Blog, “ Obama threatens to veto House Republican spending measure”, <http://thehill.com/blogs/blog-briefing-room/news/144285-obama-waves-veto-threat-at-continuing-resolution>, 2/15/11,]

The Obama administration on Tuesday threatened to veto the House GOP's measure funding the federal government. In a statement of administration policy, the Office of Management and Budget said cuts included in the Republican continuing resolution would hamstring the U.S. economy and compromise national security. "If the president is presented with a bill that undermines critical priorities or national security through funding levels or restrictions, contains earmarks or curtails the drivers of long-term economic growth and job creation while continuing to burden future generations with deficits, the president will veto the bill," the statement said.

#### No link – funding exists for the Plan now, but isn’t being spent on it

**Tellez, 11 -** EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, SEAFARERS INTERNATIONAL UNION (Augustin, Testimony before the HEARING ON CREATING JOBS AND INCREASING U.S. EXPORTS BY ENHANCING THE MARINE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM, 6/14,

<http://republicans.transportation.house.gov/Media/file/TestimonyCGMT/2011-06-14%20Tellez.pdf>)

The use of the Harbor Maintenance Tax is another issue - and one that directly impacts our ability to meet the President's export initiative goals. Right now, over $5 billion sits in the Harbor Maintenance Trust fund and those dollars aren't being spent on our harbors and rivers. This means that our navigation channels and harbors have been accumulating silt and sediment that make it more difficult for deeper draft vessels to navigate. The U.S. Anny Corps of Engineers has reported that almost 30% of commercial vessels calling on American ports cannot carry full loads because of inadequate depths. Ships cannot transit our harbors fully loaded, which is inefficient and costly, both for exports and imports: We must use this trust fund for the purpose for which it was created - ensuring our ports, harbors and navigable rivers are dredged and able to handle the traffic they need to handle.

**Affs must be a net-increase in funding - increase means net increase**

**Words and Phrases, 2K5 (Cumulative Supplementary Pamphlet, v. 20a, p.295)**

Cal.App.2 Dist. 1991. Term “increase,” as used in statute giving the Energy Commission modification jurisdiction over any alteration, replacement, or improvement of equipment that results in “increase” of 50 megawatts or more in electric generating capacity of existing thermal power plant, refers to “net increase” in power plant’s total generating capacity; in deciding whether there has been the requisite 50-megawatt increase as a result of new units being incorporated into a plant, Energy Commission cannot ignore decreases in capacity caused by retirement or deactivation of other units at plant. West’s Ann.Cal.Pub.Res.Code § 25123.

**That must come from a baseline**

**Rogers 05 (Judge, STATE OF NEW YORK, ET AL., PETITIONERS v. U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, RESPONDENT, NSR MANUFACTURERS ROUNDTABLE, ET AL., INTERVENORS, 2005 U.S. App. LEXIS 12378, \*\*; 60 ERC (BNA) 1791, 6/24, lexis)**

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

**Trade-off disads are unpredictable – hundreds of programs in the U.S. to trade-off with, overburdens the aff research which kills clash over programs and any hope of education – spending and politics disads solve their offense**

#### 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.

**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

# PTX

#### No impact to food prices

Doug 08 (May 4, pg. http://www.networkeddemocracy.com/?p=92)

In a sharp rebuttal of the Malthusian assertion that increasing wealth inspires greater fertility, the evidence of history is that fertility in wealthier countries approaches near zero and can even become negative. (For example, Russia is facing [population decline](http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0377/is_158/ai_n8680968).) Data and estimates by the U.S. Census Bureau, shown in the graph, show that the global growth rate year over year is declining. Ultimately, world population is expected to [ultimately peak and perhaps even drop off a little by 2070](http://www.newscientist.com/article/dn1108-global-population-to-peak-in-2070.html). Thus, world population growth is eventually limited as societies reach higher stages of development. 2. As illustrated by Julian Simon’s [victorious bet against Paul Erhlich](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Simon-Ehrlich_wager), commodity prices tend to be brought back into line by the market. While there can be dislocation of prices for an extended period of time, and many people can suffer greatly during that time, there will ultimately be an adjustment of the prices downward. In fact, Simon claimed that eventually prices *would be lower*. 3. Moreover, while population growth is currently outstripping food supply, the [Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations forecasts that food supply will be more the sufficient by 2030](http://www.fao.org/english/newsroom/news/2002/7828-en.html). This suggests that the gap between supply and demand is actually decreasing. 4. Finally, the recent sharp rise commodity prices may significantly related to monetary policy and global commodity speculation. The U.S. Dollar has been falling, and worries about the stock market are thought to have caused a [flight of dollars into commodities](http://www.moneyweek.com/file/41971/why-gold-is-still-undervalued.html), driving up the prices of oil and gold in particular. Speculative interest in these products is probably driving up the prices of other agricultural commodities. When other investment opportunities become more favorable again, [there could be a dramatic flight out of those speculative positions](http://www.telegraph.co.uk/money/main.jhtml?xml=/money/2008/03/04/cccomms104.xml). So, while food insecurity is amajor problem that needs serious attention, it is stretching the facts to call it the harbinger of the end of civilizationor a dire threat that requires the complete transformation of society.Catastrophe theories often assume that present conditions will continue on their current trajectory unabated, when in fact the self-organizing nature of modern society means that humanity is always reacting and adjusting to present conditions.

**No evidence the Plan is sufficient to DRAIN all capital needed to get passed CIR**

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.

**Cross-x they said everyone agreed on what should be on there – so deal is inevitable then**

## A2: Bioterrorism

**Biological weapons won’t be used and won’t cause extinction**

**Mueller 05** (John, Professor of political science at Ohio State University, “Simplicity and Spook: Terrorism and the Dynamics of Threat Exaggeration,” International Studies Perspectives, 6, 208-234)

Properly developed and deployed, biological weapons could indeed, if thus far only in theory, kill hundreds of thousands, perhaps even millions, of people. The discussion remains theoretical because biological weapons have scarcely ever been used even though the knowledge about their destructive potential as weapons goes back decades, even centuries in some respects (the English, e.g., made some efforts to spread smallpox among American Indians in the French and Indian War) (Christopher, Cieslak, Pavlin, and Eitzen, 1997:412). Belligerents have eschewed such weapons with good reason:**biological weapons are extremely difficult to deploy and to control**. Terrorist groups or rogue states may be able to solve such problems in the future with advances in technology and knowledge, but the record thus far is unlikely to be very encouraging to them. For example, **Japan** reportedly **infected wells** in Manchuria **and** bombed several Chinese cities with plague-infested fleas before and during the Second World War. These ventures may have **killedthousands of Chinese, but** they apparently also**caused thousands of unintended casualties among Japanese** troops and seem to have had little military impact.18 In the 1990s, AumShinrikyo, a Japanese cult that had some300 scientists in its employ and an estimated budget of $1 billion, reportedly tried at least nine times over 5 years to set off biological weapons by spraying pathogens from trucks and wafting them from rooftops, hoping fancifully to ignite an apocalyptic war. **These efforts failed to create a single fatality**in fact,nobody even noticed that the attacks had taken place (Broad, 1998; Rapoport, 1999:57). For the most destructive results, **biological weapons need to be dispersed** in very lowaltitude aerosol clouds: **aerosols do not** appreciably **settle, and anthrax** (which is not easy to spread or catch and is not contagious) **would** probably **have to be sprayed near nose level** (Meselson, 1995; Panofsky, 1998; Terry, 1998). **Explosive** methods of **dispersion** may **destroy the organisms**. Moreover, except for anthrax spores, long-term storage of lethal organisms in bombs or warheads is difficult, and, even if refrigerated, most of the organisms have a limited lifetime. **The effects** of such weapons can **take** days or **weeks** to have full effect, **during which time they can be countered** with civil defense measures. And their impact is very difficult to predict and in combat situationsmay spread back on the attacker (OTA, 1993:48–49, 62; Broad and Miller, 1998; Easterbrook, 2002).

## 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—**

#### They read a generic link – squo triggers it

Patton 2/14—Washington Editor for Fleet Management (Oliver, “Infrastructure Featured in State of Union, House Hearing”, <http://www.truckinginfo.com/channel/fleet-management/news/story/2013/02/infrastructure-featured-in-state-of-union-house-hearing.aspx?prestitial=1>, chm)

Infrastructure had its moment in the spotlight this week as President Obama called for most-needed repairs funded in part by private investment, and the lead transportation committee in the House kicked off what will be a two-year effort to reauthorize the federal highway program.¶ In his State of the Union address on Tuesday evening, Obama said that reinvestment in infrastructure will make the country more competitive and, not incidentally, create more jobs.¶ “Tonight I propose a “Fix-It-First” program to put people to work as soon as possible on our most urgent repairs, like the nearly 70,000 structurally deficient bridges across the country,” he said.¶ “And to make sure taxpayers don’t shoulder the whole burden, I’m also proposing a Partnership to Rebuild America that attracts private capital to upgrade what our businesses need most: modern ports to move our goods; modern pipelines to withstand a storm; modern schools worthy of our children.”¶ Although he acknowledged the role of taxes in paying for infrastructure, Obama did not explicitly call for increases. But witnesses at the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee hearing yesterday took up the slack.¶ “It’s a difficult time to consider taxes, but we have to fund transportation,” said Ed Rendell, the former Pennsylvania governor who now co-chairs the action group Build for America that is calling for substantial new investment.¶ Rendell told the committee that short-term fuel tax increases should be part of an overall funding package **that includes a national infrastructure bank** and an easing of restraints on tolling.¶ The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, which represents the views of the business community, is solidly behind a fuel tax increase, said president and CEO Thomas Donohue.¶ “The Chamber supports reasonable increases that are phased in and indexed to inflation,” Donohue said.¶ The fuel tax is a user fee so shippers can get their goods to customers in a timely way, and it is insane to consider today’s highway congestion a cost of doing business, he said.¶ Asked by Rep. Nick Rahall, D-W.Va., if groups like the Chamber should help build support for a fuel tax hike, Donohue replied, “We’ll raise a lot of noise but maybe Congress could say nothing instead of saying hell no.”¶ Terrence O’Sullivan, general president of the Laborers’ International Union of North America, continued the theme, saying that his group supports user fees and more use of public-private partnerships.¶ Rep. Bill Shuster, R-Pa., the chair of the committee, said that while the panel must tend to water resources and passenger rail legislation it also is beginning work on highway reauthorization.¶ He said Rep. John Duncan, R-Tenn., will chair a panel on intermodalism and freight movement that will make recommendations on legislative language for the reauthorization.¶ Shuster had to take a moment to apologize at the start of the hearing for remarks about President Obama’s State of the Union address.¶ Obama said: “Ask any CEO where they’d rather locate and hire, a country with deteriorating roads and bridges or one with high-speed rail and Internet, high-tech schools, self-healing power grids.”¶ Asked by Politico for his reaction, Shuster said, “I think he’s lying about CEOs – they want to invest in a country that has high-speed rail? Really? Tell me what CEO said that.”¶ Shuster opened yesterday’s hearing with an apology. “I do not think the president is a liar,” he said, adding that while he disagrees with the president on high-speed rail this type of rhetoric is not his style.¶ The other themes, besides the need for more revenue, that emerged at the hearing were the need for a strong federal role in transportation, and for improvements in the administration of governance.¶ Rendell, Donohue and O’Sullivan told Rahall that they favor a federal presence over devolution of money and authority to the states.

**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.

**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.

**Deal inevitable**

Allan **Wernick 1-25**, attorney and director of the City University of New York’s Citizenship Now!, 1-25-13, A look at where key Congressional players stand on immigration indicates reform could come soon, http://www.nydailynews.com/new-york/citizenship-now/immigration-chances-good-sweeping-immigration-reform-article-1.1245988

As expected, President Obama confirmed his support for immigration reform in his inaugural address. It was one of the few specific issues mentioned by the President in setting the program for his coming four years in office. In the last few weeks, **some pundits have argued that the** **debate over debt and budget issues or gun control will sidetrack the President** from his commitment to immigrants. That analysis ignores the expectations of Latino voters and their allies. Obama and both parties **have no choice** but to make immigration reform a priority in the coming year. **The doubters are wrong**. I am more optimistic than ever that we will see reform this year. To understand why, lets take a look at what some key players on the immigration reform debate have been saying and doing this year: l Charles Schumer — New York Democrat Chuck Schumer will pay a key role in shaping the debate. That’s good news for immigrant rights’ advocates. As chair of the Senate Subcommittee on Immigration, Border Security and Citizenship, Sen. Schumer is responsible for leading any reform bill through the Senate. **Particularly experienced** in dealing with immigration legislation, many credit then-Congressman Schumer with the deal-making that led to passage of the last legalization legislation, the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986. More than 3 million undocumented immigrants were legalized under that act. **Schumer is already on the move, organizing his colleagues for the fight to come.** l Marco Rubio — Florida Sen. Marco Rubio’s call last spring for a Dream Act for undocumented youth was an historic turning point in the immigration reform debate. A rising Conservative Republican star, Rubio’s proposal forced Obama’s hand. The President’s decision to grant Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals helped him consolidate the Latino vote, a key factor in his victory. Recently, Rubio's position on legalization has moved from supporting just legal status to agreeing that legalization must include a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants. Though many others in the Republican party have yet to adopt the “path to citizenship” position, **it will hard for Republican leaders to buck one of their few Latino leaders**. Rubio is a key player in the Republicans’ plan to reach out to Latinos. As a possible 2016 Presidential candidate, **Rubio can’t afford to anger Latinos.** l Luis Gutierrez — Chicago Congressman Luis Gutierrez is the Democratic Party’s conscience on immigration issues. Gutierrez is a tenacious advocate for immigrants’ rights. Though not a member of the party’s leadership, his impact on the debate will be greater than might be expected from his position alone. He has a long history of advocating for immigrants’ rights and he stood up to the Obama administration’s early resistance to the DACA program. Of Puerto Rican ancestry, Gutierrez recognized early in his career the importance of reaching out to his Mexican constituents. To help lead the immigration reform debate in the House of Representatives, Gutierrez is giving up his senior position on the prestigious House Financial Services Committee to join the Subcommittee on Immigration Policy and Enforcement. House Democratic leaders will look to Gutierrez to speak for immigrants about which compromises are acceptable to Latinos and which are not. He has closer ties to the immigrants’ rights movement than any other federal elected official. l Paul **Ryan** — Former Vice Presidential candidate Paul Ryan has no intention of letting Marco Rubio steal the show on immigration reform. A contender with Rubio for a possible 2016 run for the White House, Ryan reportedly reached out to House colleague Gutierrez regarding possible Tea Party support for a generous immigration bill. Ryan and any other Republicans seeking a national leadership role must be sensitive to the growing Latino vote. Unlike many of his Republican colleagues, Ryan is not a reformed immigrant-basher, reversing his position only after Romney and his defeat in November. Compared to other Republicans, **he has been relatively immigrant-friendly much of his career.** l John Boehner and Harry Reid — Boehner, as Speaker of the House, and Reid, as Senate Majority Leader, together need to make the system work for immigration reform to become law. Within days of President Obama’s reelection, Republican Boehner made clear his intention to seek common ground with Obama on the issue. As a leading Republican, Boehner knows that his party’s future is bleak if it maintains a restrictionist stance. Reid, as his party's Senate leader, will do what it takes to get Obama and Schumer’s program through the Senate. Reid must also keep his own constituents in mind. In his home state of Nevada, Latinos made up 18% of voters in 2012, up from 15% in 2008, a number that will surely grow going forward. **Immigration reform will happen this year. Count on it.**

**Adding new immigrants not key---immigration and visas are already increasing**

**Porter 2-5 –** Eduardo Porter, writer for the New York Times, February 5th, 2013, "Immigration Reform Issue: The Effect on the Budget" [www.nytimes.com/2013/02/06/business/immigration-reform-issue-the-effect-on-the-budget.html?pagewanted=all&pagewanted=print](http://www.nytimes.com/2013/02/06/business/immigration-reform-issue-the-effect-on-the-budget.html?pagewanted=all&pagewanted=print)

Yet immigration reform today means something quite different than it did in 2007. Notably, the elements needed to stop the flow of illegal immigrants north are much less important to the enterprise. The Obama administration has already spent huge amounts of money on border enforcement. Today, border policing costs about $18 billion a year — nearly 50 percent more than it did in 2006. And deportations have soared. What’s more, **illegal immigration has slowed to a trickle**, as Mexico has grown more robustly than the United States. The illegal immigrant population has even been **shrinking** in the last few years. And it may continue to do so as the Mexican population of prime migration-age people stops growing.¶ Also, **many employers have already gotten some of what they wanted: the number of workers entering the United States on temporary visas for low-end jobs in agriculture and other industries has increased sharply.**¶ “The discussion is in a different environment,” said Gordon H. Hanson, an **expert on the economics of immigration at the University of California**, **San Diego.** “**The flow of new immigrants is not the story anymore.”**

**Boehner will push immigration reform – it’s a republican concession – shields Obama’s cap**

**Foley & Stein 1-2,** writers for the Huffington Post (Elise & Stein, “Obama's Immigration Reform Push To Begin This Month”, *Huffington Post*, January 2, 2013, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/02/obama-immigration-reform\_n\_2398507.html)

Lofgren expressed hope that immigration reform would be able to get past partisan gridlock, arguing that the election was seen as something of a mandate for fixing the immigration system and Republicans won't be able to forget their post-election promises to work on a bill. "In the end, immigration reform is going to depend very much on whether Speaker [John] Boehner wants to do it or not," Lofgren said.

**Immigration reform doesn’t solve – multiple barriers**

**Holmes 1-23** former assistant secretary of state, distinguished fellow at the Heritage Foundation (Kim R., “HOLMES: A problem-solving approach to immigration”, *Washington Times*, January 23, 2013, http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2013/jan/23/holmes-a-problem-solving-approach-to-immigration/#ixzz2JJSdNxe0)

Immigration has many moving parts that need to be fixed. As my colleagues Matt Spalding, Jessica Zuckerman and James Carafano argue in a forthcoming Heritage Foundation report, it cannot be solved in a single “comprehensive” bill. The problems are too varied. We need a pragmatic, problem-solving approach, not some back-room political deal that is likely to make matters worse.¶ We need to gain operational control of our borders. We could build actual fences in places where they work. Where they don’t, virtual barriers could be erected by using unmanned aerial vehicles and cameras and sensors to enhance monitoring and detection. We can also do a better job of working with the Mexicans, through the Border Enforcement Security Task Force and the Merida Initiative, for example.¶ Another piece of the puzzle is law enforcement at home. The use of illegal labor here is a huge draw for illegal immigrants, and discouraging it requires telling American employers that there will be consequences for hiring illegal immigrants. All sorts of tools exist to do this, including Social Security No Match, random workplace inspections, E-Verify and checks of I-9 forms. They should be strengthened.¶ Yet another step is to make immigration responsive to the needs of the economy. America actually needs foreign labor. A temporary worker program could supply a rotating, temporary foreign workforce, depending on the demands of the economy. This not only makes economic sense; it would channel foreign workers into a legal system, discouraging them from taking an illegal route.¶ We should also make legal immigration easier. America needs immigrants; the issue is not how to stop immigration, but rather how to make it legal and responsive to the needs of Americans. The inefficiencies of the bureaucratic system that manages immigration today are a major reason why we have so many illegal immigrants in the first place. It’s why the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services should be reformed.¶ Then there is the thorny issue of what to do about illegal immigrants already living here. Whatever we do, we must not penalize legal immigrants who did the right thing. Not only is the rule of law at stake, but so, too, is basic fairness.¶ The child of a Mexican mother who went through the process legally suffers when another child of a mother who entered illegally receives special treatment. It is simply unfair. Whatever is done, compassion for that child and for the mother who followed the law should not be forgotten.¶ A pragmatic, step-by-step approach is needed to solve the whole problem of immigration. We don’t need a proposal that claims to be “comprehensive” but in reality is merely politics as usual.

**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.