Jackson-Vanik needs to and will be repealed because of agriculture market threats

Sorensen 6-27

By Loretta Sorensen, Midwest Producer. “Vilsack: Repeal Jackson-Vanik amendment or lose trade with Russia.” Posted: Wednesday, June 27, 2012 12:16 pm on Midwest Producer. http://www.midwestproducer.com/news/markets/vilsack-repeal-jackson-vanik-amendment-or-lose-trade-with-russia/article\_dc5cff3e-c07b-11e1-a016-0019bb2963f4.html.

If Congress fails to act before mid-August in repealing the 1974 Jackson-Vanik amendment, American farmers, ranchers and producers could lose a significant opportunity to capture market share for American agriculture products when Russia joins the World Trade Organization (WTO) this fall. In an interview with Midwest Producer, USDA Secretary of Agriculture Tom Vilsack noted that delaying the repeal doesn't make good business sense or common sense. "Every one of our 100 legislators has a 'beef' if you will with Russia," Vilsack said. "It may be in regard to intellectual property, Internet issues, Russia's approach to Syria or any other of a host of issues. They're using this discussion (about Jackson-Vanik) as a vehicle for having all these other discussions which have nothing to do with trade. This is not the time nor the place to inject all these issues that have nothing to do with exports. "We saw a 70 percent increase in U.S. beef sales to Russia in the past 12 months," Vilsack added. "There's obviously a desire and an interest in purchasing American products. If we lose this opportunity, it will be difficult and take time to regain the lost market share." The Jackson-Vanik amendment to the Trade Act of 1974 was implemented to pressure the Soviet Union to allow emigration of Soviet Jews, prisoners of conscience and victims of religious persecution. The legislation required the U.S. to enact annual certification of Russia's full compliance with the Jackson-Vanik amendment. With the collapse of the Soviet Union two decades ago, freedom of emigration became a reality for all citizens. If the amendment remains in place, the U.S. is the only country that will not be able to take full advantage of reduced tariffs, quotas and access to Russian markets once Russia completes the requirements for WTO membership. "Russian membership in the WTO is a good thing for the U.S.," Vilsack said. "Russia gains very little through repeal of the legislation. We gain far better access to Russian markets and a much leveler playing field to compete with other countries that will try to sell ag products to Russia." In December 2011, trade ministers at the 8th Ministerial Conference of the World Trade Organization celebrated conclusion of 18 years of negotiations for Russia to agree to comply with WTO requirements. Russia was then invited to become the 154th WTO member. In the process of approving Permanent Normal Trade Relations (PNTR) with Russia, Congress must pass a short and simple bill that grants Russia PNTR status and repeals Jackson-Vanik. Failure to do so will mean the U.S. will be in violation of WTO rules once Russia becomes a WTO member. Through Russia's WTO membership, Moscow will be required to enact a host of economic reforms that will further open the Russian market to U.S. goods and services and provide a process for addressing any future unfair or unsupported trade barriers that might arise. In an address to the U.S. Senate Committee on Finance on June 21, 2012, Vilsack noted that the USDA strongly supports establishing PNTR with Russia and ensuring that Russia remains one of the U.S. top export markets as it joins WTO. "PNTR is not a favor to Russia," Vilsack said. "It is a significant opportunity for America's farmers, ranchers and producers. It will provide improved, predictable access to Russia's 140 million consumers and an expanding middle class that has grown by more than 50 percent in the last decade." Vilsack explained that the U.S. has been extending market access to Russia since 1992 on an annual basis. U.S. agricultural exports to Russia in fiscal year 2011 were nearly $1.4 billion, contributing significantly to the U.S. agricultural trade surplus. The U.S. imported only $25 million of agricultural products from Russia in 2011. As part of its WTO membership agreement, Russia will reduce tariffs on a number of agricultural products. Soybean tariffs will be at zero. For soybean meal, tariffs will be reduced from 5 percent to 2.5 percent. Maximum bound tariffs on most cheeses will drop from 25 percent to 15 percent within three years. Russia's duties are already relatively low for many fruits and tree nuts, but those rates will be bound and, in many cases, reduced substantially within a few years of accession. Through the Russian WTO membership, U.S. farmers will have more certain and predictable market access, Russia will be obligated to apply its trade regime in a manner consistent with WTO rules, and they will be obligated to follow detailed rules governing transparency in development of trade policies and measures. Compliance with Russia's obligations will be enforceable through use of the WTO dispute settlement process. "I believe Jackson-Vanik will be repealed," Vilsack said. "There is bipartisan support for the repeal. I believe members of Congress realize farmers, ranchers and producers will be at a serious disadvantage if the repeal doesn't happen. We can't cede that much territory to our competitors."

High speed rail unpopular

Freemark ’11 (Yonah – Master of Science in Transportation from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Bachelor of Arts in Architecture, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Yale University with Distinction. Also a freelance journalist who has been published in Planning Magazine; Next American City Magazine; Dissent; The Atlantic Cities; Next American City Online; and The Infrastructurist – He created and continues to write for the website The Transport Politic – The Transport Politic – February 8th, 2011 – http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2011/02/08/the-white-house-stakes-its-political-capital-on-a-massive-intercity-rail-plan/)

The White House Stakes Its Political Capital on a Massive Intercity Rail Plan $53 billion proposed for investments over the next six years. The President wants to “Win the Future,” but will his Republican opponents relax their opposition to rail spending? Vice President Joe Biden spoke in Philadelphia this morning to announce that the Obama Administration intends to request from Congress $8 billion in federal funds for the advancement of a national high-speed rail system as part of a six-year transportation reauthorization bill. The White House’s commitment to fast trains has been evident throughout the Administration’s two-year lifespan, beginning with the addition of $8 billion for the mode in the 2009 stimulus bill and continued with $2.5 billion included in the Fiscal Year 2010 budget. Yet this new funding, which would add up to $53 billion over the six-year period, is remarkable for its ambition. It is clear that President Obama’s 2012 re-election campaign, already being framed in terms of “winning the future,” will hinge partially on whether voters agree with his assessment of the importance of investing in the nation’s rail transport infrastructure. In his speech, Mr. Biden argued that American wealth was founded on “out-building” the competition. Infrastructure, he noted, is the “veins and the arteries of commerce.” The President and his team will be making this case to the American people the next two years, hoping that the public comes to endorse this message of national advancement through construction. Whether the proposal — to be laid out in more detail with next week’s introduction the President’s full proposed FY 2012 budget — has any chance of success is undoubtedly worth questioning. Republicans have campaigned wholeheartedly against rail improvement projects in Iowa, Ohio, and Wisconsin; even Florida’s project, which would require no operating subsidies once in service, hangs in the balance. But as part of the larger transportation reauthorization legislation, which is apparently slated to move forward by this summer, a real expansion in high-speed rail funding seems possible, especially if Mr. Obama pressures the Democratic-controlled Senate to push hard for it.

Political Capital is key to balance the fight within the agenda

Stokes, ’11 [Bruce Stokes January 26, 2011 An Agenda, If You Can Keep It <http://nationaljournal.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/member/daily/an-agenda-if-you-can-keep-it-20110126?mrefid=site_search>]

After years of relative quiescence, Congress actually has a trade agenda in 2011: possible votes on the Korea, Colombia, and Panama trade agreements, and on Russia’s application to join the World Trade Organization. Whether, when, how, and which elements of this agenda will be completed will largely depend on political calculations in the White House and on Capitol Hill. “The first question,” observed William Reinsch, president of the National Foreign Trade Council, “is, how many of these fights does the administration want to have?” At the top of the list will be the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement, which President Obama made his own by arm-wrestling the South Koreans for fixes to benefit the American auto industry. Now, that it has the support of Ford and the United Auto Workers, most observers agree that the deal with South Korea has sufficient votes for passage. And Obama has said he wants Congress to act on it by June. But the business community also wants action on the Colombia and Panama agreements negotiated by the George W. Bush administration. “From our perspective,” said Calman Cohen, president of the Emergency Committee for American Trade, “they are like three children. We want them all to go forward.” Congressional GOP leaders agree. “I strongly believe that we should consider all three agreements in the next six months,” House Ways and Means Committee Chairman Dave Camp, R-Mich., said at a trade hearing this week. Objections to the Panama accord, based on tax and labor issues, seem to pose no major obstacles. Organized labor continues to highlight the murders of union organizers in Colombia and other labor-rights abuses there, but Ways and Means ranking member Sander Levin, D-Mich., a longtime critic of Colombia’s record on these issues, suggested in testimony this week that some accommodation might be possible. “I believe there is now an opportunity for the two governments to work together mutually to achieve real progress on the ground,” he said. Republican leaders in Congress have talked of voting on all three trade deals, possibly one right after the other, to facilitate the legislative calendar and, the administration suspects, to aggravate divisions among Democrats. Parliamentarians, meanwhile, will have to decide if fast-track negotiating authority still applies to the Colombia agreement. Because Congress failed to act on it when it was first submitted, the fast-track authority for the deal expired. This is not a problem in the House, where Republicans control the Rules Committee, but it is in the Senate, where fast-track is needed to facilitate a vote. Business lobbyists think that the Korea deal could move by itself before the August recess but that doing all three together will take considerably more time, contrary to Camp’s ambitions. Members of the business community are less sanguine about legislation blessing Russia’s application to join the WTO, where membership can be held up by any current member. Georgia has yet to give its assent to Russia’s application, which might make the need for U.S. action moot. To give Moscow the green light, Congress would have to accord Russia most-favored-nation trading status, thus granting it the lowest possible U.S. tariffs. That, in turn, requires waiving the Jackson-Vanik amendment to the 1974 trade act, effectively acknowledging that emigration from Russia is no longer a U.S. concern. Although Washington has no complaints about Russian emigration policy, Jackson-Vanik has long been seen as useful leverage over Moscow that many in Congress may be loath to relinquish. Capitol Hill staffers warn that passage of Russian WTO membership will be an uphill fight. Moscow has few champions in Congress, where Senate debate late last year over the New START deal demonstrated deep-seated suspicion among conservatives. Russia’s piracy of intellectual property and its past use of health and safety standards to bar the importation of U.S. poultry have also soured business interests. Buyers’ remorse over China’s admission to the WTO fuels congressional reluctance to make the same mistake twice. And Moscow’s past history of quixotic actions—cutting off gas to Ukraine, for example—makes advocates of WTO membership wary of going out on a limb only to have Moscow cut it off. Moscow is anxious to join the WTO, however, and membership is a key element in the administration’s “reset” of U.S.-Russia relations. Moreover, a Russia that is subject to international rules and dispute settlement might be better than a Russia operating outside the law. Ever since the financial crisis began in 2008, Russia has been one of the most frequent instigators of protectionist trade practices. WTO membership could help discipline such behavior. Veterans of past trade battles on Capitol Hill advise that the administration might have to give Congress something to vote for—some new oversight or restraint—to ease the pain of voting to waive Jackson-Vanik. When China was granted admission to the WTO, for example, Congress created a commission to report on Beijing’s human-rights record. After two years of relegating divisive trade issues to the back burner, in 2011 the administration now has a legislative trade agenda. The question is how much political capital it is willing to invest to get it through Congress. The White House can anticipate hand-to-hand combat in budget negotiations with Republicans over discretionary spending. Such conflict will unavoidably preoccupy administration strategists, who may want to husband their resources for more electorally attractive issues. Congress could accomplish a fair amount on trade this year, but doing so could be an uphill slog.

Repeal is key to Relations

Gvosdev, 2-19-12 [Nikolas K., former editor of the National Interest, and a frequent foreign policy commentator in both the print and broadcast media. He is currently on the faculty of the U.S. Naval War College, <http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/11441/the-realist-prism-resetting-the-u-s-russia-reset>]

The third is whether some of the new foundations in the U.S.-Russia relationship have solidified to the point that they can help weather the current storms. In contrast to the situation in 2008, there are now some important institutional connections in place. The Northern Distribution Network could represent enough ballast -- both in terms of the income generated for Russia and the safe route it offers the U.S. and NATO for the war effort in Afghanistan and for egress once the drawdown begins in the coming year -- to help prevent the relationship from veering out of control. The partnership between Exxon and Rosneft to develop both the Russian Arctic and additional projects in North America creates another set of incentives to keep ties on a level basis, as does the immense potential of a fully realized partnership between Russian and American firms in the nuclear power industry. American car manufacturers have found Russia to be a booming export market, while the U.S. space program is now dependent on Russia to ferry astronauts and cargo to maintain America’s manned presence in space. In short, there are a growing number of interests that depend on the preservation of healthy U.S.-Russia relations for their own success. But it is not yet clear whether they have sufficient clout to outweigh the naysayers on both sides. An upcoming decision-point could offer a good indication of what to expect. The World Trade Organization is expected to ratify Russia’s accession later this spring. However, American firms will not be able to take advantage of Russia's WTO membership as long as U.S. trade with Russia is still subject to the Cold War-era Jackson-Vanik amendment. Congress would first have to agree to "graduate" Russia from the terms of the legislation, but many members remain hesitant. An unofficial swap would see Russia given permanent normal trading relations status, but with new legislation applying "smart sanctions" against specific Russian individuals and entities accused of condoning human rights abuses, most notably in the death of Russian lawyer Sergei Magnitsky. Whether this Solomonic compromise could work, however, remains to be seen. The Russian government has already responded very negatively to sanctions unilaterally imposed by the State Department and may be quite unwilling to accept such a compromise, even if it means graduating Russia from Jackson-Vanik. At the same time, there remains resistance within Congress to "giving up" one of its last remaining tools to pressure Russia on a whole range of issues, from chicken imports to religious freedom. The fate of the Jackson-Vanik amendment, therefore, is the canary in the coal mine for U.S.-Russia relations. If a successful repeal is negotiated, it bodes well for regenerating the relationship. However, if Obama, like George W. Bush before him, is unable to secure Russia’s graduation, this could end up being a fatal blow to the whole idea of the reset.

US-Russia relations solve nuclear war and every major impact

Allison & Blackwill, ’11 [Graham, director of the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard’s Kennedy School, former assistant secretary of defense in the Clinton administration, Robert D., Henry A. Kissinger senior fellow for U.S. foreign policy -- Council on Foreign Relations, served as U.S. ambassador to India and as deputy national security adviser for strategic planning in the Bush administration, both co-chairmen of the Task Force on Russia and U.S. National Interests, co-sponsored by the Belfer Center and the Center for the National Interest, 10-30-11 Politico, “10 reasons why Russia still matters,” <http://dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=161EF282-72F9-4D48-8B9C-C5B3396CA0E6>]

That central point is that Russia matters a great deal to a U.S. government seeking to defend and advance its national interests. Prime Minister Vladimir Putin's decision to return next year as president makes it all the more critical for Washington to manage its relationship with Russia through coherent, realistic policies. No one denies that Russia is a dangerous, difficult, often disappointing state to do business with. We should not overlook its many human rights and legal failures. Nonetheless, Russia is a player whose choices affect our vital interests in nuclear security and energy. It is key to supplying 100,000 U.S. troops fighting in Afghanistan and preventing Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. Ten realities require U.S. policymakers to advance our nation's interests by engaging and working with Moscow. First, Russia remains the only nation that can erase the United States from the map in 30 minutes. As every president since John F. Kennedy has recognized, Russia's cooperation is critical to averting nuclear war. Second, Russia is our most consequential partner in preventing nuclear terrorism. Through a combination of more than $11 billion in U.S. aid, provided through the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction program, and impressive Russian professionalism, two decades after the collapse of the “evil empire,” not one nuclear weapon has been found loose. Third, Russia plays an essential role in preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons and missile-delivery systems. As Washington seeks to stop Iran's drive toward nuclear weapons, Russian choices to sell or withhold sensitive technologies are the difference between failure and the possibility of success. Fourth, Russian support in sharing intelligence and cooperating in operations remains essential to the U.S. war to destroy Al Qaeda and combat other transnational terrorist groups. Fifth, Russia provides a vital supply line to 100,000 U.S. troops fighting in Afghanistan. As U.S. relations with Pakistan have deteriorated, the Russian lifeline has grown ever more important and now accounts for half all daily deliveries. Sixth, Russia is the world’s largest oil producer and second largest gas producer. Over the past decade, Russia has added more oil and gas exports to world energy markets than any other nation. Most major energy transport routes from Eurasia start in Russia or cross its nine time zones. As citizens of a country that imports two of every three of the 20 million barrels of oil that fuel U.S. cars daily, Americans feel Russia’s impact at our gas pumps. Seventh, Moscow is an important player in today’s international system. It is no accident that Russia is one of the five veto-wielding, permanent members of the U.N. Security Council, as well as a member of the G-8 and G-20. A Moscow more closely aligned with U.S. goals would be significant in the balance of power to shape an environment in which China can emerge as a global power without overturning the existing order. Eighth, Russia is the largest country on Earth by land area, abutting China on the East, Poland in the West and the United States across the Arctic. This territory provides transit corridors for supplies to global markets whose stability is vital to the U.S. economy. Ninth, Russia’s brainpower is reflected in the fact that it has won more Nobel Prizes for science than all of Asia, places first in most math competitions and dominates the world chess masters list. The only way U.S. astronauts can now travel to and from the International Space Station is to hitch a ride on Russian rockets. The co-founder of the most advanced digital company in the world, Google, is Russian-born Sergei Brin. Tenth, Russia’s potential as a spoiler is difficult to exaggerate. Consider what a Russian president intent on frustrating U.S. international objectives could do — from stopping the supply flow to Afghanistan to selling S-300 air defense missiles to Tehran to joining China in preventing U.N. Security Council resolutions. So next time you hear a policymaker dismissing Russia with rhetoric about “who cares?” ask them to identify nations that matter more to U.S. success, or failure, in advancing our national interests.

Text: The 50 states should invest in high speed railroad transportation.

Giving authority to the states would maximize solvency – best way to fund and manage

Edwards 11

(Chris, director of tax policy studies at the Cato Institute, November 16, 2011, “Federal Infrastructure Investment,” http://www.cato.org/publications/congressional-testimony/federal-infrastructure-investment)

The U.S. economy needs infrastructure, but state and local governments and the private sector are generally the best places to fund and manage it. The states should be the "laboratories of democracy" for infrastructure, and they should be able to innovate freely with new ways of financing and managing their roads, bridges, airports, seaports, and other facilities. It is true that — like the federal government — the states can make infrastructure mistakes. But at least state-level mistakes aren't automatically repeated across the country. If we ended federal involvement in high-speed rail, for example, California could continue to move ahead with its own system. Other states could wait and see how California's system was performing before putting their own taxpayers on the hook.

**AT: Economy**

1. Alt causes - debt

Snyder 11(Michael Snyder is the founder and editor of The Economic Collapse November 5, 2011, U.S. Economy: $15 Trillion In Debt, 45 Million on Food Stamps, Zero Solutions In Sight) <http://www.econmatters.com/2011/11/us-economy-15-trillion-in-debt-45.html>

How does a country end up 15 trillion dollars in debt? 30 years ago, we were just a little over a trillion dollars in debt. How in the world do supposedly rational people living in "the greatest nation on earth" allow themselves to commit national financial suicide by allowing government debt to explode like that? It almost seems like there should be some sort of official ceremony in Washington D.C. to commemorate this achievement. It really takes something special to be able to roll up 15 trillion dollars of debt. To get to this level, we really had to indulge in some wild spending.

For example, did you know that the U.S. national debt grows by more than 2 million dollars every single minute? All of this debt has fueled an unprecedented boom of prosperity for the last 30 years, but now that prosperity is drying up. Today, there are over 45 million Americans that are on food stamps. America is being deindustrialized at a blinding pace and there are not nearly enough jobs for everyone. Poverty is exploding all over the nation, and millions of families have lost their homes to foreclosure. Unfortunately, there are zero solutions on the horizon. The leaders of both major political parties seem even more clueless right now than in past years. We really could use some hope, but hope is in very short supply.

When evaluating the health of America's economy, it is important not to look at the short-term numbers. Rather, the key is to look at the long-term trends and the balance sheet numbers.

For example, if a mother and a father gave their teenage kids a bunch of credit cards and told them to go out and buy whatever they wanted, that would create a lot of "economic activity", but it would also send that family to the poorhouse really quickly.

Well, we have basically done the same thing as a nation. We are drowning in debt, and all of this debt is going to destroy us financially. Unfortunately, the federal government continues to spend money as if there was no tomorrow. Right now, spending by the federal government accounts for about 24 percent of GDP. Back in 2001, it accounted for just 18 percent.

When you are running up a credit card, it can be a lot of fun and it can seem like there aren't any consequences.

But when it comes to debt, there are always consequences. The following is what former Republican Senator Alan Simpson (of the Simpson-Bowles Commission) recently had to say about the horrific debt crisis we are currently facing....

"It's very simple. If you spend more than you earn, you lose your butt"

2. Competitiveness doesn’t increase growth

DeMartino 2K [Prof International Studies, Denver (George, Global Economy, Global Justice, p 176]

The neoclassical view of competitiveness can be summarized simply and elucidated quickly. Neoclassicals argue unequivocally that the competitiveness of a nation’s firms simply does not matter for national prosperity. National prosperity is tied most immediately to a nation’s own productivity. A nation’s stagnating income can therefore be traced to stagnation in its own productivity growth – not to decreasing competitiveness vis- à-vis other nations.

The neoclassical vision breaks with the competitiveness-enhancing perspective by focusing on absolute rather than relative productivity gains. Neoclassicals claim that a nation is far better off when its own productivity rate is high, but lower than that of its competitors (Krugman 1994a; McCloskey 1993). This conclusion follows directly from the neoclassical view of distribution in a free market economy. As we have seen, the reward that flows to a provider of a factor of production equals the marginal contribution of that factor. Rising income reflects rising productivity, not increased competitiveness of domestic firms.

3. Even if they solve congestion, it’s only in a few large cities; the railways wouldn’t connect smaller-mid sized cities that are also a source of economic growth.

4. No one policy can solve for competitiveness

Porter ‘5 [Michael, “What Is Competitiveness?”, January-April, http://insight.iese.edu/doc.aspx?id=00438&ar=7&idioma=2]

Competitiveness is defined by the productivity with which a nation utilizes its human, capital and natural resources. To understand competitiveness, the starting point must be a nation's underlying sources of prosperity. A country's standard of living is determined by the productivity of its economy, which is measured by the value of goods and services produced per unit of its resources. Productivity depends both o­n the value of a nation's products and services - measured by the prices they can command in open markets - and by the efficiency with which they can be produced. Productivity is also dependent o­n the ability of an economy to mobilize its available human resources.

True competitiveness, then, is measured by productivity. Productivity allows a nation to support high wages, attractive returns to capital, a strong currency - and with them, a high standard of living. What matters most is not exports per se or whether firms are domestic or foreign-owned, but the nature and productivity of the business activities taking place in a particular country. Purely local industries also count for competitiveness, because their productivity not o­nly sets their wages but also has a major influence o­n the cost of doing business and the cost of living in the country.

What Matters for Competitiveness

Almost everything matters for competitiveness. The schools matter, the roads matter, the financial markets matter and customer sophistication matters. These and other aspects of a nation's circumstances are deeply rooted in a nation's institutions, people and culture. This makes improving competitiveness a special challenge, because there is no single policy or grand step that can create competitiveness, o­nly many improvements in individual areas that inevitably take time to accomplish. Improving competitiveness is a marathon, not a sprint. How to sustain momentum in improving competitiveness over time is among the greatest challenges facing countries.

5. The jobs from the plan are only short term – as soon as construction is done, economic growth will halt again.

6. Alt cause - The U.S. is losing competitiveness due to decline in education.

Baily and Slaughter ‘8­

Martin N. Baily and Matthew J. Slaughter of the Private Equity Council “Strengthening U.S. Competitiveness in the Global Economy” http://www.pegcc.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/pec\_wp\_strengthening\_120908a.pdf December 2008

We in the United States do some other things not so well, things that we must start: improving to avoid major drags to competitiveness. Our report addresses three pressing areas needing improvement. 1. Worker Skills. Over the 20th century one of America’s greatest achievements was creating a worldclass education system that drove the skills upgrading of the U.S. labor force. This progress, however, has slowed dramatically in the past generation, all while educational upgrading is quickening abroad. America should immediately implement policies to reverse its educational slowdown. The key margins need to be high school and college graduation rates, through expanded early-education efforts and financial aid. Throughout our history, skills of the U.S. workforce have also expanded through immigration of highly educated workers. Such immigration often helps, not hurts, native workers as companies expand skill-intensive operations here at home. An important policy change should be to eliminate all caps on high-skilled immigration, as a complement to the educational efforts above. At the same time, to support the skills and opportunities of American workers, safety-net policies should be strengthened and expanded to assist workers who have been dislocated by economic change and who have not enjoyed economic gains commensurate with productivity growth.

7. Their impacts are empirically denied – the 07 recession and the triple A credit downgrade should have cause their impacts

**AT: Warming**

1. Warming is not caused by emission- data from satellites prove

Singer and Avery 08

(S. Fred Singer is a professor of environmental science at the University at Virginia and was involved in the development of earth observation satellites, a chief scientist for the Department of Transportation and founder of the Science and Environmental Policy Project; Dennis Avery is the director for Global Food Issues at the Hudson Institute, *Unstoppable Global Warming*, 2008, Rowman and Littlefield Publishers Inc., pg. 141)

The satellites’ moderate warming trend is mirrored by independent readings from instruments carried aloft by high-altitude weather balloons that began to get near-global coverage in the late 1950s. Both satellites and balloons fail to validate the large man-made warming trend in the lower atmosphere predicted by GCMS. Satellites and weather balloons are giving us the most accurate temperature measurements we have had in all history, and they provide evidence that the Earth’s atmosphere has not warmed strongly in a sixty-year period during which greenhouse gas emissions hugely outstripped previous human “pollution.” About 80 percent of the carbon dioxide from human activities entered the air from after 1940. That means the warming before 1940 must be largely natural so the human effects cannot reasonably be considered greater than about 0.1 C per decade- the maximum amount of the warming trend seen since the late 1970s.

2. They can’t solve for warming – countries like Russia and China will continue to emit greenhouse gases.

3. The fear of Global warming is an obsession- It is not real

Spencer’8

[Roy W, Ph.D. in meteorology at the University of Wisconsin-Madison in 1981, Climatologist and a Principal Research Scientist for the University of Alabama in Huntsville, former Senior Scientist for Climate Studies at NASA’s Marshall Space Flight Center, where he and Dr. John Christy received NASA’s Exceptional Scientific Achievement Medal for their global temperature monitoring work with satellites, “Climate Confusion”, pg. 2]

But now, the western world’s fear of global warming and its effects has reached the point of being an obsession. The media is more than willing to spread, and even amplify, the fear that humanity is filling up the Earth, pushing it beyond its ability to sustain us. Nature is suffering as a result of our sins, and humans are now being increasingly blamed for every hurricane, tornado, tsunami, earthquake, flood, and drought that occurs. Art Bell’s popular book *The Coming Global Superstorm* and its movie spin0off, *The Day After Tomorrow,* are good examples of the public’s fascination with fears of global climate catastrophes. I would say that the coming global superstorm has already arrived- but it is a storm of hype and hysteria. I believe that the environmental fears that have consumed the western world stem from two central beliefs. The first is that the Earth is fragile and needs to be protected, even to the detriment of humans is necessary. Many people feel like the climate system is being pushed beyond its limits, past some imaginary tipping point from which there will be no return. The second belief is that the increasing wealth of nations is bad for the environment. Since technology and our desire for more stuff are to blame for environmental problems, we should renounce our modern lifestyle.

4. No modeling – their evidence says that countries like China and Japan already have high speed rails yet they are still the top emitters of CO2

5. Turn – constructing HSR causes more emissions

LA Times 6/11

(Los Angeles Times (MCT), “Environmental objections line path of California’s bullet train”, June 11, 2012, http://www.joplinglobe.com/national/x1318682835/Environmental-objections-line-path-of-California-s-bullet-train)

LOS ANGELES — The California bullet train is promoted as an important environmental investment for the future, but over the next decade the heavy construction project would potentially harm air quality, aquatic life and endangered species across the state’s Central Valley. Eleven endangered species, including the San Joaquin kit fox, would be affected, according to federal biologists. Massive emissions from diesel-powered heavy equipment could foul the already filthy air. Dozens of rivers, canals and wetlands fed from the rugged peaks of the Sierra Nevada would be crossed, creating other knotty issues. A wide array of state and federal agencies is examining those effects and, over the next several months, will issue scientific findings that could affect the cost and schedule of construction. Beyond the regulators, environmental lawsuits brought by the powerful California agriculture industry are threatening to further delay work.

6. They don’t get enough cars of the road to solve for warming – their evidence indicates that at best it would be a 30%, not near enough to get rid of warming.

7. Warming is key to prevent an ice age & extinction

Hoyle and Wickramashinge ‘1

Fred and Chandra, School of Mathematics @ Cardiff U., Astrophysics and Space Science, “Cometary Impacts and Ice-Ages”, Vol. 275, No. 4, March, Springer

The 18O/16O analysis of Greenland ice cores shows that an immense melting of glacier ice began about 13,000 years ago and was essentially completed within a millenium. But this information is slow-moving in time, although it possesses the great merit of being of world-wide significance. On a more restricted geographical scale, fossil insect records show that the summer temperature in Britain rose by 10oC or more in as little as 50 years, an essentially decisive indication of a catastrophic event as its cause. The fossil insect record also shows that a second catastrophic event of a similar nature occurred 10,000 years ago, again with a major temperature rise in only a few decades. It is therefore cometary impacts that we must thank for the equable spell of climate in which human history and civilisation has prospered so spectacularly. The renewal of ice-age conditions would render a large fraction of the world's major food-growing areas inoperable, and so would inevitably lead to the extinction of most of the present human population. Since bolide impacts cannot be called up to order, we must look to a sustained greenhouse effect to maintain the present advantageous world climate. This implies the ability to inject effective greenhouse gases into the atmosphere, the opposite of what environmentalists are erroneously advocating. 5. Conclusions Ice-age conditions are dry and cold, the local temperature being reduced over the entire Earth. The high atmosphere probably had a haze of small ice crystals while the lower atmosphere was dusty. Such conditions were stable, capable of persisting until a large bolide hit one of the major oceans. The water then thrown high into the stratosphere provided a large temporary greenhouse effect, but sufficient to produce a warming of the world ocean down to a depth of a few hundred metres. It is this warming that maintains the resulting interglacial period. The interglacial climate possesses only neutral equilibrium however. It experiences random walk both up and down, until a situation arises in which the number of steps downward become sufficient for the Earth to fall back into the ice-age trap. Thereafter only a further large bolide impact can produce a departure from the grey, drab iceage conditions. This will be so in the future unless Man finds an effective way to maintain a suitably large greenhouse effect.

8. Their warming impacts are slow – tickell says a 4 degree Celsius increase would cause the impacts. That would take thousands of years.