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\*\*Uniqueness\*\*

UQ – No Economic Recovery Now

**Econ reform impossible, Obama captured by interests of Wall Street, deficit hawks, congress, and advisers will wait til econ recovers**

**Froomkin 2010**

Dan, Huffington Post Online, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/01/23/7-things-about-the-econom\_n\_433688.html

**Obama, however, captured as he is by the** [**Wall Streeters and deficit hawks on his economics team**](http://blog.niemanwatchdog.org/?p=1401)**, doesn't seem inclined** in that direction -- **nor, of course, does our utterly dysfunctional Congress. Obama and his advisers don't seem to feel the need for a new approach to growth, or to explain where they think it will come from. Their posture is simply to hang tough until it returns.**

**Banks haven't recovered as much as claimed, risking collapse**

**Froomkin 2010**

Dan, Huffington Post Online, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/01/23/7-things-about-the-econom\_n\_433688.html

**But the current economic situation is more fragile that some would have it. One particular danger is that because of bogus accounting rules, banks aren't properly recognizing their losses -- and are in fact largely insolvent.**

UQ – No Economic Recovery Now

The economy is low GDP rate drop and easing consumer spending

Bloomberg 7/30

(Shobhana Chandra, 7/30/10, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2010-07-30/recession-in-america-was-even-worse-than-estimated-revisions-to-data-show.html)BHB

Guy Lebas, chief fixed-income strategist at Janney Montgomery Scott LLC, discusses the U.S. second-quarter gross domestic product figures released by the Commerce Department today and the outlook for the economy. Growth in the U.S. slowed to a 2.4 percent annual rate in the second quarter, less than forecast, reflecting a larger trade deficit and an easing in consumer spending. Lebas speaks with Carol Massar on Bloomberg Television’s “In the Loop With Betty Liu.” (Source: Bloomberg) The worst U.S. recession since the 1930s was even deeper than previously estimated, reflecting bigger slumps in consumer spending and housing, according to revised figures. The world’s largest economy shrank 4.1 percent from the fourth quarter of 2007 to the second quarter of 2009, compared with the 3.7 percent drop previously on the books, the Commerce Department said today in Washington. Household spending fell 1.2 percent in 2009, twice as much as previously projected and the biggest decline since 1942. “We do tend to get bigger revisions at turning points in the economy,” Steven Landefeld, director of the Commerce Department’s Bureau of Economic Analysis, said in a press conference this week. On the more positive side, “in the past, we’ve tended to undershoot the recovery” as well, he said. The data better explain why the jobless rate doubled, reaching a 26-year high of 10.1 percent in October, and has been slow to subside. The government also boosted personal income levels for each of the past three years, propelling the savings rate higher and signaling households are further along the process of repairing finances. The rebound from the recession has been more subdued in the last six months of 2009, as the economy grew at an average 3.3 annual pace from July 2009 through December, instead of the 3.9 percent previously projected. By comparison, growth averaged 7.2 percent in the two quarters following the 1981-82 recession, during which the economy contracted just 2.9 percent.

UQ – No Economic Recovery Now

Economy low – low labor market means risky trends

Bloomberg 7/27

(Alex Kowalski, Tom Keene, 7/27/10, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2010-07-27/-noisy-economic-data-indicate-uncertain-outlook-for-growth-el-erian-says.html)BHB

 “Noisy” economic reports underscore the “unusually uncertain” outlook cited by Federal Reserve Chairman Ben S. Bernanke, according to Pacific Investment Management Co.’s Mohamed El-Erian. Corporate earnings are backward-looking, and the key economic issue is the U.S. labor market, El-Erian, Pimco’s chief executive and co-chief investment officer, said in a radio interview today with Tom Keene on Bloomberg Surveillance. “The minute someone puts out a green light, and earnings constituted a green light, you’ll see people rushing back into risk markets,” El-Erian said. “The indicators that we look at suggest that the economy continues to lose momentum. The key is going to be ultimately is the economy creating enough jobs to make people comfortable, to allow companies to invest?”

UQ – No Economic Recovery Now

The economy is low key indicators point to deflation

Montreal Gazette 7/30

(Paul Vieira, 7/30/10, http://www.montrealgazette.com/business/Stark+warning/3338804/story.html)BHB

A top U.S. Federal Reserve official warned Thursday the U.S. economy is close to sliding toward Japanese-style deflation, and the current policy of keeping interest rates at near-zero for an extended period might exacerbate matters. James Bullard, president of the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, said in a policy paper the best way to avoid such a dangerous outcome is for the U.S. central bank, despite its already bloated balance sheet, to buy up U.S. Treasury bonds. “The U.S. is closer to a Japanese-style outcome today than at any time in recent history,” Mr. Bullard said. The promise to keep the key policy interest at near-zero for an extended period, as the U.S. Federal Reserve has been wont to do, is a “double-edged sword,” he said, because it could reinforce expectations that inflation will fall further. “A better policy response to a negative shock,” he said, “is to expand the quantitative easing program through the purchase of Treasury securities.” Analysts say Mr. Bullard’s comments mark a sea change as up until now Fed officials in Washington, from chairman Ben Bernanke onward, have largely avoided talking about deflation and Japan, instead referring to downside risks to the economy. “This is the first time I have seen a regional Fed bank president discuss deflationary risks to this extent, and to come right out with a comparison to the Japanese experience. This is truly remarkable,” said David Rosenberg, chief economist and strategist at Gluskin Sheff + Associates. “This is not an exercise in mincing words.” Eric Green, New York-based chief U.S. strategist with TD Securities, said Mr. Bullard’s message reinforces a view that the Fed is closer to providing further stimulus to the economy. This is something Mr. Bernanke said last week was an option should it be required, although suggesting the Fed hadn’t given it much thought. “The Fed had thought more about tightening than it has about more easing. That is beginning to change,” Mr. Green said. “The Fed has a right to be concerned about how things are developing.” Economic data from the United States have come in weaker-than-expected, showing a decline in home sales, a slump in consumer confidence, and weaker manufacturing. Further, job growth has not taken off as expected — payrolls shrank in June. The fear is the U.S. economy could face another downturn, and the federal government would have little room to spend more on infrastructure or cut taxes, as voters are already worried about the country’s sky-high debt levels. This raises the spectre of deflation, or falling prices, much like Japan. Consumer prices in the United States have been falling, with core inflation, which excludes volatile-priced items, recently hitting its lowest level since 1966.

UQ – No Economic Recovery Now

Economy low – investor confidence has dropped

San Jose Mercury News 7/28

(Scott Duke Harris, 7/28/10, http://www.mercurynews.com/business-headlines/ci\_15623653)BHB

Uh-oh. Just when it seemed Silicon Valley's recovering economy might start humming like a Tesla powertrain, along comes a new survey suggesting that venture capitalists are frowning again. The last time that happened, things soon went from bad to worse. The Silicon Valley Venture Capitalist Confidence Index, a quarterly report that has tracked VC moods since 2004, showed a marked decline in the second quarter, to 3.28 from 3.65 on a scale in which 5 indicated high confidence and 1 indicated low confidence. That reversed five consecutive quarters of gradual improvement since the financial industry meltdown created fears of global depression. "It was a bit of a surprise," said Mark Cannice, a professor of entrepreneurship and innovation at the University of San Francisco who conceived and conducts the survey. A bit? Just two weeks ago, the National Venture Capital Association delivered its most upbeat quarterly report on new fundings since the already-shaken, shrinking industry was rocked by the financial crisis of 2008. And business was especially strong in the Bay Area, where startups gathered up more than $2.9 billion during the quarter, nearly doubling the amount from the previous quarter and accounting for 44 percent of the national total. And VCs, Cannice noted, had to be pleased that Wall Street had hosted some new initial public stock offerings during the quarter, headlined by Tesla Motors. A healthy IPO Advertisementmarket is critical to the venture industry because it typically delivers the biggest return on the investments — a rising tide that also lifts the values of mergers and acquisitions, the other source for venture returns. But Tesla's debut may be an exception. Solyndra's withdrawn IPO application may be more symptomatic of the dicey economy. While VCs were busy making investments in the second quarter, Cannice said, the 32 VCs he surveyed were also growing more concerned about the IPO market, possible federal regulatory changes and a stubbornly "sketchy" macroeconomy. Several VCs put their dour outlook into words for Cannice. "The world and U.S. recovery are still very fragile, and concerns are growing about Europe and China dragging the U.S. back into recession," said Graham Burnette of Red Planet Capital. "Collective fear of sluggish growth in the overall economy will drive down investors' perceived need to deploy capital. Why invest now if it's going to be cheaper in the future?" said Dag Syrrist of Vision Capital. "It's troublesome how long-term investments are now almost completely driven by short- to medium-term market worries." Cannice's VC index may not have a long track record, but it's notable that its steepest decline was recorded in the first quarter of 2008 — the quarter immediately following the onset of the recession. As the market for IPOs, fairly strong the previous year, all but froze over, the VC mood continued to plummet with the collapse of Bear Stearns and later Lehman Brothers, before bottoming out in the fourth quarter of 2008 while fears gathered that the economy could tumble into a depression. And now, as some economists warn of a double-dip recession, we have the specter of a double dip in VC confidence.

UQ – No Economic Recovery Now

Double dip is coming – stimulus has run its course

Washington Post 7/28

(Neil Irwin, 7/28/10, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/07/28/AR2010072806049.html?hpid=topnews) BHB

The U.S. economy is out of the ditch. But is there enough gas left in the engine to reach highway speed? The recovery faces a crucial test over the next couple of months: Either it will pick up vital momentum from increased consumer spending and investment or stall out, dipping into a period of anemic growth -- or perhaps even another recession. Forecasters knew this inflection point would arrive, a moment when consumers and businesses must take over for government stimulus spending and the rebuilding of inventories. On Friday, the government will offer crucial evidence when it reports on second-quarter economic growth. This will be the first in a series of indicators in the coming weeks that could help answer whether the economy has achieved cruising speed, in particular whether the private sector is growing fast enough to put unemployed Americans back to work. Forecasters are expecting that gross domestic product rose at a rate of 2 to 2.5 percent rate in the April-through-June quarter, which would be too slow to drive down the jobless rate. Just Wednesday, the government announced a surprising 1 percent drop in June orders for durable goods and a compilation of anecdotal reports from around the country by the Federal Reserve showed a recovery that is increasingly uneven. This fit into the pattern of recent economic indicators showing that the transition to a self-sustaining recovery has been rocky. Fits and starts are common during early stages of economic expansion. Before long, it should be clear whether the summer of 2010 has indeed been a mere soft patch as recovery took hold. "We're right on the cusp between simply decelerating and actually falling into a double dip," said Robert A. Johnson, executive director of the Institute for New Economic Thinking. "We have households still trying to be cautious and improve their savings, and if they cut back further, it will create a feedback loop that drives us back down." It was barely a year ago that the economy made the transition from steep contraction toward expansion. Simultaneously, a gush of federal stimulus money started spreading through the economy. Government backstops for the financial system helped instill confidence that the system wouldn't collapse. An aggressive series of interest rate cuts and other actions by the Federal Reserve took effect. All those factors helped ease the fear of economic collapse that earlier weighed on businesses considering investment decisions and consumers thinking of purchases. Now, though the impact of the fiscal stimulus continues to be felt, it is tapering off, no longer adding to growth. At the same time, a one-time boost to growth from business inventories is also ending. During the depths of the recession, companies reduced their production even more than consumers pulled back, depleting their inventories. The need to replenish those inventories contributed to growth in late 2009 and early 2010. Economists and policymakers have been counting on the inventory bounce and stimulus priming the pump, helping create a self-sustaining momentum. Those temporary factors, goes the logic, should make consumers more confident about making major purchases, which in turn increases demand for products, leading businesses to ramp up production and hire more employees. That should result in higher incomes and even more consumer confidence, fueling a virtuous cycle. But that cycle could sputter if Americans, groaning under the weight of household debt run up during the past decade, decide they would rather pay it down instead of increasing their spending. Americans remain deeply uncertain about the economic future. A Conference Board survey showed they are actually less confident about the economy now than they were last August, when the expansion had just begun.

UQ – No Economic Recovery Now

**The recovery is based upon government spending, which won't last, killing the recovery**

**Froomkin 2010**

Dan, Huffington Post Online, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/01/23/7-things-about-the-econom\_n\_433688.html

**Even assuming that we are at the beginning of an enduring recovery, there are many signs that it will be a slow one, and that it could be as long as a decade** until most American families return to the standard of living they enjoyed before the crash. Most notably, **unemployment is widely expected to be astronomically high for at least another year or two** -- remaining around 10 percent through 2010. **the recovery, such as it is, has been largely fueled by government money --** not just the stimulus, but also the bailouts, targeted programs such as the homebuyers tax credit and "cash for clunkers," and emergency spending on such things as extended unemployment insurance. **What happens, however, when those stop? And none are designed to go on forever.** Washington Post financial columnist [Steven Pearlstein](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/01/05/AR2010010503809.html?nav=rss_opinion/columns) recently put it this way:

UQ – Economic Recovery is an Illusion

**When the stimulus ends and inventories are corrected, recovery will regress**

**Froomkin 2010**

Dan, Huffington Post Online, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/01/23/7-things-about-the-econom\_n\_433688.html

My best guess is that **the current upswings in economic output, confidence and financial asset prices are largely a reflection of the extraordinary fiscal and monetary juice provided by Treasury and the Federal Reserve,** along with the natural rebound that occurs after a collapse in consumer and business spending like that which occurred in the first half of 2009**. The surprising strength of the bounce-back testifies to the wisdom of the underlying strengths of the U.S. economy and the success of the policies, but is likely to peter out as the stimulus begins to wear off and the inventory correction is completed.**

**No solid foundation for economic recovery**

**Froomkin 2010**

Dan, Huffington Post Online, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/01/23/7-things-about-the-econom\_n\_433688.html

**The giddiness over the recovering stock market makes it easy to overlook some key questions about its rise. But what exactly *has* sent the Dow up almost 70 percent since March? Could it be another bubble? And could it burst?**Was it a function of the extraordinary liquidity pumped into the system, first through the bailouts and now through nearly zero-interest loans to the banks? Was it foreign investors attracted by weak dollar and low interest rates? Where's all the money coming from? **No one seems to know. (Does anyone really care?) But whatever it was could presumably come to an end, devestating the market and the economy.**

UQ – Economic Recovery Now

The economy is high now – the auto industry is making record profits

Voice of America 7/30

(Dan Robinson, 7/30/10, http://www1.voanews.com/english/news/Obama-Tours-Auto-Plants-to-Spotlight-Industry-Recovery-99654889.html)BHB

President Barack Obama visited two automobile manufacturing plants near Detroit, Michigan, to spotlight progress made in helping the U.S. auto industry recover from near collapse. From the brink of collapse, when President Obama took office and forced the government to step in to support General Motors and Chrysler, the auto industry has made steady progress. The administration points to statistics showing that after huge job losses linked to the U.S. financial crisis, auto industry job growth is on track to be the strongest in more than a decade, adding 55,000 jobs since the middle of 2009. The president was welcomed to the Chrysler Jefferson North Assembly Plant, where the car company employs just over 2,800 workers.

The economy is high know the housing market has returned

Rosnick 7/30

(David Rosnick – Center for Economic and Policy Research, 7/30/10, http://yubanet.com/usa/GDP-Rises-2-4-Percent-in-Q2.php)BHB

 Gross Domestic Product grew at a 2.4 percent annualized rate in the second quarter of 2010. Final demand from domestic sources contributed 4.12 percentage points to GDP - the largest quarterly contribution to growth since 2003. The largest contributor to final domestic demand came in fixed investment, which grew at a 19.1 percent annualized rate since the first quarter. Outside of nonresidential structures, the growth in investment was broadly-based. Equipment and software grew at a 21.9 percent annualized rate - the third straight quarter of double-digit growth in that category of investment - adding 1.36 percentage points to GDP growth. Residential investment contributed a little more than one quarter of the growth in fixed investment. This increase is likely driven by a surge in home sales as households raced to claim expiring tax credits. The fees on sales of existing homes are included in this spending category, so the 27.9 percent annualized growth in residential investment is surely masking much weaker construction activity. This is not the first time since the collapse of the housing bubble that home construction has contributed to GDP growth. In the advance estimates of GDP for the third quarter of 2009, residential investment was reported as growing 23.4 percent - only to be revised down to a more modest 10.6 percent and resuming its fall over the next two quarters. It would be surprising if such growth could be sustained for long, given the recent deflation in the price of housing.

UQ – Economic Recovery Now

Employment and productivity are increasing now, jump-starting the recovery

Kileson 10

(Kevin; Econ Researcher Fed Reserve St Louis; April 10; http://www.stlouisfed.org/publications/re/articles/?id=1943&pv=1&utm\_source=Research%2Bemail&utm\_medium=email&utm\_campaign=Research%2BRE%20email) BHB

Economists have been closely watching the contours of this recovery to see if the pattern of job growth—or lack, thereof—is similar to those that followed the previous two recessions. Recall that labor markets did not improve until well after these recessions ended. For example, the 2001 recession was deemed to have ended in November 2001, but the unemployment rate did not peak until June 2003 and payroll employment did not reach its trough until August 2003. Although the current recovery is in its early stages, it nonetheless appears that a similar labor market pattern is developing. Despite rising real GDP in the third and fourth quarters of 2009, firms continued to shed jobs over the second half of 2009 and the first two months of 2010. Although the SPF expects job gains to average about 100,000 per month over the last nine months of 2010, these increases might be much less if not for the hiring associated with the 2010 decennial census. While perhaps disconcerting to the public and economic policymakers, the lack of job growth in the face of rising real incomes and faster economic growth reflects continued strong gains in labor productivity. In 2009, productivity rose 5.8 percent—the largest annual increase since 1965. To most economists, strong productivity bodes well for the economy over the long run. Indeed, rising living standards depend on little else. In the short run, particularly in the early stages of the recovery, firms use their existing labor force and capital stock to fulfill orders and expand production. Eventually, though, the extremely rapid rate of productivity growth increases the growth of income and consumer spending. As the economy strengthens, firms once again begin to hire, forcing the unemployment rate down to its natural rate.

UQ – Economic Recovery Now

Economy high – job growth, investor confidence

Voice of America 7/25

(Michael Bowman, 7/25/10, http://www1.voanews.com/english/news/US-Treasury-Secretary-Sees-Continued-Economic-Growth-99195514.html)BHB

The Obama administration says the U.S. economy continues to recover from a deep recession and is less vulnerable to any future financial crisis. Nearly a full year of economic expansion has yet to bring about significant reductions in America's stubbornly-high unemployment rate or the record-high federal deficit. Nevertheless, Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner says the U.S. economy is on the right track after the worst recession of the post-World War II era. "You are seeing a recovery," he said. "You are seeing private investment expand again and job growth starting to come back. That is very encouraging." Geithner was speaking on NBC's Meet The Press program. He acknowledged the economic recovery has been slow to gain momentum, but said the moderate pace is to be expected after a severe downturn made worse by a catastrophic financial crisis. "This was a recession caused by a set of policies that left us with a $1.3-trillion deficit when the president came into office, and an economy that was falling off the cliff," he said. "Millions of Americans had already lost their jobs. The recession was a year old at that point. And given that Americans had been borrowing too much and we had a huge growth in risk-taking and leverage in the financial system, what you would expect is a more moderate-paced recovery than is typical." Some economists worry about the possibility of a so-called "double-dip" recession, where the economy appears to be recovering, then stalls and plunges back into negative growth. Geithner said he sees no evidence that another downturn is imminent.

UQ – Economic Recovery Now

**Risk of recovery high**

**Froomkin 2010**

Dan, Huffington Post Online, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/01/23/7-things-about-the-econom\_n\_433688.html

**Clinton-era Labor Secretary** [**Robert Reich**](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/robert-reich/whats-ahead-for-the-econo_b_411640.html) **recently speculated about what lies ahead for the economy.** He wrote **he see only a 10 percent chance of a double dip recession (vs. a 30 percent chance of a strong or solid recovery; a 40 percent chance of a jobless recovery; and a 20 percent chance of a stalled recovery)**. But his description of that particular scenario was particularly vivid:

UQ – No Double-Dip Now

No double dip its super rare at worst just a slow down

Washington Post 7/28

(Neil Irwin, 7/28/10, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/07/28/AR2010072806049.html?hpid=topnews) BHB

True double-dip recessions -- a second extended contraction in economic activity -- are rare, historically. But economic activity wouldn't need to contract for joblessness to remain high. The economy's natural growth rate, due to population growth and technological improvements, is 2.5 to 3 percent a year. So any extended period of growth much below that, say 1 to 2 percent, would drive unemployment up. And while many economists now argue that the odds of a dip back into recession have increased in the past couple of months, fewer say it's probable. "It seems extremely unlikely to me that we would have a true double dip," said Joseph E. Gagnon, a senior fellow at the Peterson Institute for International Economics. "But a period of sub-par growth would be not at all surprising and may even be the most likely possibility."

\*\*Generic Links\*\*

Link – Generic – Immigration Kills Economy

Immigration kills the economy – low wages, unemployment, investor confidence

Malanga 6

(Steven - Senior Fellow at the Manhattan Institute, City Journal, Summer 2006, http://www.city-journal.org/html/16\_3\_immigrants\_economy.html)BHB

Although open-borders advocates say that these workers are simply taking jobs Americans don’t want, studies show that the immigrants drive down wages of native-born workers and squeeze them out of certain industries. Harvard economists George Borjas and Lawrence Katz, for instance, estimate that low-wage immigration cuts the wages for the average native-born high school dropout by some 8 percent, or more than $1,200 a year. Other economists find that the new workers also push down wages significantly for immigrants already here and native-born Hispanics. Consequently, as the waves of immigration continue, the sheer number of those competing for low-skilled service jobs makes economic progress difficult. A study of the impact of immigration on New York City’s restaurant business, for instance, found that 60 percent of immigrant workers do not receive regular raises, while 70 percent had never been promoted. One Mexican dishwasher aptly captured the downward pressure that all these arriving workers put on wages by telling the study’s authors about his frustrating search for a 50-cent raise after working for $6.50 an hour: “I visited a few restaurants asking for $7 an hour, but they only offered me $5.50 or $6,” he said. “I had to beg [for a job].” Similarly, immigration is also pushing some native-born workers out of jobs, as Kenyon College economists showed in the California nail-salon workforce. Over a 16-year period starting in the late 1980s, some 35,600 mostly Vietnamese immigrant women flooded into the industry, a mass migration that equaled the total number of jobs in the industry before the immigrants arrived. Though the new workers created a labor surplus that led to lower prices, new services, and somewhat more demand, the economists estimate that as a result, 10,000 native-born workers either left the industry or never bothered entering it. In many American industries, waves of low-wage workers have also retarded investments that might lead to modernization and efficiency. Farming, which employs a million immigrant laborers in California alone, is the prime case in point. Faced with a labor shortage in the early 1960s, when President Kennedy ended a 22-year-old guest-worker program that allowed 45,000 Mexican farmhands to cross over the border and harvest 2.2 million tons of California tomatoes for processed foods, farmers complained but swiftly automated, adopting a mechanical tomato-picking technology created more than a decade earlier. Today, just 5,000 better-paid workers—one-ninth the original workforce—harvest 12 million tons of tomatoes using the machines.

Link – Increased Immigration 🡪 Unemployment

No labor shortages for immigrants to fill – leads to unemployment

Camarota 9

(Steven A.; senior demographic analyst, Center of Immigration Studies, April 2009, http://www.cis.org/FirstQuarter2009Unemployment)

In the second half of 2007 and into 2008 unemployment began to rise slightly faster for immigrants than for natives. By the first quarter of this year, immigrants had higher unemployment than natives.Unemployment has risen faster among the least educated immigrants. The unemployment rate for immigrants without a high school diploma has increased 9.9 percentage points since the third quarter of 2007 to 14.7 percent in the first quarter of 2009. For natives without a high school diploma it increased 7.9 percentage points to 19.5 percent during the same period.The unemployment rate for immigrants with at least a college degree has increased 3.7 percentage points since the third quarter of 2007 to 6.3 percent in the first quarter of 2009. For natives it increased 1.5 percentage points to 4.0 percent. There is little evidence of a labor shortage, particularly for less-educated workers. In the first quarter of 2009 there are almost 31 million natives and immigrants with a high school degree or less unemployed or not in the labor force. (Persons not in the labor force are ages 18-65 and neither working nor looking for work.) Even before the recession began, unemployment for young and less-educated natives was very high. In the third quarter of 2007 unemployment was 11.6 percent for those native-born without a high school diploma and 10.6 percent for those (18 to 29) with only a high school diploma.States with the largest decline in immigrant employment are Colorado, Georgia, North Carolina, Arizona, Nevada, Minnesota, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Florida, Connecticut, Virginia, and California. Native-born jobs losses also have been significant in most of these states. Analysis by job category shows that a major reason for the more rapid increase in immigrant unemployment is that they tend to be employed at the bottom end of the labor market, in occupations hit hard by the recession. However, the larger increase in unemployment for immigrants with a college degree relative to natives with the same education is harder to explain. The statistics in this report come from the public use files of the Current Population Survey (CPS), which is collected monthly by the Census Bureau for the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS). The CPS is the primary data source for the nation’s unemployment rate and other labor-force-related statistics. Each CPS includes about 130,000 individuals, roughly half of whom are in the labor force. It does not include those in institutions such as prisons. Like all government surveys, the data are weighted to reflect the actual size and demographic makeup of the U.S. population. The government publishes employment statistics that are both seasonally adjusted and unadjusted from the survey. The figures in this analysis are all seasonally unadjusted. Unadjusted numbers are computationally straightforward and easy for other researchers to replicate. Most researchers outside of the government report unadjusted numbers.1 In fact, the government itself has never reported seasonally adjusted numbers for immigrants and natives. The figures in this report are reported by quarter. Quarterly data are more statistically robust, especially for smaller populations like immigrants, because they include three months of data. To provide unbiased estimates, all significant tests in this report were calculated using the parameter estimates provided by the Census Bureau.2

Link – Increased Immigration 🡪 Unemployment

Economy is suffering due to unemployment—it is a uniquely bad time for amnesty

Fotopoulos 10 [Maria, Senior Writing Fellow for CAPS, July 9 2010, http://open.salon.com/blog/turbodog50/2010/07/09/amnesty\_amidst\_high\_unemployment]

While amnesty makes absolutely no sense for the United States in the best of times, there are truly compelling reasons to say no to amnesty in the worst economic period since the Great Depression.

U.S. unemployment officially is 9.5 percent, but the actual number likely is closer to 16.5 percent when part-time people who want full-time jobs, those who have given up looking and people who dropped off unemployment rolls are factored in to the calculation. Once you drill down to specific states or groups, the numbers are particularly ugly. In California, unemployment is 12.4 percent, and 20 percent in several counties. Nationwide, there is 37.3 percent unemployment among black teens and 24.4 percent among white teens. The U.S. has had a decade of stagnating job growth in the private sector. Nearly 8 million jobs have been lost during this recession – jobs that reportedly may not return soon, if ever. Even if you have a job, your wages may be artificially suppressed by illegal labor or labor brought in on special visas such as H1-Bs. This wage suppression is occurring across pay ranges – at the low end of the pay scale in farm fields and fast food to the mid-range on construction sites and at the professional level in public accounting firms. Very simply put, jobs held illegally by foreign workers are jobs that could be held by American citizens. This is a concept not lost on former presidents, including Hoover, Truman and Eisenhower, who deported millions of people that were in the U.S. illegally.

Getting American citizens back to work – not coddling people who are here illegally – should be on Obama’s Top 10 List. The only responsibility Obama has to people who are living and working here illegally is to encourage their return to home countries (along with any children born here) as humanely as possible through workplace enforcement (including the use of E-Verify), deportation, attrition and strict border and visa enforcement.

Link – Increased Immigration 🡪 Unemployment

The recession changes the debate – immigration during periods of unemployment leads to more unemployment

Camarota 9

(Steven A.; senior demographic analyst, Center of Immigration Studies, April 2009, http://www.cis.org/FirstQuarter2009Unemployment)

The above statistics paint a very bleak picture for unemployment among immigrants and natives. The unemployment rate was 9.7 percent for immigrants overall and 8.6 percent for natives. At present the United States has not changed its immigration policy in any significant way in response to the recession. Table 10 reports the number of individuals given authorization to work in the United States (temporary and permanent) in fiscal year 2008. The table shows that more than 1.3 million new individuals were authorized to work in the United States in 2008 on a temporary or permanent basis. If we include adult illegal aliens who were given permanent residence (a “green card”) from within the United States, which confers work authorization, we would have to add another 100,000 to 250,000 new individuals to this total. The very high unemployment of immigrants overall, and the rapid increase in unemployment even among educated immigrants, calls into question the wisdom of bringing in so many foreign workers. This is especially true when one considers that the unemployment rate for the most recently arrived immigrants is 13.3 percent.

Link – Increased Immigration 🡪 Unemployment

Increasing immigration prevents the economy from recovering – unemployment and wages

King 7

(May 3rd 2007 committee hearing, subcommittee on immigration, citizenship, refugees, border security, and international law, library.cqpress.com) BHB

Protecting jobs and economic opportunity for Americans is one of the most important topics Congress must address.A comprehensive immigration reform bill, like the one being discussed by the Senate, the administration and the open borders lobby will not protect American jobs or the aspiration of so many Americans to better their lives. Importing millions of poorly educated foreign workers won't help our country but will only hinder its growth. Americans are conditioned to believe that such immigrants are necessary to our economy, because they supposedly take jobs Americans will not do. The reality is employers hire desperate aliens who will work for much less than Americans, driving wages down and making it impossible for American workers to compete.Even Alexander Aleinikoff, a very aptly named former Clinton administration INS official, and current dean of the Georgetown University's Law Center, has stated that it's a myth to say that there is little or no competition between undocumented workers and American workers. And what about the claims that there are jobs Americans won't do? That claim is a slap in the face to the millions of U.S. citizens who go to work every day, working those very same jobs side by side.

Link – Increased Immigration 🡪 Lower Wages

Immigration lowers wages

**Meissner 9**

(Doris - Senior Fellow Migration Policy Institute; “Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration, Border Security and Citizenship Hearing – ‘Date Change---Comprehensive Immigration Reform in 2009, Can We Do It and How?’,” 4-30-09)BHB

Yet immigration is not unambiguously beneficial. At a minimum, labor inflows have distributive consequences. While economists remain divided about the details, most agree that for at least some Americans, their relative wages fall as a result of immigration. In particular, low-skilled native-born workers (those without a high school degree), recent immigrants and workers with poor language skills are most likely to suffer wage losses from immigration. n12 And even college-educated immigrants may depress U.S. wages if employers use high-skilled immigration as an explicit strategy to reduce their payroll costs.

Link – Increased Immigration 🡪 Lower Wages

Immigration can lower wages.

Borjas 6 (George J., Professor of Economics and Social Policy at Harvard University, The Journal of Human Resources, Vol. 41, No. 2, Spring 2006, JSTOR, p. 221-222) TJN

In view of these potential problems, it is not too surprising that the empirical literature has produced a confusing array of results. The measured impact of immigration on the wage of native workers in local labor markets fluctuates widely from study to study, but seems to cluster around zero. In recent work (Borjas 2003), I show that by defining the labor market at the national level - which more closely approximates the theoretical counterpart of a closed labor market - the measured wage impact of immigration becomes much larger. By examining the evolution of wages in the 1960-2000 period within narrow skill groups (defined in terms of schooling and labor market experience), I concluded that a 10 percent immigrant-induced increase in the number of workers in a particular skill group reduces the wage of that group by 3 to 4 percent.

Immigration decreases the average American’s wages

Hanson 7 (Gordon H. Hanson “The Economic Logic of Illegal Immigration” CSR NO. 26, April 2007 Council on Foreign Relations pg 19-20)

These benefits, however, are not shared equally. Labor inflows from abroad redistribute income away from workers who compete with immigrants in the labor market. George Borjas estimates that over the period 1980 to 2000 immigration contributed to a decrease in average U.S. wages of 3 percent.34 This estimate accounts for the total change in the U.S. labor force due to immigration, including both legal and illegal sources. Since immigration is concentrated among the low-skilled, low skilled natives are the workers most likely to be hurt. Over the 1980 to 2000 period, wages of native workers without a high school degree fell by 9 percent as a result of immigration.35 On the other hand, lower wages for low-skilled labor mean lower prices for labor intensive goods and services, especially those whose prices are set in local markets rather than through competition in global markets. Patricia Cortes finds that in the 1980s and 1990s U.S. cities with larger inflows of low-skilled immigrants experienced larger reductions in prices for housekeeping, gardening, child care, dry cleaning, and other labor-intensive, locally traded services.36 Lower prices for goods and services raise the real incomes of U.S. households, with most of these gains going to those in regions with large immigrant populations.

Link – Increased Immigration 🡪 Lower Wages

Studies indicate that immigrants drive down wages of native-born workers.

Malanga 6 (Steven, Manhattan Institute Senior Fellow, July 23 2006, http://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/\_chicsuntimes-why\_unskilled\_immigrants.htm) TJN

The flood of immigrants, both legal and illegal, from countries with poor, ill-educated populations, has yielded a mismatch between today's immigrants and the American economy and has left many workers poorly positioned to succeed for the long term. Unlike the immigrants of 100 years ago, whose skills reflected or surpassed those of the native work force, many of today's arrivals, particularly the more than half who now come from Central and South America, are farmworkers in their home countries who come here with little education or even basic training in blue-collar occupations. Nearly two-thirds of Mexican immigrants, for instance, are high school dropouts, and most wind up doing either unskilled factory work or small-scale construction projects, or they work in service industries, where they compete for entry-level jobs against one another, against the adult children of other immigrants, and against native-born high school dropouts. Of the 15 industries employing the greatest percentage of foreign-born workers, half are low-wage service industries, including gardening, domestic household work, car washes, shoe repair and janitorial work. Studies show that immigrants drive down wages of native-born workers and squeeze them out of certain industries. Harvard economists George Borjas and Lawrence Katz, for instance, estimate that low-wage immigration cuts the wages for the average native- born high school dropout 8 percent, or more than $1,200 a year. Even economists who don't find as much of an impact on all native Americans admit that the new workers push down wages significantly for immigrants already here and native-born Hispanics. Consequently, the sheer number of immigrants competing for low-skilled service jobs makes economic progress difficult. A study of the New York City's restaurant business, for instance, found that 60 percent of immigrant workers do not receive regular raises, while 70 percent had never been promoted.

Link – Increased Immigration 🡪 Displacement, Lower Wages

Foreign workers displace American workers, lower wages, and working conditions

FAIR 3(Federation For American Immigration Reform, February 2003, http://www.fairus.org/site/PageServer?pagename=research\_research104b) TKK

Guestworkers displace American workers and lower American workers’ wages and working conditions in certain job sectors. Guestworker programs are a drain on the tax system. Guestworkers rarely go home. Any guestworker program that involves “earned legalization” is an amnesty, a reward for law-breaking that is vociferously opposed by the American public. Whenever the government has empanelled experts to examine the idea of expanding existing guestworkers programs—such as the Commission on Agriculture Workers (1992), the Commission on Immigration Reform (1995), and the joint U.S.-Mexico Bi-National Study on Migration (1997)—they have recommended against them, citing negative impacts to wages and working conditions in the affected industries.

Link – Increased Immigration 🡪 Displacement, Lower Wages

Immigrants create self-sustaining networks that flaunt legal protections on industries displacing workers and lowering wages

FAIR 2

(Labor and Economics, “Immigration and the Economy,” 10-2002, www.fairus.org)BHB

The jobs immigration does create are often for other immigrants and at the expense of Americans. “Once in place, ethnic hiring networks are self-reproducing since each new employee recruits others from his or her own group.”11 A GAO study found that a decade of heavy immigration to Los Angeles had changed the janitorial industry from a mostly unionized native black workforce to one of non-unionized immigrants.12 According to the Census, the employment of black Americans as hotel workers in California dropped 30 percent in the 1980s, while the number of immigrants with such jobs rose 166 percent. “Indeed, many of the positive aspects of entrepreneurship have a negative dimension that is not often acknowledged. The ethnic solidarity hypothesized to be conducive to immigrant business can be seen in another light, as exclusionary and clannish, impeding access to business and employment opportunities for the native-born. The informal business transactions in immigrant communities that are normally regulated by gossip and ostracism can sometimes be enforced in ways that are distinctly illegal.”13 As immigrants come to occupy a niche, we grow dependent on continued immigration. Wayne Cornelius, a political scientist at UC San Diego, found [in a three-year study] that unskilled immigrant labor is increasingly structurally embedded in the economy, especially in California, “where immigrants have largely replaced U.S.-born workers in many occupations, from electronics assembler to gardener to domestic worker.”14 “Network recruitment [of immigrants] not only excludes American workers from certain jobs; it also builds a dependency relationship between U.S. employers and Mexican sources that requires a constant infusion of new workers.”15 “As foreign students increasingly dominate these demanding fields, fewer and fewer Americans will enter them. Thus not only are Americans being displaced from these jobs now, but the candidates for these jobs in the future will increasingly be non-Americans. If this continues long enough, we will end up with ever-fewer American-born scientists, engineers, computer scientists, programmers, and mathematicians; perhaps none at all.”16

Link – Increased Immigration 🡪 Worker Displacement

Immigration leads to low-skilled unemployment

Oesch 10

(Daniel - Université de Genève; European Journal of Industrial Relations 2010 16: 39; p. 43) BHB

Another aspect of globalization is increased labour migration. Immigrants augment a country’s labour supply and may thus increase competition for jobs (Borjas et al., 1997). This reduces native workers’ employment opportunities if these two groups are substitutes in production. This assumption is not unrealistic for low-skilled workers: in some sectors and occupations, low-skilled native and low-skilled immigrant labour may be almost interchangeable. Hence a large influx of immigrants – if wages do not rapidly adjust downwards – may increase a country’s low-skilled unemployment rate.

Link – Increased Immigration 🡪 Kills Business Productivity

Immigration kills business productivity

FAIR 2

 (Labor and Economics, “Immigration and the Economy,” 10-2002, www.fairus.org)BHB

While businesses like to enjoy the low-wage labor supplied by high immigration, it comes at a price. Part of that price is lost productivity. Business and social transaction costs rise, as time, effort, and money are spent overcoming language and cultural barriers.5 “Poor English skills among foreign-born residents cost more than $75 billion a year in lost productivity, wages, tax revenue and unemployment compensation,” says Ohio University economist Lowell Gallaway.6

Link – Increased Immigration 🡪 Unemployment, Burdens Federal Budget

Immigration raises unemployment and raises social service costs

Malanga 6

(Steven - Senior Fellow at the Manhattan Institute, City Journal , “How Unskilled Immigrants Hurt Our Economy” Summer 2006, http://www.city-journal.org/html/16\_3\_immigrants\_economy.html)BHB

But the tale of Librado Velasquez helps show why supporters are wrong about today’s immigration, as many Americans sense and so much research has demonstrated. America does not have a vast labor shortage that requires waves of low-wage immigrants to alleviate; in fact, unemployment among unskilled workers is high—about 30 percent. Moreover, many of the unskilled, uneducated workers now journeying here labor, like Velasquez, in shrinking industries, where they force out native workers, and many others work in industries where the availability of cheap workers has led businesses to suspend investment in new technologies that would make them less labor-intensive. Yet while these workers add little to our economy, they come at great cost, because they are not economic abstractions but human beings, with their own culture and ideas—often at odds with our own. Increasing numbers of them arrive with little education and none of the skills necessary to succeed in a modern economy. Many may wind up stuck on our lowest economic rungs, where they will rely on something that immigrants of other generations didn’t have: a vast U.S. welfare and social-services apparatus that has enormously amplified the cost of immigration. Just as welfare reform and other policies are helping to shrink America’s underclass by weaning people off such social programs, we are importing a new, foreign-born underclass. As famed free-market economist Milton Friedman puts it: “It’s just obvious that you can’t have free immigration and a welfare state.”

\*\*Generic Aff Answers\*\*

Link Turn – Increased Immigration 🡪 Wage Increases

Immigration spurs investment and job creation – increases wages for experienced workers

Martin and Calvin 10

(Phillip - Ag & Resource Econ @ UC Davis; Linda – Ag econ @ USDA; Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy; Volume32, Issue2; Pp. 232-253)

Immigrants do more than add to the labor force; their presence may encourage investment and job creation, thereby reducing any wage-depressing effects. Borjas assumed that immigrants and U.S. workers are substitutes within each age-experience cell, while [Peri (2010)](http://aepp.oxfordjournals.org/content/32/2/232.full#ref-33) assumed that the immigrant and U.S.-born workers within each cell are complements, that is, 25–30 year-old immigrants with less than a high-school education fill different jobs than similar U.S.-born workers. Peri also assumed that there could be an investment response to the arrival of immigrants, which increases the demand for labor, and found that immigrants increase the wages for similar U.S. workers within most age and education cells.

Aff Defense – Increased Immigration doesn’t Lower Wages

**Only flawed, outdated studies show immigration kills wages—modern research contradicts, 3 reasons**

**Saiz 2006**

Albert Saiz ***University of Pennsylvania, The Wharton School http://www.sciencedirect.com/science?\_ob=MImg&\_imagekey=B6WMG-4KWK0W6-1- 1&\_cdi=6934&\_user=56861&\_pii=S009411900600074X&\_orig=na&\_coverDate=03%2F31%2F2007&\_sk=999389997&view=c&wchp=dGLzVlb-zSkzS&md5=7e9cc83041be3a2e9209831be89ecc8f&ie=/sdarticle.pdf***

**Studies that use historical data find a negative local association between immigration and wages in periods previous to WWI** (Goldin [20], Ferrie [13,14]). **But remarkably, there is not much evidence of such a relationship holding in the contemporaneous metropolitan US.**2 **Even unexpected immigration shocks that rapidly expand the local labor supply do not seem to decrease wages** (Card [10]). There have been so far at least three possible explanations for this surprising result. **Natives may be choosing to leave when immigrants arrive, rather than face increased competition in the labor market** (Filer [15]); **immigrants may be moving into cities with positive shocks in productivity and wage growth; or the local labor demand may be more elastic than economists had thought** (Lewis [25]).

\*\*Amnesty Links\*\*

Link – Amnesty 🡪 Burdens Federal Budget - Comparative

Amnesty costs the government more through credit systems and social services than it gains through tax revenue

Ruark 10 [Eric, Director of Research of Federation for American Immigration Reform, March 2010, http://www.fairus.org/site/News2?page=NewsArticle&id=22563&security=1601&news\_iv\_ctrl=1761]

The oft-repeated argument that an amnesty would result in increased tax revenues is based on the false premise that those amnestied workers would earn enough to pay income tax. Because illegal aliens earn such low wages they would not become net taxpayers. An amnesty could mean that more taxes would be withheld from the newly legalized workers, but these workers who are not already claiming the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) and the Additional Child Tax Credit (ACTC) would become legally entitled to do so. The result likely would be an additional drain on the U.S. Treasury of an estimated nearly $22 billion per year.

Amnesty would not be an economic stimulus – increasing the number of low-skilled workers drawing on government benefits for legal residents would worsen the situation.

McNeil 10 (Jena, homeland security policy analyst at The Heritage Foundation, July 23 2010, http://blog.heritage.org/?p=23300) TJN

Touting amnesty as an economic stimulus is weak on several points. First, these studies almost across the board assume that legalized individuals will contribute more than the taxpayer dollars they receive. The Heritage Foundation, however, has found that illegal immigrants take in $32,138 in immediate benefits and services for every $9,686 in taxes they pay out. This scenario is likely to worsen as these individuals become eligible for government benefits only permitted to legal residents of the United States. This is largely because immigrants are disproportionately low-skilled (even the CAP report recognizes this fact), and low-skilled workers draw more heavily on government welfare and income maintenance services than higher skilled workers.

Illegal immigrants often receive more from government services than they put in.

Alexander 5 (Rachel, Intellectual Conservative, September 10 2005, Opposing Viewpoints) TJN

Unfortunately, the problem of illegal immigration is at a stalemate, since a large portion of society, led by those on the left, is reluctant to address the costs posed by illegal immigration. As the U.S. developed into a welfare state, poor illegal immigrants increasingly used a larger percentage of taxpayer dollars through reliance on government programs and use of other government resources, such as law enforcement and deportation. Further, since many U.S. employers illegally hire these workers at substandard wages, they avoid collecting social security taxes from them in order to hide their existence. This results in less taxes paid by illegal immigrants for the government services they disproportionately use. Current U.S. immigration policy reflects the reality that U.S. government handouts are too easy to obtain, and so only 5,000 of 140,000 employment-based visas per year are granted to unskilled workers.

Link – Amnesty 🡪 Burdens Federal Budget

Amnesty costs trillions in social services

Carrol 9

(Cohn; Heritage Foundation; 5/9/9; http://blog.heritage.org/?p=6107) BHB

2) Illegal Immigration and Federal Deficits – Rosenberg writes: “Putting the undocumented population on the road to citizenship will also increase tax revenue in a time of economic crisis, as the newly legal immigrants will pay fees and fines, and become fully integrated into the U.S. tax-paying system.” This assumes that these individuals will not take anymore social services than they do as illegals. But with an unemployment rate of 8.5% it is difficult to assume that people that are largely high-school dropouts would be able to get jobs with millions of Americans looking for work. In reality, they are more likely to be on unemployment. Furthermore, statistics that are used to show they would bring more money fail to recognize the cost of providing entitlements like Social Security and Medicare to 11 million more people—already broken systems. Overall, amnesty will cost taxpayers at least $2.6 trillion.

Link – Amnesty 🡪 Burdens Federal Budget

Amnesty puts a huge strain on social services

McNeil 9 [Jena Baker, Writer for The Heritage Foundation, May 18 2009, http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2009/05/Amnesty-as-an-Economic-Stimulus-Not-the-Answer-to-the-Illegal-Immigration-Problem]

It Is Not an Economic Stimulus. Despite the claims that legalization would be an economic stimulus, the reality is that such a decision would be very costly to the United States. While it is true that immigrants generally add to the economy, there has been a flood of low-skill, low-educated migrants, most of whom have come to the country illegally and many of whom bring with them similarly educated and skilled family members. These migrants use public services, health care facilities, and schools while paying few of the taxes that support these public sector activities--at a very high price tag.

Overall, households headed by immigrants without a high school diploma (or low-skill immigrant households) received an average of $30,160 per household in direct benefits, means-tested benefits, education, and population-based services in FY 2004. This cost would far exceed the economic benefits of legalization.

Many low wage immigrants are relying on social services.

Malanga 6 (Steven, Manhattan Institute Senior Fellow, July 23 2006, http://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/\_chicsuntimes-why\_unskilled\_immigrants.htm) TJN

Advocates of open immigration argue that welcoming the Librado Velasquezes of the world is essential for our American economy: our businesses need workers like him. Like tax cuts, supporters argue, immigration pays for itself. But the tale of Librado Velasquez helps show why supporters are wrong about today's immigration, as many Americans sense and so much research has demonstrated. America does not have a vast labor shortage that requires waves of low-wage immigrants; in fact, unemployment among unskilled workers is high -- about 30 percent. Like Velasquez, many of the unskilled, uneducated workers now journeying here labor in shrinking industries, where they force out native workers, and many others work in industries in which cheap labor has led businesses to suspend investment in new technologies that would make them less labor-intensive. These workers come at great cost. Increasing numbers of them arrive with little education and none of the skills necessary to succeed in a modern economy. Many may wind up stuck on our lowest economic rungs, where they will rely on something that immigrants of other generations didn't have: a vast U.S. welfare and social- services apparatus that has enormously amplified the cost of immigration. Just as welfare reform and other policies are helping to shrink America's underclass by weaning people off such social programs, we are importing a new, foreign-born underclass. As famed free-market economist Milton Friedman puts it: "It's just obvious that you can't have free immigration and a welfare state."

Link – Amnesty 🡪 Burdens Federal Budget

**Amnesty put a huge strain on the federal budget**

Rector & Kim 7 [Robert & Christine, Writers for The Heritage Foundation, May 22 2007, http://www.numbersusa.com/content/learn/illegal-immigration/amnesty-costs-10-times-more-than-enforcement.html]

A second report was issued by the [Heritage Foundation](http://www.heritage.org/Research/Immigration/wm1490.cfm) a few weeks after the report discussed above. This report discussed the costs allowing current illegal aliens to become United States citizens. They will become eligible for the full array of welfare and medical benefits offered by state and federal governments. This study concluded that the $36.5 billion per year figure is valid for the next 30 years. The average age of an illegal alien is early 30s. Beginning 30 years from now, the current illegal alien population will retire. The problem is that low-skilled illegal aliens do not earn enough money to support their families, send remittances back to their homelands, and save adequate money for retirement. The U.S. taxpayer will be stuck supporting most illegal aliens in retirement. And each retired illegal alien is projected to cost the U.S. taxpayer $17,000 per year.

The Heritage report continues, that of the 10 million retired illegal aliens, some 8.5 million will live to the retirement age of 67 years old. At that time, the statistically normal lifespan is an additional 18 years. $17,000 per year for 18 years is $306,000. That is the cost of supporting one amnestied illegal alien through retirement. Multiplied by 8.5 million people, and that comes to the astounding figure of $2.6 trillion.2 Using a financial calculator, we assumed a discount rate of 5 percent and computed the net present value of a cost stream of $144.5 billion per year for 18 years from the years 2039-2057. The net present cost was given as $410 billion

Link – Amnesty 🡪 Burdens Federal Budget

Amnesty will propel the US economy into much further debt

Bonn 7 [Xelan, Writer for Patriot Union of America, September 27 2007, http://www.patriotunion.org/news/by\_issue/immigration/could\_amnesty\_bankrupt\_economy.htm]

Americans shelled out nearly $21 billion for uncompensated health care services to illegal aliens. Amnesty is not expected to decrease but rather increase this amount over time, as illegal aliens once amnestied are not going to miraculously have a larger paycheck. Extend this amount over 30 years and the cost totals $630 billion. Adjust for the added 80 million family members that come and we are looking at $3.15 trillion over the next 30 years. Our new adjusted grand total for amnesty over a 30 year period is now $36.18 trillion! Assume all projections are only 50% correct. Do we really want to amnesty 12-20 million illegal aliens and then foot the bill?What if the number of illegal aliens is really much higher, as well as our cost impacts? And what about interest payments on this money, which could effectively double or even triple the amount? Let’s see how this effects the national debt and economy.Our national debt will tick upwards an average of over $1 trillion per year, all things remaining the same (assuming there are no new healthcare programs or other costly entitlement programs enacted for Americans to impact the system). In just one decade, we will have doubled our entire national debt!  Where will that money come from?

Link – Amnesty 🡪 Burdens Federal Budget

Amnesty creates an incentive for immigrants to bring their families placing a massive burden on social services

Rector 6 [Robert, Senior Research Fellow for The Heritage Foundation, May 12 2006, http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2006/05/Amnesty-and-Continued-Low-Skill-Immigration-Will-Substantially-Raise-Welfare-Costs-and-Poverty]

But the fiscal problem gets worse; when an illegal immigrant has obtained citizenship through the Amnesty process, he or she would have the right to bring his or her parents in the U.S. as permanent lawful residents. (Currently one-tenth of the annual flow of legal immigrants to the U.S. are parents of recent immigrants who have naturalized.) If ten million current illegal immigrants were granted Amnesty and citizenship under CIRA, as many as twenty million foreign born parents would be given the right to immigrate to the U.S. Once in the U.S., the immigrant parents would receive social services and government funded medical care, much of it paid for through the Medicaid disproportionate share program. These immigrant parents coming to the U.S. would also be eligible to apply for citizenship themselves. On attaining citizenship, most would become eligible for benefits from the Supplemental Security Income (SSI) and Medicaid programs, at an average cost of over $18,000 per person per year. While it is true that the language requirements of the citizenship test would serve as a barrier to immigrant parents becoming citizens, the tests are not very difficult and the financial rewards of citizenship would be very great. If only ten percent of the parents of those receiving Amnesty under CIRA became citizens and enrolled in SSI and Medicaid, the extra costs to government would be over $30 billion per year. Obviously, these costs would not begin for some time, but the long-term potential of Amnesty to raise government spending is quite real. While no one can predict how many spouses, children, and parents of the beneficiaries of Amnesty would enter the country, the pool of those who could enter is enormous, and the potential long-term government costs would be staggering.

Link – Amnesty 🡪 Burdens Federal Budget

Amnesty puts a strain on healthcare and federal budget

Guess 6 [Gwyn, Staff Writer for Associated Content, Professor at University of Memphis, December 18 2006, http://www.associatedcontent.com/article/101348/ten\_reasons\_amnesty\_is\_a\_bad\_idea\_for.html?cat=37]

The national health care is at HUGE risk if any of these amnesty provisions is passed. Why? Because illegals can go to any hospital and demand care and the hospital is obliged to give it to them, regardless of the fact that the state picks up their bill. That translates to you and me, the hard-working taxpayer, folks. The Heritage Foundation has done some excellent work on clarifying the muddy figures and heart-gushing sentiments encorporated in this bill and in some of its ammendments. According to Robert Rector, passage of this amnesty bill would "increase long-term Federal spending by at least $50 Billion per year. That's a Billion, with a big, fat "B."

Granting amnesty to millions of illegals would put a huge fiscal strain on the federal budget and social services

Rector 6 [Robert, Senior Research Fellow for The Heritage Foundation, May 12 2006, http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2006/05/Amnesty-and-Continued-Low-Skill-Immigration-Will-Substantially-Raise-Welfare-Costs-and-Poverty]

Granting Amnesty would render illegal immigrants eligible for federal benefit programs. The CIS study estimated the additional taxes that would be paid and the additional government costs that would occur as a result of amnesty. It assumed that welfare utilization and tax payments among current illegal immigrants would rise to equal the levels among legally-admitted immigrants of similar national, educational, and demographic backgrounds. If all illegal immigrants were granted Amnesty, federal tax payments would increase by some $3,000 per household, but federal benefits and social services would increase by $8,000 per household. Total federal welfare benefits would reach around $9,500 per household, or $35 billion per year total. The study estimates that the net cost to the federal government of granting Amnesty to some 3.8 million illegal alien households would be around $5,000 per household, for a total federal fiscal cost of $19 billion per year.

Link – Amnesty 🡪 Burdens Federal Budget

Blanket amnesty will place unsustainable costs upon the United States government

Rector & Kim 7 [Robert & Christine, Writers for The Heritage Foundation, May 22 2007, http://www.numbersusa.com/content/learn/illegal-immigration/amnesty-costs-10-times-more-than-enforcement.html]

The Heritage Foundation issued two studies in 2007 pointing out that the big problem with mass legalization is that (a) most illegal aliens are low-skilled and therefore do not earn enough money to pay enough taxes to cover the government benefits they receive; and (b), amnesty would eventually make them eligible for the full array of welfare and medical benefits offered by local, state and federal governments. They found the cost of allowing illegal aliens to remain in the United States, and eventually to become citizens, would be $3.7 trillion through the year 2056. That works out to a present cost of $1 trillion, at a 5 percent discount rate. In other words, immediately upon passage of an amnesty bill, the United States government would need to put $1 trillion into an investment earning 5 percent per year if it were honest about paying for the costs of amnesty.

Link – Amnesty 🡪 Burdens Social Security

Amnesty causes Social Security to go bankrupt

Guess 6 [Gwyn, Staff Writer for Associated Content, Professor at University of Memphis, December 18 2006, http://www.associatedcontent.com/article/101348/ten\_reasons\_amnesty\_is\_a\_bad\_idea\_for.html?cat=37]

Illegals drain our Social Security System. They can apply for food stamps and they can also clain social security benefits from the system from the very day they came to this country as illegals. In the immigration compromise bill that has been before congress, over ten million illegals could use their green card status to apply for Social Security benefits. It doesn't take rocket science to know that this system is almost bankrupt and that many know it will be totally bankrupt within 20-30 years, so this provision will only shorten that time-frame. If there's anything taxpayers do NOT need now, it is to see a huge influex of people making added claims on it. Another senseless and myopic move on the part of some very greedy, power-hungry and corrupt politicians, many of whom have been at this game for decades!

Amnesty would harm social services and would threaten to bankrupt Social Security.

Smith 9 (Rep. Lamar, ranking member on the House Judiciary Committee, June 29 2009, USA Today, NEWS; Pg. 8A, LexisNexis Academic) TJN

Unemployment hit 15.5% last month for American workers without high school diplomas. It makes no sense to give amnesty or a "path to citizenship" to millions of illegal immigrants who would compete with unemployed Americans for scarce jobs and drive down their wages. Amnesty would hurt American taxpayers. After illegal immigrants are legalized, they'd become eligible for federal, state and local taxpayer-funded benefits such as Medicaid, Medicare and Social Security. Most illegal immigrants don't earn enough to pay taxes. Even when they do, the benefits they receive outweigh the taxes paid. Amnesty would threaten to bankrupt Social Security. According to the Social Security Administration, most illegal immigrants who received amnesty would collect thousands of dollars more in benefits than they paid into the system.

Link – Amnesty 🡪 Hurts Small Businesses

Amnesty inflates wages for immigrants and hurts small businesses

Guess 6 [Gwyn, Staff Writer for Associated Content, Professor at University of Memphis, December 18 2006, http://www.associatedcontent.com/article/101348/ten\_reasons\_amnesty\_is\_a\_bad\_idea\_for.html?cat=37]

Small business will really be hurt because of the unfair consideration given to guest workers. It will guarantee them work at a "prevailing wage," while the same protections are not awarded to tax paying citizens. This is directly discriminatory to our own legal citizens! Davis-Bacon amendment placed by Sen. Obama would guarantee the prevailing wage to a specific segment of non-citizens, which on the face of it is insanity. Small businesses would be forced to pay inflated wages to their guest workers while denying them to ordinary citizens.

**Link – Amnesty 🡪 Lowers Wages**

**Amnesty causes decreased wages and unemployment for American workers**

Hayes 4 [Matt, Staff Writer for FoxNews, January 21 2004, http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,109026,00.html]

The Bush Amnesty will certainly have effects on our economy if it ever comes to pass, because what the president actually proposes is to end the unskilled and semi-skilled labor market in America.

First, there is no cap on the number of illegal aliens in the U.S., or aliens outside the U.S., who would be allowed into the country, provided they could find some form of employment. Any employer in any area of business -- no matter how difficult or hazardous the work -- could decide to open a new business, or lower wages in an existing business, to federal minimum wage of $5.15 per hour and wait for citizens and lawful permanent residents to apply. When none do, the employer could then order up the needed workers from anywhere in the world. Under the Bush amnesty, we could see a crew of Saudis cleaning nuclear reactors for $35.20 each per day. If that happens, what is likely to happen to a competing cleaning contractor that employs citizens and lawful permanent residents? It will go out of business or fire its American employees in favor of dirt-cheap imported foreign labor. Taxpayers will foot the bill for the Unemployment Insurance, AFDC, and Medicaid consumed by the newly out-of-work Americans.

Amnesty would drive down the wages of American workers.

Smith 8 (Rep. Lamar, senior Republican on the House Judiciary Committee, October 9 2008, The Washington Times, OPED; A23, LexisNexis Academic) TJN

Promoting the use of cheap labor provided by illegal immigrants may help a few businesses for a short time, but an immigration policy that includes amnesty hurts American workers and American families in the long run. According to a study by the Heritage Foundation, each low-skilled immigrant household received $30,160 in government benefits - including education, medical care, transportation and sanitation services - but paid only $10,573 in taxes. That means the average low-skilled immigrant household costs American taxpayers almost $20,000 per year. Also, the Center for Immigration Studies estimates that low-skilled American workers lose an average of $1,800 a year because of competition from low-skilled immigrants for their jobs. Driving down the wages of American workers is not a route to "economic opportunity" the chamber claims is its goal.

Amnesty would result in lower wages, higher taxes, and would harm many priorities of the Chamber of Commerce.

Smith 8 (Rep. Lamar, senior Republican on the House Judiciary Committee, October 9 2008, The Washington Times, OPED; A23, LexisNexis Academic) TJN

Even the business-friendly priorities of the Chamber of Commerce are threatened by its immigration stance. For instance, ending lawsuit abuse by trial lawyers, reducing taxes, decreasing government regulation, setting reasonable climate and environmental regulations, and providing business tax credits are all chamber priorities that likely would be opposed by illegal immigrants who receive amnesty and become voters. Amnesty for illegal immigrants will only encourage more illegal immigration, which in turn will lead to lower wages for American workers, higher taxes and a political climate that undermines the chamber's stated interests. Given the current state of the economy, Congress must support policies that help the American worker and their employers who play by the rules. When it comes to illegal immigration, I recommend the chamber take its own advice and put the American people first.

Link – Amnesty 🡪 Lowers Wages, Increases Illegal Immigration

Amnesty would have a number of negative effects on including depressing wages and encouraging more illegal immigration.

Smith 9 (Rep. Lamar, ranking member on the House Judiciary Committee, June 29 2009, USA Today, NEWS; Pg. 8A, LexisNexis Academic) TJN

Granting amnesty would increase illegal immigration. Since Congress passed the last "one-time" amnesty in 1986, the number of illegal immigrants in the U.S. has jumped to more than 12 million. Amnesty sends the message that if you just get into the country, even illegally, you can stay indefinitely. Amnesty rewards illegal immigrants with the right to live and work in the U.S. That is unfair to the millions of legal immigrants who play by the rules, wait their turn and come in to the U.S. the right way. And selling amnesty to lawbreakers for the price of a fine would demean the value of the greatest honor our country can bestow: citizenship. To achieve immigration reform, the choices are not just amnesty or mass deportation. A strategy of "attrition through enforcement" would dramatically reduce the number of illegal immigrants over time. If the federal government enforced our immigration laws, especially those that target the employment of illegal workers, many illegal immigrants would simply return home because they can't get jobs. Others would never come to the USA in the first place because they would not be hired. A Zogby poll in 2006 found that a majority of voters prefer this approach over others. Amnesty would cost Americans their jobs, depress wages, burden taxpayers and encourage even more illegal immigration. On the other hand, enforcing immigration laws would increase respect for the rule of law and reduce illegal immigration.

Link – Amnesty 🡪 Worker Displacement, Lowers Wages

Illegal immigrants have displaced millions of US workers—an amnesty would displace more and keep wages low for Americans

Ruark 10 [Eric, Director of Research of Federation for American Immigration Reform, March 2010, http://www.fairus.org/site/News2?page=NewsArticle&id=22563&security=1601&news\_iv\_ctrl=1761]

There are approximately 7.5 million illegal aliens in the U.S. workforce and their presence has driven down wages and conditions for American workers, particularly those who have only a high school diploma or less, since they are the ones who directly compete with illegal aliens for jobs. An amnesty would not add significant numbers of new workers to the labor market, at least not in the short term: Illegal aliens are already here and have already displaced millions of American workers and reduced the earnings of millions more. What an amnesty would do is to sanction the actions of those employers who hired illegal aliens at the expense of native workers, and reward those who entered the U.S. illegally and may have committed other crimes (including felony identify theft or fraud) in order to work without authorization. It would also keep wage levels artificially low for millions of low-skilled American workers.

Link – Amnesty 🡪 Worker Displacement, Burdens Federal Budget

Amnesty puts a huge burden on taxpayers by unloading millions of workers onto government programs

Ruark 10 [Eric, Director of Research of Federation for American Immigration Reform, March 2010, http://www.fairus.org/site/News2?page=NewsArticle&id=22563&security=1601&news\_iv\_ctrl=1761]

On the other hand, the cost to native workers and U.S. taxpayers was enormous. While amnesty did not appreciably improve the economic situation for amnesty recipients, it did open up to them the panoply of government assistance programs. An estimate of the net cost to U.S. taxpayers ten years after amnesty was $78.7 billion, with 1.87 million workers displaced over that time. Worst of all, 1986 only set the stage for a massive increase in illegal immigration to the United States and the expectation by a powerful coalition of special interest groups that the federal government would forever abjure its responsibility to uphold immigration law.

An amnesty would further crowd out native low-skilled workers and jeopardize social service budgets

Ruark 10 [Eric, Director of Research of Federation for American Immigration Reform, March 2010, http://www.fairus.org/site/News2?page=NewsArticle&id=22563&security=1601&news\_iv\_ctrl=1761]

An amnesty would have the direct opposite effect of what is needed to provide advancement opportunities for U.S. workers at the low end of the economic spectrum. The United States already has a surplus of low-skilled native labor. For those who compete directly against illegal aliens for jobs, the unemployment rates in January 2010 were 25 percent for teenagers, 15.6 percent for those with less than a high school diploma, and 10.5 percent for those with only a high school diploma. Not only would amnesty allow the beneficiaries total access to the U.S. labor market, it would also allow amnesty recipients greater access to welfare programs, further straining government budgets and jeopardizing benefits available to low-income natives.

Link – Amnesty 🡪 Harms Education

Amnesty would harm education.

Smith 8 (Rep. Lamar, senior Republican on the House Judiciary Committee, October 9 2008, The Washington Times, OPED; A23, LexisNexis Academic) TJN

In fact, amnesty for illegal immigrants would sabotage nearly every priority of the Chamber of Commerce. Take education. According to its Web site, the Chamber endorses improvements to K-12 education. But giving amnesty to illegal immigrants would lead to more overcrowded classrooms, resulting in a poorer education for the children of U.S. citizens and legal immigrants alike. The chamber has also said it supports increased access to higher education for American students. Yet, illegal immigrants take places in colleges and universities that would normally go to U.S. citizens and legal immigrants.

Link – Amnesty 🡪 Illegal Immigration

Amnesty causes further illegal immigration due to prevailing wages

Cutler 9 [Michael, Staff Writer for Family Security Matters, December 18 2009, http://www.familysecuritymatters.org/publications/id.5047/pub\_detail.asp]

 When aliens who had previously been illegally present in the United States were granted lawful status, they were no longer exploitable. In many cases, these previously illegal aliens approached their employers and told them that they would certainly want to continue working for them but that they now wanted to be paid prevailing wages. They wanted the appropriate deductions taken from their salaries. They wanted to be compensated appropriately for working overtime and on weekends.

In short, these previously vulnerable aliens were no longer vulnerable and demanded fair and equitable treatment by their employers. In many of these instances, guess what happened? The employers fired these now-legal aliens and hired the next wave of illegal aliens!

Illegal immigration diverts money from the US economy

Cutler 9 [Michael, Staff Writer for Family Security Matters, December 18 2009, http://www.familysecuritymatters.org/publications/id.5047/pub\_detail.asp]

Illegal aliens are certainly easy to exploit because they are desperate to secure any job that they can so that they can send their money to their families back home. This, of course, raises the issue of the fact that every year foreign workers, both legal and illegal, seek to send as much money out of country and our nation's economy as possible. It has been estimated that more than $100 billion is wired or otherwise sent from the United States to other countries around the world by foreign workers. This is money that is lost to our economy. This is money that is not spent in the United States and not invested in the United States. This is money that is not earned by American citizens or lawful immigrants.

Link – Amnesty 🡪 Illegal Immigration

An amnesty policy will lower the cost of crossing the border illegally only exacerbating the problem

Ruark 10 [Eric, Director of Research of Federation for American Immigration Reform, March 2010, http://www.fairus.org/site/News2?page=NewsArticle&id=22563&security=1601&news\_iv\_ctrl=1761]

In addition, amnesty would not stop the future flow of low-skill workers into the United States. The adoption of another mass amnesty like the one in 1986 — but covering 3 to 4 times as many illegal aliens — would reinforce the message that the United States does not have the will to enforce a strict immigration policy. That would be taken as an invitation to continue to illegally seek work in the United States. Employers who previously hired illegal workers will not hesitate to do so again if they can get away with it, and a federal government that has consistently refused to uphold immigration law can not suddenly be trusted to secure the border and pursue interior enforcement. Promises of strict enforcement were made when the last major amnesty was passed in 1986 and are being made again today; yet, many of those now pushing for amnesty have adamantly opposed increased border security and/or enforcement of immigration law already on the books.7 They support nothing less than a de facto open borders policy. Even just the discussion of amnesty by elected officials serves to encourage some illegal aliens who may have considered returning to their home countries to remain in the United States, while also attracting others to come in the hopes of receiving U.S. citizenship.8

Link – Amnesty 🡪 Illegal Immigration, Lowers Wages

Amnesty would have a number of negative effects on including depressing wages and encouraging more illegal immigration.

Smith 9 (Rep. Lamar, ranking member on the House Judiciary Committee, June 29 2009, USA Today, NEWS; Pg. 8A, LexisNexis Academic) TJN

Granting amnesty would increase illegal immigration. Since Congress passed the last "one-time" amnesty in 1986, the number of illegal immigrants in the U.S. has jumped to more than 12 million. Amnesty sends the message that if you just get into the country, even illegally, you can stay indefinitely. Amnesty rewards illegal immigrants with the right to live and work in the U.S. That is unfair to the millions of legal immigrants who play by the rules, wait their turn and come in to the U.S. the right way. And selling amnesty to lawbreakers for the price of a fine would demean the value of the greatest honor our country can bestow: citizenship. To achieve immigration reform, the choices are not just amnesty or mass deportation. A strategy of "attrition through enforcement" would dramatically reduce the number of illegal immigrants over time. If the federal government enforced our immigration laws, especially those that target the employment of illegal workers, many illegal immigrants would simply return home because they can't get jobs. Others would never come to the USA in the first place because they would not be hired. A Zogby poll in 2006 found that a majority of voters prefer this approach over others. Amnesty would cost Americans their jobs, depress wages, burden taxpayers and encourage even more illegal immigration. On the other hand, enforcing immigration laws would increase respect for the rule of law and reduce illegal immigration.

Neg Defense – Amnesty doesn’t Increase Wages

1986 amnesty proves that the plan does not solve the low-wage problems of illegal immigration

Ruark 10 [Eric, Director of Research of Federation for American Immigration Reform, March 2010, http://www.fairus.org/site/News2?page=NewsArticle&id=22563&security=1601&news\_iv\_ctrl=1761]

The 1986 amnesty did not end the demand for cheap labor, nor was it accompanied by increased border security and workplace enforcement. Amnesty proponents today are making the same promises about securing the border and enacting tough penalties for employers who hire illegal aliens, but the legislative record and 23 years of history show these promises to be hollow. Those in Congress pushing the hardest for amnesty claim that the border is already secure, while they have continually sought to undermine interior enforcement.

Amnesty does not solve for cheap labor and low wages

Ruark 10 [Eric, Director of Research of Federation for American Immigration Reform, March 2010, http://www.fairus.org/site/News2?page=NewsArticle&id=22563&security=1601&news\_iv\_ctrl=1761]

The IRCA amnesty is the example of how not to approach immigration reform, yet, for some, it is the model for a massive new amnesty. Several recent reports have lauded the “success” of the 1986 amnesty, but gains were limited to the recipients and even these were minimal. The Center for American Progress has claimed that the wages for IRCA beneficiaries rose 15 percent due to the amnesty and they cite a 1996 Department of Labor report as evidence.71 What the report actually found was that for a small percentage of 1986 amnesty recipients — those who spoke English well and possessed the most job skills — their wage levels increased after legalization. However, the report also shows that this group had seen similar wage increases prior to the 1986 amnesty, and even those amnestied workers who saw an increase in earnings still earned substantially less than comparable workers.

Low-skilled wages remain low even after amnesty

Ruark 10 [Eric, Director of Research of Federation for American Immigration Reform, March 2010, http://www.fairus.org/site/News2?page=NewsArticle&id=22563&security=1601&news\_iv\_ctrl=1761]

A statistical portrait of the current illegal alien population highlights the fact that they remain largely uneducated, low-skilled, and work predominately in low-wage jobs, thus helping to keep wages in that sector artificially low. Nearly half (47%) of illegal aliens ages 25-64 have less than a high school education and 30 percent have less than a ninth grade education.77 The median

households, while illegal alien households contain one-third more workers. Even after a decade of working in the United States, the median income for illegal alien households shows negligible gain.

Neg Defense – Amnesty doesn’t Solve Illegal Immigration

The ’86 amnesty didn’t end illegal immigration – there are over three times as many people living in the U.S. illegally today.

Carafano 9 (James Jay, senior research fellow for national security at the Heritage Foundation, The Washington Times, October 11 2009, M, SUNDAY READ; Pg. 11, LexisNexis Academic) TJN

Yes, we need comprehensive immigration reform. But many proponents start with a deeply flawed assumption - that reform must begin with amnesty for virtually everyone unlawfully in the United States. America's immigration and border security problems, they argue, can't be solved without first dealing with the estimated 11 million to 12 million illegally living here. There is no practical or compassionate alternative to just giving them all amnesty, often called legalization, and putting them on the road to citizenship. This kind of thinking is just flat wrong. The first problem with the case for an "amnesty first" approach is that it won't work. In 1986, President Reagan supported similar reforms. At the time, the unlawful population was about 3 million. Now it is more that three times that.

\*\*Amnesty Aff Answers\*\*

Link Turn – Amnesty 🡪 Increases Wages

Exploitation means low wages for everyone

Jaynes 7

 (Gerald; prof. economics at Yale; May 3rd; House Judiciary Commitie COMMITITIE HEARING, SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION, CITIZENSHIP, REFUGEES, BORDER SECURITY, AND INTERNATIONAL LAW, library.cqpress.com)

Secondly and lastly, with respect to this idea of compensation and the fact that there are gainers and losers, although the vast majority of we Americans in the economy as a whole gain from immigration, is the idea that there will also be some pockets of labor markets where immigration has a very detrimental effect. There are some industries -- for example, the meat packing, the poultry industry -- where immigration has, indeed, deteriorated the conditions for workers to an extent that I would call it a national disgrace. But one of the major reasons why that occurs is simply because the undocumented workers who now dominate the labor forces in those industries are being exploited by the employers themselves. And if we allow the immigrant workers, documented or undocumented, to be exploited we do, indeed, ensure that some native- born workers are going to be exploited as well. We need to also be talking about the fact that any changes -- temporary workers, guest workers, whatever we might want to call them, are going to have to have important safeguards which attempt to protect the integrity of our low-wage labor market for all workers, native-born, immigrants alike.

\*\*Links – Employment Visas\*\*

Link - Employment-based visas 🡪 financial risk

Allowing more foreign labor will make US economy vulnerable to Asian financial crisis

FAIR 2000 [Federation for American Immigration Reform, January 1 2000, http://www.fairus.org/site/News2?page=NewsArticle&id=16826&news\_iv\_ctrl=-1]

Opening the door to increased foreign labor at this time also carries a serious risk of aggravating the unemployment impact of the Asian financial crisis on skilled U.S. workers. The California State Finance Department estimates that the Asian slowdown could cost California alone up to 65,000 non-agricultural jobs this year which would come primarily from the state's hi-technology industry. (See *The Washington Post,* Feb. 10, 1998) In the current atmosphere of economic uncertainty and confusion stemming from the continuing crisis in Asia, it would be foolhardy for Congress to add to possible severe economic problems that are expected to arise.

Link – H1-B Generic Hurt Economy

H1B visas decrease average wage, increase income equality, encourage documentation fraud and make the US economy vulnerable to international finance crises

FAIR 2000 [Federation for American Immigration Reform, January 1 2000, http://www.fairus.org/site/News2?page=NewsArticle&id=16826&news\_iv\_ctrl=-1]

Despite the economic boom of recent years, average real household income is still 2.7 percent below the level it reached in 1989. (Source: U.S. Census Bureau) Economists from Laura D'Andrea Tyson to Alan Greenspan acknowledge that the size of current immigration has had a significant impact on the supply side of the labor market. According to the Joint Economic Committee of Congress, U.S. income inequality is now at the highest level since World War II. FAIR contends that high levels of immigration, including skilled immigration has played a significant role in these developments.

FAIR further believes the proposed increase in H-1B visa levels is unwise for the following reasons:

The evidence presented to substantiate the claim that there is an acute shortage of skilled workers in the information technology industry is highly suspect. Government reports show that the H-1B program as it currently functions is being seriously abused and manipulated by employers and immigration system practitioners. There is no consensus in the information technology industry itself that the solution to worker shortages is increased immigration. Increasing the supply of foreign labor will seriously aggravate employment difficulties expected to flow from the Asian financial crisis and which are expected to be felt later this year. The solution to the problem of skilled labor shortages that is in the national interest is to increase the supply of labor qualified for these jobs from domestic sources through education, job training, and better recruitment. The existing ceiling of 65,000 visas in the temporary skilled worker program, if properly administered for the purposes for which the program was created by Congress, are more than adequate for the demonstrable, acute, short term labor needs of industry.

**H1B visas hurt US economy for several reasons**

Locke 01 [Robert, Staff Write for Front Page Magazine, January 24 2001, http://97.74.65.51/readArticle.aspx?ARTID=22968]

AMERICA'S GENEROUS IMMIGRATION LAWS are increasingly being corrupted and taken advantage of by self-aware economic interests. Take, for example, the H1-B visa program for technical workers, which was recently expanded to 200,000 people per year by the Clinton administration. H1-B allows corporations to bring in cheap foreign technical labor in the computer industry and elsewhere. This is shrinking opportunities for American citizens, driving down their wages, and stunting the production of homegrown talent.

Link – H1-Bs Hurts Economy - Remittances

H1B visas hurt the economy because workers send over 200 billion dollars to their home countries which acts as a net loss U.S. economy

Cutler 10 (Michael, Fellow at the Center for Immigration Studies, Family Security Matters, April 18, 2010, http://www.familysecuritymatters.org/publications/id.6015/pub\_detail.asp) TKK

If you wonder why I am linking the E-Verify program to the H1B Visas the answer is simple and straightforward. But in order to answer the question, I will pose a rhetorical question: "What do illegal aliens and aliens on "temporary" work visas such as the H1B visa have in common?" The answer is that they are all foreign workers and as such, their goal is to take the money they earn and send as much of it back to their families in their home countries. Each year between $100 billion and $200 billion leaves our nation's economy for foreign countries. This is money that is not earned by American citizens or resident aliens. This is money that is not spent in the United States of America. This is money that is not invested in the United States of America. This money that is utterly lost to the economy to the United States of America! By not discouraging foreign workers from coming to the United States and working and then sending money back home, our politicians make as much sense as the person who turns on the faucets on his bathtub in preparation for taking a bath but fails to close the drain. He then comes back to the tub some time later and finds that all of the hot water he had planned to bathe in had disappeared down the drain!

Link - H1-B 🡪 Lower Wages

The H1B program encourages poor documentation and below prevailing level wages

FAIR 2000 [Federation for American Immigration Reform, January 1 2000, http://www.fairus.org/site/News2?page=NewsArticle&id=16826&news\_iv\_ctrl=-1]

A 1996 audit of the H-1B program by the Department of Labor's Inspector General found that the program has already been turned into a virtual "rubber stamp" for the admission of skilled and unskilled foreign labor which become permanent additions to the U.S. labor supply. The study found 98.7 percent of temporary worker petitions were for aliens already in this country. The audit also found that 75% percent of temporary workers admitted worked for employers who did not adequately document their wages and another 13% were paid below the advertised prevailing wage. The report noted "The program has become a stepping stone to obtain permanent resident status not only for the best and brightest specialists but also for students, relatives, and friends."

Companies that hire H1B workers deceitfully depress wages

Locke 01 [Robert, Staff Write for Front Page Magazine, January 24 2001, http://97.74.65.51/readArticle.aspx?ARTID=22968]

The Labor Department has nominal regulations on the books to protect American citizens, but these have so many loopholes as to be ineffective. For example, although Labor Dept. regulations require companies to pay at least 95% of the prevailing wage, companies are free to use biased data in establishing what this wage is. The survey data is always suspect because it is provided by the very companies who will benefit from the results. They spin the data by grouping employees into inappropriate categories, by selective reporting, and by outright dishonesty. Companies who do not use foreign labor are reluctant to answer the survey as it entails some cost and time which could be spent on more productive corporate endeavors. Furthermore, because H1-B workers depress wages, their prevailing wage tends to become a self-fulfilling prophecy. No one ever checks the results of the survey.

Link - H1B🡪 Lower Wages, Unemployment

H1B visas force wages down and displace native engineers

Frauenheim 2000 [Ed, Professor of Computer Science at UC Davis, October 19 2000, http://www.salon.com/technology/feature/2000/10/19/matloff]

For the past seven years, the University of California at Davis computer science professor has been tilting his lance against Silicon Valley heavyweights and their hunger for more foreign guest workers. Foreign national techies working in the United States on "H-1B" visas not only depress the wages of U.S.-citizen programmers and squeeze out older engineers, argues Matloff, but also are often exploited along the way. Matloff has been tireless in his crusade. He has testified before Congress, written Op-Ed pieces, spoken with numerous reporters and zapped out countless e-mails railing against what he calls industry greed and shortsightedness.

Link - H1B 🡪 US Brain Drain

H1B visa causes American brain drain due to better opportunities abroad

Shapiro 9 [Gary, President & CEO of the Consumer Electronics Association, May 4 2009, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/gary-shapiro/american-brain-drain-why\_b\_195627.html]

[A recent Kauffman Foundation study, led by Wadhwa](http://www.kauffman.org/research-and-policy/immigration-and-the-american-economy.aspx), found that America is experiencing a brain drain of talented foreign-born entrepreneurs, many of whom after graduating from a U.S. university return to their home countries owing to challenges receiving a H1B visa. Most entrepreneurs surveyed said their home countries offered better opportunities to start their own businesses. Losing this level of talent weakens one of America's greatest competitive advantages. America is the most innovative, creative and entrepreneurial country on earth because we've historically attracted the best and the brightest thinkers from around the world. In the technology industry, some of our greatest companies - including Yahoo, Google, Sun, Intel, Audiovox, Qualcomm, and eBay - were founded and led by immigrants whose successful companies today employ hundreds of thousands of Americans.

H1B visa causes American brain drain due to better opportunities abroad

Cohen 9 [Sharon, MA, CPRP, Global MBA Career Counselor, Robinson College of Business at GSU, 2009, http://www.careerrocketeer.com/2009/09/american-brain-drain-global-gain.html

According to the New York Times: "the United States will struggle to compete, if it cannot more easily hire foreign-born professionals." Currently, there is a well-known candidate shortage which is apparent across a broad range of business specialties. A recent Kauffman Foundation study, found that America is experiencing a brain drain of talented foreign-born entrepreneurs. Many, graduate from a U.S. university and then return to their home countries due to H1B visa challenges. Most entrepreneurs surveyed said their home countries offered better opportunities to start their own businesses. This is a real brain drain of talent.

**Link- H1B 🡪 Discrimination**

H1B visas promote employee discrimination

Locke 01 [Robert, Staff Write for Front Page Magazine, January 24 2001, http://97.74.65.51/readArticle.aspx?ARTID=22968]

H1-B helps promote age and other forms of discrimination by giving companies a ready supply of foreigners who don't have any uppity American ideas about their rights and who can be silenced by threatening to send them back where they came from. Because even companies that don't employ H1-B workers can threaten to do so, H1-B has a chilling effect on industry as a whole.

**Neg Defense - No need for H1B**

Native workers are equally qualified as H1B recipients

Locke 01 [Robert, Staff Write for Front Page Magazine, January 24 2001, http://97.74.65.51/readArticle.aspx?ARTID=22968]

Though the H-1b has been sold as providing companies access to the "world's best and brightest", reality differs from the sales pitch. The law states the alien must have "a bachelors degree or equivalent". Hardly indicative of the world's best and brightest. Experience shows that the people imported are, in general terms, no better or no worse than domestic workers. Nobody objects to bringing in Nobel-caliber scientists and the like, but this is a tiny number of people, not 200,000 per year.

Neg Defense – H1-Bs don’t solve labor shortages

Labor shortage do not exist—H1B visas are corporate subsidies

Locke 01 [Robert, Staff Write for Front Page Magazine, January 24 2001, http://97.74.65.51/readArticle.aspx?ARTID=22968]

Industry likes to tell the public that they need to bring in foreign workers because of a so-called "labor shortage." But the very concept of a labor shortage is a sophistry that has no place in free-market economics. Economics teaches that in a free market there are never shortages of anything, only things whose price, as set by supply and demand, is higher than some person wishes to pay. There is not a technical job in America that could not be filled with an American citizen if the employer were willing to pay the right price. The fact that the company in question "cannot fill" the position is merely a function of their desire to set an arbitrary price that they feel like paying. This is not the way of the market, and frankly it is a form of corporate decadence for them to go running to the government for a subsidy in the form of cheap foreign workers.

Neg Defense - H1B does not solve recessions

H1B increases in response to recessions are always too late due to lack of predictive ability. This results in heavily pent up demand for visas

Migration Policy Institute 9 [Immigrants and the Current Economic Crisis: Research Evidence, Policy Challenges, and Implications 2009, www.migrationpolicy.org/pubs/lmi\_recessionJan09.pdf]

Pent up demand for employment-sponsored visas means that actual lower admissions in these categories are not anticipated in the immediate future. Although they are designed to respond to labor needs, employment-based admissions do not appear to respond to business cycle fluctuations. DHS admissions from the two most recent recessions are clear on this point. This trend is the result of pent up demand for employment-sponsored visas and the relatively short duration o these recessions. Whenever there are more applicants for a visa category than there are available visas, the category becomes oversubscribed and immigrant visas are issued in the chronological order in which the petitions were filed until the annual numerical limit for the category is reached. Each month the State Department publishes the filing dates of petitions currently being processed. As of December 8, 2008, the State Department was processing visas for skilled employment based visas (second and third preference) filed between October 15, 2001 and May 1 2005 depending upon the nationality of the applicant. Even if new demand for employer-sponsored visas falls, pent up demand will likely continue to drive employment based immigration in the short term

**\*\*Aff Answers – Employment Visas\*\***

**Link Turn – H1-B visas cause economic expansion**

**Preventing companies from hiring foreign workers through H-1B visas harms the US economy by not allowing it to adapt. Any expansion would prove to be net beneficial.**

Bharat Observer 9 (Bharat Observer “Restricting H-1B visas is bad for business and the economy” May 15, 2009 Friday) TKK

'In order to grow the American economy and support the American workforce, Congress should expand and improve the H-1B visa programme,' said James Sherk and Diem Nguyen Thursday. As adding regulations to the H-1B programme would be a serious setback to US visa policy and would only end up hurting the US economy, the Congress should instead raise the cap from the current 65,000 to the 2001 quota of 195,000 visas a year, they said. Sherk is fellow in labour policy and Nguyen is a research assistant for foreign policy studies at The Heritage Foundation, a Washington think tank. Referring to reports that two senators, Republican Chuck Grassley and Democrat Dick Durbin plan to introduce a bill that would limit the ability of companies to hire H-1B employees, the experts said an argument that H-1B visa recipients are a threat to American workers is 'misguided.' 'Given the current economic climate, handcuffing employers from hiring talented workers will hurt-not help-the economy, further delaying the ability of businesses to restart the national economic engine,' Sherk and Nguyen said. Many believe H-1B workers merely compete with Americans looking for work, the duo said. But 'They are wrong. The US workforce is not a 'zero-sum game, " they said. 'One hired H-1B worker does not mean an American is out of a job. In fact, the National Foundation for American Policy found that employers hired four new American workers for each new H-1B employee they hire.' Additionally, hiring H-1B employees does not lower the wages of American workers. Current law requires that when employers apply for H-1B visas, they must attest that they will pay the visa recipient the same wage they would pay an American with similar skill sets. Rather than limiting the ability of employers to hire H-1B workers by adding more rules and restrictions, Congress should ensure the federal government exercises appropriate oversight in enforcing current laws, Sherk and Nguyen said. Preventing companies from hiring foreign workers harms the US economy's ability to rapidly adapt to marketplace demands, they said suggesting, 'Companies must be able to hire persons best suited to fill positions based on their skill sets-not their nationality.'Published by HT Syndication with permission from Bharat Observer.

Link Turn – H1-B visas cause economic expansion

Visas aren’t solving the economy in the SQuo because they’re family oriented – increased worker visas would cause economic expansion

Washington Times, 10 (“Reinventing Conservatism: True conservatism best for America” Solomon Yue, Special to the Washington Times, April 7, 2010 pg 2) TKK

America does not have a legal-immigration problem. In 2009, of the 468,770 immigrant visas the U.S. government issued, 86 percent went to blood relatives of U.S. citizens. Only an infinitesimal 0.8 percent (4,000) went to financial investors, and 2.1 percent went to people with skills the U.S. economy needs.

America does have a problem with illegals, and President Obama’s **President Obama's**  -Search using:

[Biographies Plus News](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy1.lib.asu.edu/us/lnacademic/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T9848119127&returnToId=20_T9848119158&csi=8176&A=0.8932156669784558&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A0BO%23&searchTerm=President%20Obama's%20&indexType=P) News, Most Recent 60 Daysamnesty, or "path to citizenship," for them would undermine the rule of law and make it harder for jobless Americans to compete with up to an estimated 20 million newly legalized illegal aliens. As a legal immigrant who fled Communist China, I know that what makes America great is the freedom guaranteed by its Constitution, commitment to the rule of law and its ability to rejuvenate itself with the new blood of legal immigrants. In 1988, I was granted an immigrant visa based on my expertise as an international trade economist. As the party of freedom, entrepreneurship and economic growth, the Republican Party - ideally the political arm of the conservative movement - logically should support legal immigration. We also must balance the current immigration policy with a new risk-and-reward-based immigration policy. We should de-emphasize visas based on blood relationships and grant more with investment and job skills the U.S. economy needs.

Immigrant risk-takers, job creators and high-tech inventors are a boon to any economy. They probably are at least as likely as many unskilled immigrants to understand that without freedom, there is no economic growth or job creation. They almost surely will help maintain America's leadership in technological advancement and defend freedom and the fruits of their hard labor from big government's greedy reach. Like many proud unskilled immigrants, those with investment, scientific, engineering and other skills are likely to shun government's invitation to become dependent on others.

Aff Defense – H-1Bs don’t lower wages

Hiring H-1B visa employees does not hurt the wages of American workers.

Bharat Observer 9 (Bharat Observer “Restricting H-1B visas is bad for business and the economy” May 15, 2009 Friday) TKK

'In order to grow the American economy and support the American workforce, Congress should expand and improve the H-1B visa programme,' said James Sherk and Diem Nguyen Thursday. As adding regulations to the H-1B programme would be a serious setback to US visa policy and would only end up hurting the US economy, the Congress should instead raise the cap from the current 65,000 to the 2001 quota of 195,000 visas a year, they said. Sherk is fellow in labour policy and Nguyen is a research assistant for foreign policy studies at The Heritage Foundation, a Washington think tank. Referring to reports that two senators, Republican Chuck Grassley and Democrat Dick Durbin plan to introduce a bill that would limit the ability of companies to hire H-1B employees, the experts said an argument that H-1B visa recipients are a threat to American workers is 'misguided.' 'Given the current economic climate, handcuffing employers from hiring talented workers will hurt-not help-the economy, further delaying the ability of businesses to restart the national economic engine,' Sherk and Nguyen said. Many believe H-1B workers merely compete with Americans looking for work, the duo said. But 'They are wrong. The US workforce is not a 'zero-sum game, " they said. 'One hired H-1B worker does not mean an American is out of a job. In fact, the National Foundation for American Policy found that employers hired four new American workers for each new H-1B employee they hire.' Additionally, hiring H-1B employees does not lower the wages of American workers. Current law requires that when employers apply for H-1B visas, they must attest that they will pay the visa recipient the same wage they would pay an American with similar skill sets. Rather than limiting the ability of employers to hire H-1B workers by adding more rules and restrictions, Congress should ensure the federal government exercises appropriate oversight in enforcing current laws, Sherk and Nguyen said. Preventing companies from hiring foreign workers harms the US economy's ability to rapidly adapt to marketplace demands, they said suggesting, 'Companies must be able to hire persons best suited to fill positions based on their skill sets-not their nationality.'Published by HT Syndication with permission from Bharat Observer.

Aff Defense – H1-B visas don’t displace US workers

H-1B workers do not take jobs away from Americans, employers hire more Americans everytime they hire a visa worker.

Bharat Observer 9 (Bharat Observer “Restricting H-1B visas is bad for business and the economy” May 15, 2009 Friday) TKK

'In order to grow the American economy and support the American workforce, Congress should expand and improve the H-1B visa programme,' said James Sherk and Diem Nguyen Thursday. As adding regulations to the H-1B programme would be a serious setback to US visa policy and would only end up hurting the US economy, the Congress should instead raise the cap from the current 65,000 to the 2001 quota of 195,000 visas a year, they said. Sherk is fellow in labour policy and Nguyen is a research assistant for foreign policy studies at The Heritage Foundation, a Washington think tank. Referring to reports that two senators, Republican Chuck Grassley and Democrat Dick Durbin plan to introduce a bill that would limit the ability of companies to hire H-1B employees, the experts said an argument that H-1B visa recipients are a threat to American workers is 'misguided.' 'Given the current economic climate, handcuffing employers from hiring talented workers will hurt-not help-the economy, further delaying the ability of businesses to restart the national economic engine,' Sherk and Nguyen said. Many believe H-1B workers merely compete with Americans looking for work, the duo said. But 'They are wrong. The US workforce is not a 'zero-sum game, " they said. 'One hired H-1B worker does not mean an American is out of a job. In fact, the National Foundation for American Policy found that employers hired four new American workers for each new H-1B employee they hire.' Additionally, hiring H-1B employees does not lower the wages of American workers. Current law requires that when employers apply for H-1B visas, they must attest that they will pay the visa recipient the same wage they would pay an American with similar skill sets. Rather than limiting the ability of employers to hire H-1B workers by adding more rules and restrictions, Congress should ensure the federal government exercises appropriate oversight in enforcing current laws, Sherk and Nguyen said. Preventing companies from hiring foreign workers harms the US economy's ability to rapidly adapt to marketplace demands, they said suggesting, 'Companies must be able to hire persons best suited to fill positions based on their skill sets-not their nationality.'Published by HT Syndication with permission from Bharat Observer.

**\*\*H2-As, H2-Bs, H1-Cs\*\***

Link – H2-As Lower Wages

H-2A visas lock in wages driving down other employees wages and increasing over head costs

Hallstrom 6

(Luawanna – GM Coo, Harry, Singh and Sons for THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURAL EMPLOYERS AND THE AGRICULTURE COALITION FOR IMMIGRATION REFORM; 7/19/06; GUEST WORKER PROGRAMS: IMPACT ON THE AMERICAN WORKFORCE AND U.S. IMMIGRATION POLICY HEARING BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES) BHB

In order for us to survive post-9/11, we had no choice but to attempt the use of the H-2A Agriculture Guest Worker Program. We are now the largest California user of a dysfunctional 50-year-old H-2A Program, which currently supplies less than 3 percent of the U.S. seasonal agricultural workforce. The program is administratively cumbersome, it is costly, it requires farmers to wade through 33 pages of Federal regulations to try and comply with the complex requirements. We have had to hire additional staff, lawyers and consultants to keep up with the demands of the program and to protect ourselves from frivolous lawsuits. And we struggle to keep up with the spiraling adverse effect wage rate. Every year it changes on March 1. The wage rate is not market based, it does not relate to the specific job. In the area of employment, this year’s average wage hike came at a half-a-million-dollar price tag that we could have not budgeted for.

Link – H2-Bs 🡪 Job Displacement

H-2B’s hurt the economy by taking jobs away from our most vulnerable workers

NumbersUSA.com 8 (“H-2B Low-Skill, Nonimmigrant Visas”, May, 19 2008

<http://www.numbersusa.com/content/news/may-9-2008/h-2b-low-skill-nonimmigrant-visas.html>) TKK

Increasing the number of H-2B workers in the U.S. at any given time may most profoundly affect teenagers looking for summer work. According to a study out of the Center for Labor Market Studies at Northeastern University, the percentage of 16-to 19-year-olds holding jobs in the United States is the lowest it has been since the government began tracking statistics in 1948. The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that the rolls of millions of unemployed Americans include a disproportionate number of workers who do not have a high school diploma. Official unemployment rates for Americans without a diploma are nearly twice as high as for other Americans. In light of this, it is clear that increasing the number of low-skill, seasonal, foreign workers (H-2B workers) will most profoundly harm our most vulnerable workers.

Policies that increase the number of H-2B visas hurt the US taxpayer and their job markets

Lofgren 8

(“Rep. Zoe Lofgren holds a hearing on the H-2B visa program”, Subcommittee on immigration, citizenship, refugees, border security, and international law, April 16, 2008) TKK

Immigrants represent a substantial share of poorly educated persons in the U.S. While 9 percent of native-born adults lack a high school degree, the figure is 34 percent for legal immigrants, and roughly 60 (ph) percent for illegal aliens. Nearly a third of all immigrant households are headed by persons without a high school degree. Policies that would substantially increase the number of low-skilled immigrants entering the U.S. would significantly raise costs on the U.S. taxpayer. Because of all these reasons and the fact that there are currently 69 million working-age Americans currently not working in the United States -- they're simply not in the workforce, according to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics -- I oppose expanding H-2B visa programs. Speaker Pelosi and many Democrats are advocating extending unemployment benefits because the job market is so bad. How can Democrats argue at the same time that Americans don't have enough jobs, but that we need more foreign workers? I'm looking forward to the answers to these questions during our hearing today, along with the testimony of the witnesses.

Link – H2-Bs 🡪 Job Displacement

Policies that increase H-2B’s, rely on the flawed assumption that unemployed Americans wouldn’t take the jobs available, and hurt the American job market

Francis 10

(“Don’t let immigrants take US jobs; Short-term positions filled through immigration should be utilized by Americans”, David R. Francis, The Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 2, 2010) TKK

About 15 million Americans are unemployed. Yet Washington allows businesses to bring in about 1 million foreigners a year to take supposedly short-term jobs that many jobless would leap at taking if they could. It's a "ridiculous" situation, says Mark Krikorian, executive director of the Center for Immigration Studies (CIS), a Washington think tank that generally urges a lower level of immigration into the United States. This year, the H-2B program alone will let more than 100,000 lower-skilled foreign workers come to the US as "temporary, seasonal, nonagricultural guest workers." Businesses like the program because the foreigners, who need the jobs in order to stay in the US, "shut up and do what they are told," says Mr. Krikorian. But H-2B operates under a flawed assumption, says David Seminara, a former US Foreign Service officer and author of a CIS study on the program. The flawed assumption is that "Americans don't want to mow your lawn. They don't want to serve you your lobster roll sandwich during your summer holiday in Maine. They won't drive the trucks that bring food to the grocery store." In fact, many Americans would welcome such jobs.

Link – H2-Bs 🡪 Lower Wages

The H-2B program hurts union wages, and those it was originally meant to help

The Economist 10 (“Invisible hands; Immigration Law”, The Economist, April 17, 2010) TKK

Like much of America's rickety immigration system, the H-2B programme draws scorn from all sides. Companies in such industries as forestry and fisheries depend heavily on guest workers. But since 1990 the H-2B has been capped at a paltry 66,000 a year. Even with exemptions for workers who extend their visas, that cap has been hit every year but one. In 2008 American companies requested nearly 294,000 H-2Bs. Unions, for their part, fret that guest workers take jobs from willing Americans, as well as driving down wages and benefits. And immigrant-rights advocates point to the potential for abuse inherent in the programme. Although temporary agricultural workers are guaranteed housing, travel expenses, firm hours of work and access to lawyers, H-2B visa-holders are promised only prevailing local wages. Their visas are tied to their jobs, which deters complaint.

Link Turn – H2-B Helps Economy

H-2B has fueled the Economy

Yasseri 9 (Sanam Yasseri, Southwestern Journal of International Law, 2009 Southwestern Law School) TKK

Employer reliance on this temporary workforce impacts every U.S. consumer. H-2B guest workers build our homes, clean our hotels, and work in our factories. They fill jobs that fuel our economy. They raise the productivity of businesses, allowing U.S. corporations to reap enormous profits. In the past, many employers relied on students and other low-wage earners to perform seasonal and temporary work. [n67](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy1.lib.asu.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1280707033387&returnToKey=20_T9851917115&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.593217.2099285172" \l "n67#n67) Today, employers still spend tens of thousands of dollars and  [\*369]  considerable time in developing aggressive recruiting campaigns to hire Americans for short-term jobs. [n68](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy1.lib.asu.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1280707033387&returnToKey=20_T9851917115&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.593217.2099285172" \l "n68#n68) However, the number of Americans willing to work in these temporary and seasonal positions has drastically declined. [n69](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy1.lib.asu.edu/us/lnacademic/frame.do?reloadEntirePage=true&rand=1280707033387&returnToKey=20_T9851917115&parent=docview&target=results_DocumentContent&tokenKey=rsh-20.593217.2099285172" \l "n69#n69) Therefore, the H-2B program has become critical in preserving the flow of low-skilled labor to American businesses. While the program has greatly benefited U.S. employers and fueled the economy, it has disadvantaged migrant workers by denying them a mechanism to effectively enforce their workplace rights and limit employer exploitation.

No Link – H-1Cs don’t affect Economy

**AT H-1C affects the economy**

**U.S. Department of Labor 2010**

<https://www.dol.gov/federalregister/HtmlDisplay.aspx?DocId=23584&AgencyId=15&DocumentType=2>

The statute giving rise to **the H-1C program**, moreover, **mandates the introduction of no more than 500 nurses per year** (for 3 years, ending in December 2009) through the program. **Collectively, the changes made by this Final Rule will not have an annual effect on the economy** of $100 million or more **or adversely affect in any material way the economy, a sector of the economy, productivity, jobs, the environment, public health or safety, or State, local, or tribal governments or communities.** Therefore, the Department has concluded that **this Final  Rule is not economically significant.** The Department anticipates that the **changes in this Final Rule would have little to no net direct impact on employers, above and beyond the baseline** of the current costs required by the program as it is currently implemented.

**H-1C visas don’t exist currently**

**Shapiro 2010**

Ronald Shapiro Law Group, Saturday, July 31, 2010 <http://www.ronaldshapiro.com/foreign-nurse-visas>

|  |
| --- |
| **The shortage of qualified nurses in many regions of the United States led to the creation of the H-1C visa for medical professionals. This program,** which **expired in December of 2009,** is presently being reviewed by the U.S. Congress for the purpose of being reinstated.  |

\*\*Which Internal Link Is Best?\*\*

I/L – Reducing the Deficit Bad

**Premature ending Deficit spending leads to econ collapse**

**Froomkin 2010**

Dan, Huffington Post Online, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/01/23/7-things-about-the-econom\_n\_433688.html

In Washington salons and newsrooms, you are not considered a serious person unless you are very, very worried about the deficit. **The principle that reducing the deficit is of the greatest urgency** (and must come at the cost of entitlements) **is for some reason firmly lodged in the halls of power in Washington. An example of just how uncontroversial deficit hawkery is among Washington's elite** **was** provided by The Washington Post [earlier this month](http://www.nytimes.com/2010/01/06/business/media/06post.html) **when it** **supported** and apparently didn't think twice about turning over its news columns to an organization funded by Peter G. Peterson, the billionaire investment banker on **a crusade to reduce the deficit by looting Social Security.** But **deficit hawkery right now is not just ludicrous, it's dangerous.** As New York Times columnist [Paul Krugman](http://www.nytimes.com/2010/01/04/opinion/04krugman.html) noted recently, "**the calls we're already hearing for an end to stimulus, for reversing the steps the government and the Federal Reserve took to prop up the economy, will grow even louder.**" He adds: **But if those calls are heeded, we'll be repeating the great mistake of 1937, when the Fed and the Roosevelt administration decided that the Great Depression was over, that it was time for the economy to throw away its crutches. Spending was cut back, monetary policy was tightened -- and the economy promptly plunged back into the depths.**

**Economy is not sustainable without regulatory reforms, making collapse inevitable
Froomkin 2010**

Dan, Huffington Post Online, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/01/23/7-things-about-the-econom\_n\_433688.html

Back in March, Obama [described modern Wall Street](http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/washington/2009/03/obama-text.html) as a "house of cards" and a "Ponzi scheme" in which "a relatively few do spectacularly well while the middle class loses ground." In his [major speech](http://www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/Remarks-by-the-President-on-the-Economy-at-Georgetown-University/) on the economy in April, the president proclaimed that "we cannot go back to the bubble-and-bust economy that led us to this point." He continued: **It is simply not sustainable to have a 21st-century financial system that is governed by 20th-century rules and regulations that allowed the recklessness of a few to threaten the entire economy.** **It is not sustainable to have an economy where in one year, 40 percent of our corporate profits came from a financial sector that was based on inflated home prices, maxed-out credit cards, over-leveraged banks and overvalued assets.** It's not sustainable to have an economy where the incomes of the top 1 percent has skyrocketed while the typical working household has seen their incomes decline by nearly $2,000. **That's just not a sustainable model for long-term prosperity.** He was right. He even used powerful biblical imagery from Jesus's Sermon on the Mount to liken the boom-and-bust economy he inherited to a house built on sand and the future U.S. economy he is working toward to one built on a rock, that could weather a storm. **But the big banks, with their enormous political clout, appear to be managing to duck the re-regulation that seemed inevitable a year ago -- and they are now in fact more powerful than ever.** **The ultimate litmus test is that the banks that are "too big to fail," rather than being broken up, are now making huge profits -- and paying astronomical bonuses -- based on the implicit guarantee that the government will pay their debts if they ever face bankruptcy. Indeed, that government backstop gives them every reason to place riskier bets than ever.** Even Obama's latest, [much more assertive and populist](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/01/21/obama-turns-to-populist-p_n_431272.html) proposal to limit bank activities does not break up those banks -- and faces an uncertain future in our nearly paralyzed legislative branch. Economist [Simon Johnson](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/01/07/simon-johnson-the-financi_n_414662.html) (the subject of [one of Hanrahan's articles](http://www.niemanwatchdog.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=background.view&backgroundid=00415)) recently said on CNBC: The conventional wisdom is you can't have back-to-back major financial crises. I think we're going to push that, we're going to have a look and see whether that's true. And the next 12 months could really be exciting. People could be very positive, but **we are setting ourselves up for an enormous catastrophe.** Indeed. By Obama's biblical analogy, **our economy is still very much built on sand --and the next big storm might not be very far away at all.**

I/L – Consumer Spending Key

**Consumption key link to long term econ not deficit spending or confidence**

**Froomkin 2010**

Dan, Huffington Post Online, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/01/23/7-things-about-the-econom\_n\_433688.html

In an interview with [Fox News](http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2009/11/18/transcript-fox-news-interviews-president-obama/) back in November, **Obama himself raised the possibility that the economy could once again head into a tailspin, saying: I think it is important though to recognize that if we keep on adding to the debt, even in the midst of this recovery, that at some point, people could lose confidence in the US economy in a way that could actually lead to a double-dip recession.** This is the classic Wall-Street influenced worst-case scenario -- with government spending as the villain and interest rate increases as the ultimate horror, leading to doom. But **Obama may be worrying about the wrong side of the Wall Street/Main Street axis. The more likely reason the economy could tank again is because of insufficient demand. For the past decade or so, the growth of the U.S. economy was primarily fueled by the credit and housing bubbles -- which now turn out to have been illusory. So what will spur growth this time? Especially with so many Americans out of work?** Where's the demand going to come from? Citing, among other things, the likelihood that the U.S. savings rate could go markedly higher in the coming years, **Nobel laureate economist** [**Joseph Stiglitz**](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/8243019.stm) **warns that "we are not seeing a recovery of sustained consumption,"and says there is a "significant chance" of a double-dip recesssion for that reason.**

I/L – Job Creation Key

Creating High skill jobs will help boost the economy.

TECHWEB 10 (“Startup Visa Act proposed to create US jobs” Techweb, March 4, 2010) TKK

"Everywhere Dick LugarDick Lugar  -Search using: ****[Biographies Plus News](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy1.lib.asu.edu/us/lnacademic/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T9848119127&returnToId=20_T9848209025&csi=295551&A=0.15051160700989308&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE0009XOR%23&searchTerm=Dick%20Lugar%20&indexType=P) ****[News, Most Recent 60 Days](http://www.lexisnexis.com.ezproxy1.lib.asu.edu/us/lnacademic/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T9848119127&returnToId=20_T9848209025&csi=295551&A=0.15051160700989308&sourceCSI=162599&indexTerm=%23PE0009XOR%23&searchTerm=Dick%20Lugar%20&indexType=P) and I travel for the Foreign Relations Committee," said Kerry in a statement, "we see firsthand the entrepreneurial spirit driving the economies of our competitors. Creating a new magnet for innovations and innovators to come to the United States and create jobs here will offer our economy a double shot in the arm -- robust job creation at home and reaffirmation that we're the world's best place to do business."

I/L – Job Creation Key

The economy is rebounding but has slowed until jobs return

Aversa 7/30

(Jeannine - AP Economics Writer; 7/30/10; http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20100730/ap\_on\_bi\_go\_ec\_fi/us\_economy) BHB

The economy is still growing, just not by much. And until that changes, don't look for the jobs to come back. Americans spent less and businesses thought twice about restocking their shelves in the past three months, making for a sluggish spring. And the government now says the recession was a deeper hole to climb out of than previously known. The gross domestic product, the broadest measure of U.S. economic output, grew at an annual rate of 2.4 percent from April to June, down from 3.7 percent the quarter before and the weakest showing in nearly a year. Many economists say the economy is growing even more slowly now. "The economy has lost some steam," said Sung Won Sohn, an economist at California State University, Channel Islands. "Some of the pistons in the engine are sputtering, and economic momentum is slowing."

I/L- Productivity Key

Growth is a function of productivity

Saari 6

(Seppo - Dr of Science in Technology at Satakunta University of Applied Sciences; “Productivity Theory and Measurement in Business”)BHB

By help of the production function, it is possible to describe simply the mechanism of economic growth. Economic growth is a production increase achieved by an economic community. It is usually expressed as an annual growth percentage depicting (real) growth of the national product. Economic growth is created by two factors so that it is appropriate to talk about the components of growth. These components are an increase in production input and an increase in productivity.

Productivity losses impact the world economy

Tammy 9

(John - senior economic adviser to H.C. Wainwright Economics; 7/30; http://www.realclearmarkets.com/articles/2009/07/30/why\_investors\_should\_ignore\_gdp\_97333.html) BHB

The great Canadian economist Reuven Brenner has likened macroeconomic calculations to dangerous mythmaking that sustains "the illusion that prosperity is necessarily linked with territory, national units, and government spending in general." Truer words have rarely been written, particularly when we consider how very much our economic health is related to productivity outside our borders. Simplified, with the only closed economy being the world economy, our productivity accrues to individuals outside the United States, and foreign productivity similarly accrues to our own economic well-being. National economic statistics presume a war among the economically productive based on country borders, when in fact the world is an increasingly integrated economic whole.

Productivity is key to an improved standard of living

Geithner 5

(Timothy – CEO Fed Reserve; Remarks by Mr Timothy F Geithner at the Puerto Rico Bankers Association Luncheon, New York, 12 April 2005)BHB

Perhaps the most important dimension of this experience was the doubling of productivity growth, from about 1.5 percent a year in the two decades up to 1995 to more than 3 percent a year in the decade since. Productivity growth is important because it is the primary driver of long term gains in living standards. And this acceleration in the United States seems more remarkable in part because most other large mature economies experienced a slowdown in productivity growth during the same period. This doubling of productivity growth in the United States can be broken down into several important elements. One was rapid improvement in the productivity of the relatively small part of the economy that produces information technology, including computers and computer software and telecommunications equipment. Also important was very substantial growth in investment in information technology by the rest of the economy. And alongside these changes, U.S. firms became significantly more efficient in their use of equipment and labor.

I/L – Productivity Bad

Continued increases in productivity will out strip stable growth this leads to global economic collapse

Akyüz 10

(Yılmaz- Special Economic Advisor South Centre Geneva; South Centre Research Papers; MARCH 2010 “GLOBAL ECONOMIC PROSPECTS: THE RECESSION MAY BE OVER BUT WHERE NEXT?” p.20.)

Globalization has tilted the balance between labour and capital against the former. Closer integration of China and India into the global economy and the collapse of the Soviet Union have doubled the global labour force and tripled the total number of workers producing for international markets (Akyüz 2006). This, together with increased international mobility of capital and labour-market deregulation, has significantly reduced the bargaining power of workers. In almost all industrial countries productivity-adjusted real wages have been falling, resulting in falling shares of labour income in GDP. In DEEs such as China, expansion of exports of manufactures has no doubt brought some benefits to labour, as it moved them from low-productivity rural employment to higher-productivity industries. But in these countries too, industrial wages have fallen well behind the productivity growth. This means that the purchasing power of labour over the goods and services they are producing has been falling. The consequent threat of global underconsumption and deflation has so far been avoided thanks to surges in spending on consumption and property driven by asset and credit bubbles and increased household debt not only in the US, but also in a number of other AEs and DEEs, notably in Europe. This has also been associated with massive international capital flows and sharp changes in net asset positions of countries. However, this process has generated not only large global imbalances but also financial fragility and instability, leading to the most serious post-war global crisis. We now face a major dilemma. On the one hand, a return to “business as usual” so as to restore growth based on debt-driven consumption and property booms will simply mean postponing the adjustments needed for reducing trade imbalances and financial fragility, and this will inevitably result in a deeper global economic and financial crisis. On the other hand, financial consolidation and retrenchment by highly indebted consumers and deficit countries to reduce fragility could simply raise the spectre of under-consumption and global deflation, threatening growth and welfare. This trade-off between financial stability and growth exists, however, only in appearance because unless the underlying problem of under-consumption is addressed, neither financial stability nor growth may be sustained for long.

I/L – Consumer Confidence Key

**American consumers, infrastructure, and the housing market is key to the economy**

Castelllani 9 (“Recommendations for the next stimulus; A focus on the American worker”, John J. Castellani, The Washington Times, February 2, 2009) TKK

First, permanent middle-class tax relief must be a priority. American consumers are key drivers of the U.S. economy, and immediate assistance will increase American families' net incomes and bolster consumer confidence, reigniting our economic engine. Furthermore, Congress should extend federally funded unemployment benefits to help workers who have exhausted regular benefits.

Additionally, we must repair and modernize our infrastructure. Targeted infrastructure investments will help put Americans back to work in the short term, and enhance American competitiveness in the long term. In addition to physical infrastructure, we must focus this reconstructive effort on transformative investments, including uniform, interoperable health information technology, scientific research and development capabilities, and alternative, efficient energy technologies.

We must also stabilize the deteriorating housing market by reducing mortgage rates to 4.5 percent or lower. For most Americans, a home is their most significant asset, making stability of the housing market essential to improving consumer confidence. Additionally, with housing and housing-related industries accounting for more than 20 percent of U.S. GDP, calming the housing market would go a long way toward creating more American jobs.

I/L – Higher Wages Key

Minimum wage hurts the economy all economists agree

Carey 9 (W. P. Carey, “Friend or Foe: Does the Mnimum wage Hurt the Workers It’s Intended to Help?” Published November 10, 2009 in Knowledge@ W.P. Carey)

Economists rarely agree on anything, Boyes said, but when it comes to the federal minimum wage, there is near-unanimous agreement that these wage floors stunt growth, hamper businesses' ability to compete and, maybe most importantly, make it more difficult for low-wage, low-skilled workers (most especially teenagers) to find entry-level jobs. Yet despite the fact that nearly all the evidence suggests that it is a drag on the economy and a burden on American workers, the minimum wage has survived in this country (and many other Western nations) for decades. According to Boyes and others, there's almost no chance that it will ever be abolished.

**I/L – Education key to economy**

Education is an important distinction – college educated immigrants may improve the economy, but low-skilled immigrants are a fiscal drain on other taxpayers.

Rector 6 (Robert, Heritage Foundation Senior Research Fellow, May 12 2006, http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2006/05/Amnesty-and-Continued-Low-Skill-Immigration-Will-Substantially-Raise-Welfare-Costs-and-Poverty) TJN

Overall, immigration is a net fiscal positive to the government's budget in the long run: the taxes immigrants pay exceed the costs of the services they receive. However, the fiscal impact of immigrants varies strongly according to immigrants' education level. College-educated immigrants are likely to be strong contributors to the government's finances, with their taxes exceeding the government's costs. By contrast, immigrants with low education levels are likely to be a fiscal drain on other taxpayers. This is important because half of all adult illegal immigrants in the U.S. have less than a high school education. In addition, recent immigrants have high levels of out-of-wedlock childbearing, which increases welfare costs and poverty.

An increase in immigration would increase future government spending dramatically.

Rector, Kim, and Watkins 7 (Robert, Heritage Foundation Senior Research Fellow, Christine, Heritage Foundation Policy Analyst, Shanea, Heritage Expert, April 4 2007, http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2007/04/The-Fiscal-Cost-of-Low-Skill-Households-to-the-US-Taxpayer) TJN

If the low-skill households' share of interest and other financial obligations for past activities is added, the total annual fiscal deficit of these households rose to $483 billion. Over the next ten years, the constant dollar net cost of low-skill households (immediate benefits received minus taxes paid) is likely to be at least $3.9 trillion. Policy changes that would expand entitlement programs such as Medicaid will increase these costs at the margin. On the other hand, changes in immigration law that would significantly increase the inflow of low-skill workers and families will increase future government spending dramatically.

An increase of low skill immigrant workers receiving services would increase the deficit and burden taxpayers.

Rector, Kim, and Watkins 7 (Robert, Heritage Foundation Senior Research Fellow, Christine, Heritage Foundation Policy Analyst, Shanea, Heritage Expert, April 4 2007, http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2007/04/The-Fiscal-Cost-of-Low-Skill-Households-to-the-US-Taxpayer) TJN

Changes to immigration policy could have a much larger effect on the fiscal deficits generated by low-skill fam­ilies. Policies which would substantially increase the inflow of low-skill immigrant workers receiving services would dramatically increase the fiscal deficits described in this paper and impose substantial costs on U.S. taxpayers.

Unskilled laborers are often times an economic loss.

Cox 6 (Stephen, editor of Liberty magazine and professor of literature at the University of California San Diego, October 1 2006, Liberty, Opposing Viewpoints) TJN

Do we have to choose the kind of workers who should be invited in? Yes, we do. I will return to that theme. Before doing so, I want to examine another issue that proponents of open borders usually don't want to think about: the net contributions of unskilled laborers to the *actual* American economy. **Despite all the talk about the economic contributions of unskilled labor, few unskilled immigrants contribute anything equal to what they extract from the unwill**ing taxpayer**.**  I'm not saying this simply because illegal immigrants generally avoid paying income taxes. Imagine an unskilled laborer who has come here legally, just as proponents of open borders wish that all unskilled laborers could do. Let's say he makes $15,000 a year—an income that is above the minimum wage, an income that is quite good enough to draw millions of people here from almost anywhere in the world, provided we had open borders. And let's say that his wife works too (part time, because of the kids) and makes $10,000 a year. That $25,000 is the value they contribute to the American economy. Out of it, they pay maybe $1,200 in sales taxes, $500 in the property taxes that are included in their rent, $1,900 in Social Security payments, and zip in income taxes. (Whatever taxes are extracted from their checks, they get back in refunds. Actually, because of tax subsidies to poor people, they will probably get back a good deal more than they pay in, but to be extra-fair I won't pause to calculate that.) Of course, the Social Security contributions are not invested and will never earn enough to pay the total cost of the couple's retirement benefits; other taxpayers will have to do that. In this respect, the couple is already a serious economic loss. The scale of that loss will appear when they retire. Other losses are happening right now. Because of their low income, man and wife are eligible for innumerable welfare programs—from subsidized housing to medical assistance (if they don't have adequate private insurance, which they won't) to free legal aid to disaster aid if a storm comes through. Any physical disability may result in hundreds of thousands of dollars in bills to other taxpayers. Whenever the couple have a child, that's $10,000 at the county hospital. Afterwards, it's probably $5,000 a year for a government-financed preschool, then $10,000 a year (the approximate national average) in government funds for K-12 education.

I/L – Employment Key

Employment is good for the economy because of its potential to reduce poverty

Hull 9 [Katy, Staff writer for Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2009,

www.oecd.org/dataoecd/27/7/43280288.pdf

Whether they are subsistence farmers, salaried workers, or self-employed entrepreneurs, poor people derive most of their income from work. This basic fact means that the level of employment, the quality of jobs, and the access which the poor have to decent earnings opportunities will be crucial determinants of poverty reduction. The intuition that jobs matter for development has not been lost on the governments of low income countries and the vast majority of national development strategies look to employment generation as a major channel for poverty reduction.

I/L – Employment Key

Unemployment means that no one spends – this kills growth

Faux 10

(Jeff – Founder Economic Policy Institute; 7/7/10; http://www.epi.org/analysis\_and\_opinion/entry/myths\_about\_the\_federal\_budget\_deficit/) BHB

The assumptions upon which the administration bases it ten year budget projections show the unemployment rate remaining over 9 percent next year. By 2014 it's still at 6 percent, leaving some 3 million more people out of work than before the current crisis began. In 2020, assuming ten years of steady economic growth without another recession, the unemployment rate is still expected to be higher than it was in 2007. Every administration wants to show an upbeat future, so if anything these numbers are optimistic. (Goldman-Sachs and other private forecasters say the jobless rate will actually rise in 2011.) Moreover, these figures appear inconsistent. For example, they assume that recovery will be driven by consumer spending. But in an era of prolonged unemployment and depressed wages, consumers can only spend significantly more by going further into debt. Yet, at the same time, the CBO/OMB models tell us that interest rates will rise, which, as economist Jamie Galbraith has noted, will generate explosive deficits in the future.

Employment is key to generating spending this is the key internal link to the economy

Money Morning 10

(Investment Magazine; 7/4; http://www.marketoracle.co.uk/Article20836.html)

Don Miller writes: Unemployment figures released Friday confirmed that the U.S. economy is still recovering, but they also showed it will take years to replace the 8 million jobs lost during the Great Recession. And until meaningful hiring takes place, consumers are unlikely to loosen their purse strings, the key to putting the economy back on track to full recovery.

Unemployment stops all recovery

AP 8/1

(Associated Press; 8/1/10; http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/38512512/ns/business-stocks\_and\_economy/)

Former Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan says he thinks the economy is having a modest recovery, but right now there's a "pause" in that recovery, so it feels like a "quasi-recession." Greenspan says long-term unemployment is pulling the economy apart even though large banks are doing much better and large companies are in excellent shape. Greenspan predicts that unemployment will remain where it is, hovering around 9.5 percent, for the rest of the year.

I/L – Job Creation Key

Jobs are key to the economy

Castelllani 9 (“Recommendations for the next stimulus; A focus on the American worker”, John J. Castellani, The Washington Times, February 2, 2009) TKK

We are facing one of the most difficult periods in the history of the United States' economy. With approximately 2.6 million jobs lost in the last year - nearly 2 million in just the past four months - many American workers began 2009 with greater financial woes than they've ever had. The close of 2008 saw a record number of emergency economic recovery proposals and rescue plans for our financial institutions, the automotive industry and insurance companies. This crucial support was key to preventing even larger economic declines. As we enter 2009, it's time for a renewed focus on American workers, the backbone of the U.S. economy. We need decisive, bipartisan action to return our economy to a path for growth, full employment and an enhanced standard of living for all Americans.

We need to act immediately, but we must also act prudently. New legislation must focus on job creation and investments that will transform our nation's ability to compete in the international economy. We must ensure emergency action includes provisions that address several critical areas.

\*\*Link Defense\*\*

Neg Defense – AT 2009 Council on Foreign Relations Study

The ’09 CFR study is flawed – amnesty would be costly.

McNeil 9 (Jena, homeland security policy analyst at The Heritage Foundation, July 13 2009, http://blog.heritage.org/?p=10537) TJN

On July 8, 2009, the Council on Foreign Relations Independent Task Force on U.S. Immigration Policy, chaired by Jeb Bush and Mack McLarty, released a report which attempts to give a solution to America’s immigration problem. The report starts off well, emphasizing that immigration has been positive for America and citing the need for more legal immigration avenues and a market based temporary worker program. But then it dovetails, recommending legalization of those illegal immigrants living in the United States. Legalization is a fancy term for an amnesty. We gave amnesty in 1986—and it did nothing to solve the problem. More and more folks saw an incentive to come here illegally, and they did, in droves. The number of illegal immigrants in the U.S. was around 11 million in 2008. While the economy has certainly decreased the numbers here illegally, the fact is that millions remain, and the numbers will increase when the economic gets better (even the CFR report confirms this is true). For its part, the report addresses 1986 head-on. It claims that 2009 would be different. That this isn’t 1986, because we have more stuff at the border designed to keep people out. But the problem is, border security isn’t enough to stop illegal immigration. In fact, many of the illegal immigrants in the U.S. are overstays—those who came to the U.S. on a legal visa and just stay here permanently. Having Border Patrol agents on the Southwest border won’t do anything to stop those folks. And the worst decision would be to dampen legal immigration in an effort to stop illegal. So what should America do? It’s obviously not something we should ignore—Heritage and the report both agree on that. But the comprehensive approach advocated by the report just always winds up meaning an amnesty. A better approach would be to secure the border, enforce the law here in the United States to ensure that people return home, open up legal avenues of immigration, and provide a market-based temporary worker program. Proponents of amnesty always try to paint immigration as a choice between a costly amnesty and the forced deportation of each and every illegal immigrant in the U.S. This approach is deeply flawed. The better solution is to rely on law enforcement and market forces to stop undocumented labor while supporting legitimate opportunities for immigrants to come here. This report is not the first to tout legalization, and it probably won’t be the last. And while its ‘bi-partisan’ nature is certainly attractive, it doesn’t make legalization anymore than a costly amnesty.

Neg Defense – AT – Center for American Progress Study

The Center for American Progress study is flawed – there are multiple reasons why amnesty would not be an economic stimulus.

McNeil 10 (Jena, homeland security policy analyst at The Heritage Foundation, July 23 2010, http://blog.heritage.org/?p=23300) TJN

Ever since President Barack Obama made a campaign promise to move forward with comprehensive immigration reform early in his presidency, there has been a series of studies aimed at making the economic case for another amnesty. The newest, a study by the Center for American Progress (CAP), claims that legalizing the 11 million illegal immigrants inside the United States would increase GDP by at least $1.5 trillion over 10 years. Touting amnesty as an economic stimulus is weak on several points. First, these studies almost across the board assume that legalized individuals will contribute more than the taxpayer dollars they receive. The Heritage Foundation, however, has found that illegal immigrants take in $32,138 in immediate benefits and services for every $9,686 in taxes they pay out. This scenario is likely to worsen as these individuals become eligible for government benefits only permitted to legal residents of the United States. This is largely because immigrants are disproportionately low-skilled (even the CAP report recognizes this fact), and low-skilled workers draw more heavily on government welfare and income maintenance services than higher skilled workers. The report, of course, rests on the idea that these individuals, once legalized will quickly learn English, obtain an education, and move about the economy in a way that will make them, and therefore all taxpayers, significantly better off. This economic story, however, involves in a lot of public outlays. First, it assumes that legalization will lead immigrants to obtain more education, thus improving their earning potential and their contributions to overall economic activity. However, publicly supported adult education is expensive and provides limited improvements in earnings. Second, low-skilled workers do help increase the productivity of higher skilled workers, but demand for these workers is limited by the growth of higher skilled employment and lower skilled workers tend to displace other lower skilled workers. In short, the public investment in low-skilled workers is high and their value is dependent on what happens to the growth in higher skilled employment. This isn’t to say that immigrants can never make a better life for themselves. And in fact, immigrants do contribute to the economy. But when you subtract the high cost from the likely economic contribution, there is little about this scenario that would be an economic stimulus. Another issue that these studies often leave out is that history demonstrates that another amnesty will encourage more people to come here illegally. It happened after the 1986 amnesty. In that instance, 3 million people were legalized on the premise that there would be robust immigration enforcement to stop more people from coming. The U.S. failed to provide this promised enforcement, and millions more came here illegally. A better approach would be to make illegal immigration a less attractive choice, concentrating on enforcement while looking for avenues to bring people here legally that are both market based and don’t encourage more illegal immigration. The report tries to downplay a focus on enforcement as ineffective. But when the Bush Administration started enforcing the law at the border and inside the U.S., people started going home.

Neg Defense – Plan doesn’t raise wage floor

Immigrants are the last group to get hired – they get the low wage jobs

Hossain 09

(Mahmood Phd Candidate Wichita State; Immigration and its Impacts on the Wage Gap in the United States; p. 26) BHB

The Job and Gender Queue theories show that many employers now would “prefer to hire white males followed by white females, nonwhite females and nonwhite males” (Bisping & Fain, 2000. P 126). If there is an unforeseeable event that occurs in the grouping of a particular order, the unemployment rate increases for one particular group. One example is that if there is a huge increase in the white male unemployment rate then there would be a ripple effect across the entire job queue (Bisping & Fain, 2000). This means that with more white males who are unemployed, the white females would have to wait much longer for a job thus also increasing their unemployment rate. In the same vein, if there are more employed white males and females who are unemployed, non white males would have a much greater problem in finding a suitable job and it is the same for the non white females. This can be regarded in terms of immigrants such that immigrants would the last choice for employers to hire. This is partly due to prospective employees refusing to work at the work place because several factors such as working conditions and wages paid. Since most immigrants are willing to work the lower paid jobs it can be inferred that employers are able to fulfill any positions that are open at lower pay.

Generic Defense – Can’t Solve All I/Ls to Economy

**Can't access all seven internal links to solve the economy—structural factors that outweigh**

**Froomkin 2010**

Dan, Huffington Post Online, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/01/23/7-things-about-the-econom\_n\_433688.html

An [extraordinary series](http://www.niemanwatchdog.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=home.topics&topic=2CCFE105-E740-134C-4EDF12478427F881) of articles recently appeared on the [Nieman Watchdog Web](http://www.niemanwatchdog.org/index.cfm) site, anchored by investigative reporter John Hanrahan and mostly based on interviews with some of the nation's most perceptive, prescient and prophetic economists. The series laid out **a broad landscape of economic issues** that **have been largely overlooked during the reporting of the nation's economic collapse -- to our great peril.** Hanrahan's articles explore key elements of the story that reporters should have been -- and should still be -- writing about. **Among them: The** [**endemic fraud**](http://www.niemanwatchdog.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=background.view&backgroundid=00404) **at the heart of the collapse, the resultant need for a** [**comprehensive dissection**](http://www.niemanwatchdog.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=background.view&backgroundid=00415) **of some key financial institutions, how the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan have** [**weakened the economy**](http://www.niemanwatchdog.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=background.view&backgroundid=00417)**, the dramatic effects of the crash on** [**domestic poverty**](http://www.niemanwatchdog.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=background.view&backgroundid=00422) **and** [**world poverty**](http://www.niemanwatchdog.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=background.view&backgroundid=00419)**, and underlying it all, the critically important role of government spending in a recovery, be it through a** [**second stimulus**](http://www.niemanwatchdog.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=background.view&backgroundid=00400) **or** [**expanded entitlements**](http://www.niemanwatchdog.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=background.view&backgroundid=00397) **or jobs programs, all of which requires that** [**deficits**](http://www.niemanwatchdog.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=background.view&backgroundid=00401) **be seen, for the short run at least, as the solution, not the problem.**As a coda to Hanrahan's series, here is a list of seven things all of us should be more alarmed by than we currently are, going forward. A common theme underlying them all is that while our leaders -- and the voices of conventional wisdom -- treat our current recession as cyclical in nature, and are essentially mostly just waiting around for growth to pick up again, there is plenty of reason to believe **that this crisis was instead an expression of structural problems. And if that is so, and we don't take the proper action, then the wait could be a long one.**

Generic Defense – Can’t Solve Consumer Confidence

**Middle class will never be the same, confidence, housing, and savings prove**

**Froomkin 2010**

Dan, Huffington Post Online, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/01/23/7-things-about-the-econom\_n\_433688.html

**The full effects of the crash of 2007-2008 on the lives of regular Americans has yet to be fully appreciated. For most members of the middle class, their sense of financial well-being was largely based on the size of their 401(k)s and their equity as homeowners. After the collapse of stock prices and with the steep drop in home prices, many may never** **feel the same way again, or spend their money as confidently.**While 401(k)s have somewhat bounced back, about o**ne in four homeowners now actually have negative equity** -- are "underwater". A recent study by [Barry P. Bosworth and Rosanna Smart](http://www.brookings.edu/papers/2009/1118_wealth_bosworth.aspx?rssid=bosworthb) for Brookings finds that **American households lost $13 trillion in wealth between mid-2007 and March 2009,** or about 15 percent in all. That decline badly hit baby boomers just as they're headed into retirement. And **middle-income families whose head is age 50 or younger actually have smaller net incomes today than in 1983.** Meanwhile, many American families spent much of the last decade (or two) living beyond their means, piling up debt on their credit cards, or "bubble borrowing." [Two University of Chicago researchers](http://blogs.wsj.com/economics/2009/06/25/guest-contribution-housing-bubble-fueled-consumer-spending/) have found that the housing bubble hugely increased household consumption as homeowners borrowed on average $0.25 to $0.30 for every $1 increase on their home equity. Now that housing prices have crashed and credit is tight, the inevitable result, Atif Mian and Amir Sufi write somewhat euphemistically, is a "painful process of household de-leveraging."

Generic Defense – Can’t Solve – No Middle Class

**Wealth stratification has destroyed the middle class, who have no financial security anymore**

**Froomkin 2010**

Dan, Huffington Post Online, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/01/23/7-things-about-the-econom\_n\_433688.html

Harvard Professor [Elizabeth Warren](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/elizabeth-warren/america-without-a-middle_b_377829.html), an emerging hero among progressives in her role as chair of the congressional bailout oversight panel, sees the latest series of blows as the unfortunate culmination of a crisis that started taking form a generation ago. **For long stretches of time, the growth in the nation's GDP has gone almost entirely to the top 1% or less of the population. That has resulted in a dramatic shift in wealth away from the middle class, made the economy more vulnerable to disaster and made the toll of such a disaster more catastrophic to all but the wealthiest Americans.** Warren writes: **America today has plenty of rich and super-rich. But it has far more families who did all the right things, but who still have no real security. Going to college and finding a good job no longer guarantee economic safety. Paying for a child's education and setting aside enough for a decent retirement have become distant dreams.** Tens of millions of once-secure middle class families now live paycheck to paycheck, watching as their debts pile up and worrying about whether a pink slip or a bad diagnosis will send them hurtling over an economic cliff. She concludes: "America without a strong middle class? Unthinkable, but the once-solid foundation is shaking."

Generic Defense – Wage Decreases Irrelevant

Even if immigrants hurt workers wages they still help the annual income of the US economy

Hanson 7 (Gordon H. Hanson “The Economic Logic of Illegal Immigration” CSR NO. 26, April 2007 Council on Foreign Relations pg 19-20)

Immigration generates extra income for the U.S. economy, even as it pushes down wages for some workers. By increasing the supply of labor, immigration raises the productivity of resources that are complementary to labor. More workers allow U.S. capital, land, and natural resources to be exploited more efficiently. Increasing the supply of labor to perishable fruits and vegetables, for instance, means that each acre of land under cultivation generates more output. Similarly, an expansion in the number of manufacturing workers allows the existing industrial base to produce more goods. The gain in productivity yields extra income for U.S. businesses, which is termed the immigration surplus. The annual immigration surplus in the United States appears to be small, equal to about 0.2 percent of GDP in 2004.33

Generic Defense – Temporary Workers don’t fill jobs

There is no shortfall of workers in essential industries – a guest worker program doesn’t make economic sense.

Malanga 6 (Steven, Manhattan Institute Senior Fellow, July 23 2006, http://www.manhattan-institute.org/html/\_chicsuntimes-why\_unskilled\_immigrants.htm) TJN

Despite our cherished view of immigrants as rapidly climbing the economic ladder, new arrivals and their children face a lifetime of economic disadvantage, because they arrive here with shortcomings not easily overcome. Mexican immigrants, who are up to six times more likely to be high school dropouts than native-born Americans, not only earn substantially less than the native-born median, but the wage gap persists for decades after they've arrived. A study of the 2000 census data, for instance, shows that the cohort of Mexican immigrants between 25 and 34 who entered the United States in the late 1970s were earning 40 to 50 percent less than native-born Americans in that age group in 1980, but 20 years later they had fallen even further behind their native-born counterparts. Given these realities, several of the major immigration reforms now under consideration simply don't make economic sense -- especially the guest-worker program favored by President Bush and the U.S. Senate. Careful economic research tells us that there is no significant shortfall of workers in essential American industries desperately needing supplement from a massive guest-worker program.

Turn – Recession hurts immigrants

**Immigrants are more vulnerable to economic downturns due to lack of available public services**

Migration Policy Institute 9 [Immigrants and the Current Economic Crisis: Research Evidence, Policy Challenges, and Implications 2009, www.migrationpolicy.org/pubs/lmi\_recessionJan09.pdf]

Beyond demographic and labor force characteristics, public policies may also make migrants more likely to feel the effects of downturns much more deeply than other populations. Since the implementation of 1996 welfare law, known as the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act (PRWORA), many legal immigrants who are not citizens and have been in the United States for less than five years are exclude from access to major federal public benefit programs, such as cash welfare and food stamps, which are important sources of support during periods of job loss, underemployment, or other economic hardship. Some states, including California, New York, Texas, Florida, Illinois, and new Jersey have restored state-based coverage to these recent legal immigrants although collapsing tax revenues have spread the economic pain throughout the country and state governments are scrambling to cover ever widening deficits. This new fiscal reality in most states makes immigrants who lose their jobs particularly vulnerable regardless of whether a state has formally restored benefits to them or not. Except for a specified group of emergency services, unauthorized immigrants are generally ineligible for federal benefits and services. For instance, unauthorized immigrants are ineligible for unemployment insurance, the Earned Income Tax Credit, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, food stamps and Medicaid. Overall, public benefits permit low-wage natives and naturalized citizens to survive periodic economic downturns by providing a stable source of emergency income. For low-skilled noncitizens without access to these public benefits, periodic or even just short-term unemployment can lead to greater economic hardship.

\*\*Economic Growth Bad\*\*

Impacts- Econ Bad- Extinction

Economic growth causes extinction

Nadeau 95 (“spaceship earth Homo economicus and the Environmental Crisis”, http://docs.google.com/gview?a=v&q=cache:JQ2B0zSVoeAJ:www.earthscape.org/p3/ES15351/NADEAU\_CH\_1.pdf+nadeau\_ch\_1.pdf&hl=en&gl=us, CH)

In physics, in the years following , attempts to understand the non- linear dynamics of living systems would reveal a relationship between parts (organisms) and whole (ecosystem) in which the stability of the whole is mediated and sustained by interactions within and between the parts. In biology, the old mechanistic model of evolution as a linear pro- gression from “lower” atomized organisms to more complex atomized organisms would be displaced by a model in which all parts (organisms) exist in interdependent and interactive relation to the whole (life). In envi- ronmental science, researchers would not only discover that all parts (organisms) exist in embedded relation to the whole (ecosystem or bios- phere) and that the interactions within and between parts function as self- regulating properties of the whole. They would also reach the dire con- clusion that continued disruptions of the complex web of interactions between these parts by human economic activity could eventually threaten the survival of our species

Impacts- Econ Bad- Extinction

Economic growth destroys ability to survive- extinction

Nadeau 95 (“spaceship earth Homo economicus and the Environmental Crisis”, http://docs.google.com/gview?a=v&q=cache:JQ2B0zSVoeAJ:www.earthscape.org/p3/ES15351/NADEAU\_CH\_1.pdf+nadeau\_ch\_1.pdf&hl=en&gl=us, CH)

As E. O. Wilson points out, our species is the “greatest destroyer of life since the ten-kilometer-wide meteorite landed near the Yucatan and ended the Age of Reptiles sixty-five million years ago.”6 The claim that human impacts on the global ecological system are leading us down the path to large-scale disruptions of this system is accurate. And the infer- ence that our species, like that of the great dinosaurs, may become extinct in the process should be taken quite seriously. If the cold war is in fact over and we manage to prevent any future use of nuclear weapons, the three menacing and interrelated problems that must be resolved in the interest of human survival are overpopulation, global warming, and loss of species diversity. The following is Wilson’s overview of the population problem: The global population is precariously large, and will become much more so before peaking some time around. Humanity overall is improv- ing per capital production, health, and longevity. But it is doing so by eating up the planet’s capital, including natural resources and biological diversity millions of years old. Homo sapiens is approaching the limit of its food and water supply. Unlike any species that lived before, it is also changing the world’s atmosphere and climate, lowering and polluting water tables, shrinking forests, and spreading deserts. Most of the stress originates directly or indirectly from a handful of industrialized coun- tries. Their proven formulas for prosperity are being eagerly adopted by 12 the rest of the world. The emulation cannot be sustained, not with the same levels of consumption and waste. Even if the industrialization of developing countries is only partly successful, the environmental after- shock will dwarf the population explosion that preceded it.7 In the global human population was roughly half a billion, in our numbers had grown to two billion, and in the count was six bil-lion and increasing at the rate of each day. This exponential increase means that people born in were the first to witness a dou- bling of the human population in their own lifetime, from billion to more than six billion. The problem faced in predicting future increases in the global human population is that the estimates are extremely sen-sitive to the replacement number or the average number of children born to each woman. In each woman bore an average of chil- dren, but by that number had declined to If this number declined to, it is estimated that there would be billion people on earth in and a leveling off of the human population at billion in If the number decreased slightly to, the population would peak at billion and then decline to billion by But if the number of these births is estimates are that the global human pop- ulation would be billion in and billion in Even if the human birth rate were to decrease to one child per woman, the global human population would not peak for one or two generations. Because estimates of the number of people that can be sustained in the biosphere over an indefinite period tend to fall between five and sixteen billion, most experts agree that what is required is not merely zero population growth but negative population growth.8

Impacts- Econ Bad- War

Economic growth and an increase of resources causes conflict – history proves

Meir Kohn 5 (11-?- 5, Economic Development and the Evolution of Government in Pre-Industrial Europe, P1, Dartmouth College, Dpt of Economics, http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=866986) LE

In pre-industrial Europe, government and the economy developed together, each influencing the other. The development of each was shaped by competition. Governments competed for territory, principally by means of war. Their success depended primarily on their ability to mobilize resources. So governments that could tap the resources of thriving economies had an advantage over governments that could not. Of course, whether or not an economy thrived depended to no small extent on the nature and conduct of its government. This nexus of government, war, and economy generated a sort of cycle. A period of peace allowed economies to develop and grow. This economic growth increased the resources available to governments, enabling them to embark on military adventures. War and the means used to finance it depressed economic activity and eventually starved governments of resources. This made it impossible for them to continue fighting. Peace then returned and the economy slowly recovered. This set the scene for another cycle. Economic growth and war were both self-limiting. It is this political-economic cycle much more than the demographic-economic cycle of Malthus that has been the main obstacle to sustained economic progress.

Economic growth ensures famine through resource depletion—this will spark global resource wars.

Milbrath 89 (Lester, Professor Emeritus of Political science and Sociology at SUNY-Buffalo, Envisioning a Sustainable Society, pp. 343-344, AD: 7-6-9)

Trying to solve our nested set of ecological/economic problems only with technological fixes is like treating an organic failure with a bandage. The key difficulties, which will be ignored by that strategy are that biospheric systems will change their patterns and there will be an increasing squeeze on resources. As global human population continues to grow, and these new people demand economic growth to fulfill their needs, there will be unbearable pressure for resources. Soils will be depleted. Farmland will be gobbled up into urban settlements. Water will become scarce, more polluted, and very high priced. Forests will be depleted faster than they can regenerate. Wilderness will nearly disappear. The most easily extracted mineral deposits will be exhausted. We will search the far corners of the globe, at very high economic and environmental cost, for more minerals and possible substitutes for those that are being depleted. Fossil fuels, especially petroleum, will constantly diminish in supply and rise in price. Worst of all, biospheric systems will react to our interference by no longer working the way we have counted on. International competition for scarce mineral and fuel resources could become intense and bloody. The highly developed nations are likely to try using their money and/or military power to garner the bulk of the resources for their own use. (It is difficult to imagine that a big power would allow its supply of critical fuels or minerals to be cut off without putting up a fight.) At best, those actions will only postpone the inevitable adjustment. The poorest nations (usually those with the densest populations) will be unable to maintain even subsistence levels—they are likely to suffer widespread famine and disease. All of this frantic activity will have devastating impacts on the ecosphere. Climate change will debilitate every ecosystem and economy. Ultraviolet radiation will increase, as will acid rain and toxic poisoning of our air, soil, and water. In addition, we can expect more and more soil depletion, loss of crop land, mismanagement of water resources, oil spills, devastating accidents (Bhopal, Chernobyl), deforestation, spreading deserts, extinction of species, loss of wildlife, and air and water pollution. With disrupted biospheric systems and severe resource shortages, I cannot imagine that it will be possible to sustain growth in material throughput. We may be able to grow in nonmaterial ways (increasing knowledge, artistic output, games, and so forth), but material growth cannot continue. Our endeavor not to change will have failed to forestall change; instead, we will become victims of change.

Impacts- Econ Bad- War- Goldstein

Economic growth breeds war- best empirical evidence throughout history

Goldstein 87 (Joshua S, Poli- Sci @ MIT *, Journal of Conflict Resolution,* Vol 31, No 4, Dec. 1987, http://www.jstor.org/stable/174156 , P. 591- 92) ET

Why should an upturn in economic growth lead, about a decade later, to an upturn in great power war? My answer is based on the cost of wars. The biggest wars occur only when the core countries can afford them, which is after a sustained period of economic growth (Farrar, 1977; Vayrynen, 1983). When treasuries are full, countries will be able to wage big wars; when they are empty, countries will not wage such wars.21 Thus, when the growth of production accelerates, the war-supporting capacity of the system increases, and bigger wars ensue. Throughout history, wars have cost money. In preindustrial times, most European wars were fought by mercenaries hired by monarchs. A favorite phrase in this era was "money is the nerves of war." If the mercenaries were not paid, they would not fight-or, worse, they would turn on their masters. Braudel (1972) describes fifteenth- to seventeenthcentury European wars as moving in surges-the economy recovered from one war and was in turn drained by the next.22

High growth wars are the most frequent and largest scale

Goldstein 87 (Joshua S, Poli- Sci @ MIT*, Journal of Conflict Resolution,* Vol 31, No 4, Dec. 1987, http://www.jstor.org/stable/174156 , P. 590) ET

The lagged correlations reported here suggest a new theory of the long wave, based on a two-way causal relationship between economic and political variables. Sustained economic growth both promotes (enables) war and is disrupted by war. Figure 10 illustrates the cyclical sequence of production and war in this theory. Faster growth gives rise to increased great power war severity. Higher war severity in turn dampens long-term economic growth. Lower growth leads to less severe war, which in turn allows faster economic growth. This sequence takes roughly 50 years-one long wave-to complete. While war and economic growth are the driving variables, prices react to war, and real wages react to war and prices.

High growth wars are the most severe

Goldstein 87 (Joshua S, Poli- Sci @ MIT *, Journal of Conflict Resolution,* Vol 31, No 4, Dec. 1987, http://www.jstor.org/stable/174156 , P. 592-93) ET

This effect of economic growth on the severity of war may be augmented by a "lateral pressure" effect (North and Lagerstrom, 1971; Choucri and North, 1975; Strickland, 1982). During production upswings, the great powers grow more rapidly-heightening competition for world resources and markets, and raising the stakes for international competition and conflict. Kondratieff himself (I928/ 1984: 95) attributes the correlation of major wars with long wave upswings to a process much like lateral pressure: The upward movement in business conditions, and the growth of productive forces, cause a sharpening of the struggle for new markets-in particular, raw materials markets.. .. [This] makes for an aggravation of international political relations, an increase in the occasions for military conflicts, and military conflicts themselves. Lasswell (1935/1965: 121) likewise argues that "prosperity expands markets, intensifies contact, sharpens conflict and war."

Impacts- Econ Bad- War- Goldstein

Economic upswing is the most probable route to war

Goldstein 85 (Joshua S, Poli Sci @ MIT, *International Studies Quarterly* vol. 29, No. 4, Dec 1985, http://www.jstor.org/stable/2600380, p. 415 ) ET

There are strong theoretical reasons for long economic waves and recurring major wars to be linked with each other. Causality could potentially run in both directions. Long-term economic upswings could increase the likelihood of war through several mechanisms: (1) the expansionary upswing phase could heighten competition for markets, resources and strategic territory, raising the likelihood of international conflict and war (North and Lagerstrom, 1971); (2) long-term prosperity could support higher military expenditures, arms races, and the costs of war (Farrar, 1977); and (3) prosperity could create an aggressive, expansionist psychological mood conducive to war (Lasswell, 1935: 116-121).13 Conversely, major wars can affect the world-economy, especially prices. Heavy expenditures for war goods raise the overall level of demand, while prolonged wars often reduce the overall level of production (especially in front-line countries) due to war damage, labor shortages, blockades, etc. (Bernstein, 1940). Hence prices tend to rise, and inflation becomes globalized (even affecting neutrals) during a major war. Thompson and Zuk (1982) analyze the effect ofwars on British and US wholesale prices (1750-1938 and 1816-1977, respectively). They find a statistically significant increase in prices following the onset of major wars, and report that 'an impressive proportion of the [Kondratiefi] price upswings' can be accounted for by such wars. In addition to prices, wars may also affect other economic variables such as production, capital investment, innovation, and employment.14

Economic Upswings statistically cause wars – 71% see great power wars and correlation is even stronger

Goldstein 85 (Joshua S, Poli Sci @ MIT, *International Studies Quarterly* vol. 29, No. 4, Dec 1985, http://www.jstor.org/stable/2600380, p. 421- 423) ET

Columns 5 and 6 show the incidence ofwar years during upswings and downswings- column 5 measuring as a war year any year in which a great power war was in progress; column 6 measuring only years in which very major wars were in progress. The first measure matches the upswing/downswing pattern from 1595 on, except for two periods (1747-1761 and 1917-1939). Overall, 71 percent of the upswing years saw great power wars in progress, as compared with 50 percent of the downswing year The correlation is stronger for the incidence of very major wars (column 6). There were no wars this severe before 1595, but after 1595 the upswing/downswing pattern matches the ups and downs of war incidence with only one exception (1917-1939 slightly higher than 1893-1916). Of the upswing years, 40 percent saw very major great power war in progress, as compared with only 6 percent of the downswing years

Impacts- Econ Bad- War- Goldstein

Growth causes war to counterbalance economic superiority

Goldstein, 85 [Joshua, International studies quarterly, v29, n4, p411-444, “Kondratieff Waves as War Cycles,” jstor]

3. The 'power transition' school (Organski, 1958; Farrar, 1977 ;Organski and Kugler, 1980; Doran and Parsons, 1980; Gilpin, 1981) holds that differences in the growth and development of national capabilities lead to shifts in the relative power of the world's major nations. One nation holds the most powerful position in the international order, while rising powers (with growing capabilities) try to establish anew place for themselves in that international order. When a rising challenger has been locked out of the established order, or a leading power fears losing its position to a challenger, war may be used to change or preserve the international order. The power transition model is not explicitly cyclical, except in Doran's 'power cycle' variant, and even in that case is not linked to the economic long wave. It could, however, help to explain the tendency of major wars to recur regularly. After a major war, the international order is restructured around winners and lossers. A long period must then elapse before the losers (or new entrants) can equalize their capabilities with those of the dominant power (which emerged from the war with a head start)-even if all countries have long since recovered economically from the war.

These will be nuclear

Goldstein, 85 [Joshua, International studies quarterly, v29, n4, p411-444, “Kondratieff Waves as War Cycles,” jstor]

First, the incidence of great power war is declining-more and more 'peace' years separate the great power wars. Second, and related, the great power wars are becoming shorter. Third, however, those wars are becoming more severe-annual fatalities during war increasing more than a hundred- fold over the five centuries. Fourth (and more tentatively), the war cycle may be gradually lengthening in each successive era, from about 40 years in the first era to about 60 years in the third. The presence of nuclear weapons has continued these trends in great power war from the past five centuries-any great power wars in this era will likely be fewer, shorter and much more deadly.

Impacts- Econ Bad- War- Goldstein- Long Wave Theory Defense

Long wave theory proven- more than 10 examples

Goldstein 5 (Josh, poli sci @ MIT, *NATO Conference*, Feb 5, http://www.joshuagoldstein.com/jgkond.htm ) ET

Looking forward, moving clockwise around Figure 2, I projected that an upturn in production, marking a change from the “stagnation” quarter-cycle to the “rebirth” phase, would be the next development, perhaps starting in the mid-1990s (I would now say 1992). Specifically, the “stagnation” phase (running from 1980 to 1991) was defined as follows: “production growth is low and uneven; investment is low; war severity declines; inflation is low (or prices even decline); innovations begin rising; real wages fall.” The subsequent “rebirth” phase starting by the mid-1990s was defined thus: “production growth picks up again, investment follows; prices are low; war severity is low; innovation is high; real wages are high. During that rebirth phase, according to my theory, great-power war and military spending would continue a downward trend that I dated from the late 1970s, while inflation remained in check but production growth accelerated. Barron’s magazine in 1988 subtitled an interview, “Joshua Goldstein Looks to the Nifty ‘90s.” These projections of an upcoming phase of prosperity and peace ran counter to the short-term trends and conventional wisdom in the late 1980s. President Ronald Reagan had reversed the post-Vietnam trend by sharply increasing military spending, while “Cold War II” had replaced an earlier period of détente. These trends were “counter-cyclical,” I wrote. The idealized long wave scheme in Figure 2 was not intended to track long-wave phase timing exactly, but in fact it tracks quite well. Taking literally the timing of the sequence shown in Figure 2, we may set the “price peak” at the top to 1980 – the last firm point of reference at the time of writing in the late 1980s. The price peak indicates the end of a phase of higher inflation and, historically, a period of price deflation (as between the World Wars), or in recent times a period merely of lower inflation. At the same time, the real wage trough indicates a rising trend in real wages (which reflect inflation inversely). About twelve years into the cycle, or 1992, would be the production trough, indicating a pickup in the pace of production growth after a long sluggish period. In 1995, the investment trough marks a similar upturn in investment, and around nineteen year after the price peak, or 1999, innovations peak and begin a period of either decline or slower growth in innovation. Finally, out around 21 years into the cycle, or 2001, the war trough indicates a new upturn in military spending (historically an upturn in great-power war severity). The price trough (ending a half-cycle of low inflation) would come at “+/- 25" years, around 2005.

Long wave theory proved by 2001

Goldstein 5 (Josh, poli sci @ MIT, *NATO Conference*, Feb 5, http://www.joshuagoldstein.com/jgkond.htm ) ET

According to my long-wave sequence, sometime around 1977 should have marked the end of a war upswing period and the start of a downswing to last until roughly the turn of the century. The interesting thing about the projection in the late 1980s is that U.S. military spending had recently reversed a long trend of decline and risen somewhat (even as a percent of a rising GDP). The long-wave model projected a renewed downward trend, and that is what actually occurred (Figure 3). In terms of U.S. military spending, however, the 1977 date would seem somewhat late. (The 1940-80 war upswing has always been problematical in my scheme because of the huge war right at the start). In terms of long-wave timing, the new upturn in U.S. military spending since 2001(see Figure 3) is worrisome, as it could signal the starting gun for a new long-term upswing of rising military spending, an upswing that could even culminate in another ruinous great-power war in the coming decades.

Long wave theory proven right by the 90’s

Goldstein 5 (Josh, poli sci @ MIT, *NATO Conference*, Feb 5, http://www.joshuagoldstein.com/jgkond.htm ) ET

I am not sure how best to measure production – in my earlier research I used several scholars’ long-term production indexes – but the growth of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) seems a good measure to start with. The Penn World Table [7] provides GDP data adjusted for purchasing-power parity. In Figure 5 I have graphed the growth rate in the U.S. GDP per capita, adjusted for inflation. According the long-wave sequence, the phase from 1969 to 1991 should be characterized by slow and uneven growth, then the period since 1991 by more robust growth. What one sees in the data is not so much a slowdown and then speed-up of per capita GDP growth, but rather a greater volatility and then stability. During the nominal production “downswing” of 1969-91, ever-lower valleys and ever-higher peaks alternate rapidly). Then in the nominal production upswing from 1992 forward, we see a dramatic stabilization of growth rates – around 3 percent a year in real per capita terms – for a solid nine years. I am not sure what to make of this stable period, but it is an interesting change just at the time the long-wave sequence calls for a phase shift in production growth.

Impacts- Econ Bad- War- Goldstein- Long Wave Theory Defense

Goldstein’s long wave theories empirically correct

Goldstein 87 (Joshua S, Poli- Sci @ MIT, *Journal of Conflict Resolution,* Vol 31, No 4, Dec. 1987, http://www.jstor.org/stable/174156 , intro) ET

This article summarizes the main empirical findings of a research project on long waves of roughly 50 years length in political/economic life. The statistical analysis of 40 historical economic time series, along with data on great power wars, indicates that war plays a central role in the long wave, that "stagflation" can be seen as a phase of the long wave, and that war dampens economic growth. Since 1495, long waves are identified in great power war severity and in internationally synchronized trends of prices and real wages. Weaker long waves are found in world production since 1750, these phases leading the war phases by about a decade. A theoretical model consistent with these lagged correlations among variables is elaborated. Long waves are seen as arising from a two-way causality between war and economic growth.

**Impacts- Econ Bad- War- Goldstein- Long Theory Defense**

Long wave theories true- 10 examples

Goldstein 85 (Joshua S, Poli Sci @ MIT, *International Studies Quarterly* vol. 29, No. 4, Dec 1985, http://www.jstor.org/stable/2600380, intro ) ET

Kondratieff long economic waves are found in the core of the world- system, at least in synchronized price movements, from 1495 through 1945. These long economic waves are synchronous with a cycle of war between core nations, in which an escalatory war upswing recurs roughly every 50 years. These great power wars apparently play a central role in the economic long wave, especially in connection with inflationary periods on long wave upswings. The long waves of economics and war in the core of the world-system can be traced through ten repetitions since 1495; since around 1945, however, war, prices and production have diverged. Over five centuries, the war cycle has lengthened somewhat, the wars themselves have shortened, and their severity has increased a hundredfold.

Long waves are true- price series prove

Goldstein 85 (Joshua S, Poli Sci @ MIT, *International Studies Quarterly* vol. 29, No. 4, Dec 1985, http://www.jstor.org/stable/2600380, p. 413 ) ET

While these four theories shape the main lines of the debate, a number of hybrid theories combine and supplement them. These include the work of Rostow (1975, 1978), combining elements of the capital and innovation theories but ultimately focusing on the relative prices of primary and secondary goods; of Van Duijn (1983), combining capital and innovation; of Kleinknecht (1981), combining innovation and capitalist crisis; and of Hopkins and Wallerstein (1979) and Bousquet (1980), combining a Marxist interpretation of war/hegemony with capitalist crisis. Despite the differences between the four approaches, they all agree (following Kondratieff's dating) regarding the approximate dating of upswings and downswings during 1790-1922 (the period covered by Kondratieff). However, for the period before 1790 they disagree about whether long waves exist at all; and for the period since around World War II (see Dupriez, 1978; Wallerstein, 1979), the periodizations based on production (e.g., Mandel, 1980) diverge from those based on prices (e.g., Rostow, 1978), or on war (e.g., Modelski, 1981). Empirically, the evidence for economic long waves has been mixed. For price series, there is fairly strong evidence that upswings and downswings match approximately the datings given by Kondratief, for 1790-1922 (Gordon, 1978; Rostow, 1978; Van Ewijk, 1982; Cleary and Hobbs, 1983). For production and trade series, however, there is controversy over the technique of removing longer-term secular trends and identifying long waves in the residuals. The secular trend can be hypothesized as linear, exponential, or cubic, and the results vary accordingly. Long waves are more strongly evident in price series than production series (Van Ewijk, 1982; Cleary and Hobbs, 1983). However, opinion still ranges from the view that long waves are no more than an accidental series of ups and downs (see reviews by Eklund, 1980; and Rosenberg and Frischtak, 1983), to the view that long waves can be found in production as well as price data (Mandel, 1980).

And the methods used are tested in multiple ways- theories are correct

Goldstein 85 (Joshua S, Poli Sci @ MIT, *International Studies Quarterly* vol. 29, No. 4, Dec 1985, http://www.jstor.org/stable/2600380, p. 419 ) ET

Third, wars were correlated with economic phase periods in several ways. Each war was categorized as having occurred primarily in one phase period.26 These war categorizations are listed in Appendix 2. Fatalities from the wars in each phase period were summed, and expressed as an average annual fatality level for each phase period. Average fatalities on downswings and upswings could thus be compared, and it was hypothesized that they would be higher on the upswings. Average annual fatalities were also calculated for each phase period by a second method-cutting the fatality time series strictly at each turning point between phases. This method counts 'overlap' years from a war into an adjacent phase period, and (when compared to the first method) indicates sensitivity to the choice of turning points. Numbers of wars were also counted for each phase period

Impacts- Econ Bad- A2: War- Econ good

Growth doesn’t stop wars- 20th century shows

Ferguson 6 (Nial, prof @ Harvard, *Foreign affairs,* 10.6.6) ET

It might have been expected that such prosperity would eliminate the causes of war. But much of the worst violence of the twentieth century involved the relatively wealthy countries at the opposite ends of Eurasia. The chief lesson of the twentieth century is that countries can provide their citizens with wealth, longevity, literacy, and even democracy but still descend into lethal conflict. Leon Trotsky nicely summed up the paradox when reflecting on the First Balkan War of 1912-13, which he covered as a reporter. The conflict, Trotsky wrote, "shows that we still haven't crawled out on all fours from the barbaric stage of our history. We have learned to wear suspenders, to write clever editorials, and to make chocolate milk, but when we have to decide seriously a question of the coexistence of a few tribes on a rich peninsula of Europe, we are helpless to find a way other than mutual mass slaughter." Trotsky later made his own contribution to the history of mass slaughter as the people's commissar for war and as the commander of the Red Army during the Russian Civil War.

And economic decline doesn’t cause war- empirics prove

Ferguson 6 (Nial, prof @ Harvard, *Foreign affairs,* 10.6.6) ET

Nor can economic crises explain the bloodshed. What may be the most familiar causal chain in modern historiography links the Great Depression to the rise of fascism and the outbreak of World War II. But that simple story leaves too much out. Nazi Germany started the war in Europe only after its economy had recovered. Not all the countries affected by the Great Depression were taken over by fascist regimes, nor did all such regimes start wars of aggression. In fact, no general relationship between economics and conflict is discernible for the century as a whole. Some wars came after periods of growth, others were the causes rather than the consequences of economic catastrophe, and some severe economic crises were not followed by wars.

Impacts- Econ Bad- War- A2: Interdependence

Economic interdependence won’t stop war- WWI and current day Taiwan potential prove

Innocent 9 (Malou, Foreign policy analyst @ Cato institute, *Real Clear World*, Feb 27, http://www.realclearworld.com/articles/2009/02/china\_peace\_partner\_or\_warmong.html ) ET

While there is some evidence to support the presumption that China will become adversarial, others see China becoming a status quo power seeking peaceful relations with the rest of the global community. For these experts, the potential for hostile US-China relations is all the more reason to encourage Beijing's integration into the global economic and trading system, which may undermine China's propensity to base its interests simply in military terms. To put a twist on the old saying, so long as goods cross borders, soldiers won't. Nations that trade and cooperate are less likely to go to war, and given today's economic climate, it's hoped that Chinese and American strategic interests are converging because of economic interdependence. Economic interdependence, of course, doesn't preclude war. Strong trade ties between Britain and Germany didn't prevent the outbreak of World War I. Nations may be willing to forgo economic gains if it conflicts with their strategic interests. One potential flash point between the United States and China is Taiwan. Many believe that the US is committed to protect the peace and security of Taiwan from coercion by Beijing under the Taiwan Relations Act of 1979.

Economic interdependence doesn’t prevent conflict

The American 10 (http://blog.american.com/?page\_id=13486, *The American,* Jan 10) ET

As Larison points out, America’s global presence over the past 60 years has not prevented conflicts (and, I would assume, miscalculation) from occurring. Nor would I make such a claim. Yet the increasing degree of instability, tension, and conflict that is normal in international affairs can only be exacerbated under conditions where both the existing hegemony and the accepted rules of the game (global trade, for example) are weakening or increasingly seen as ineffective. To take one current claim, everyone knows that China benefits enormously from the current global free trade regime, as well as from American willingness to provide public goods such as maintaining freedom of the seas. Many assume that China would therefore do nothing to kill the goose that lays the golden egg. I would simply respond that we have no way of knowing what calculations Beijing would make in a world in which current rules of trade and navigation and American military capability (if not will) no longer operate. Perhaps China’s leadership, instead of stepping up to fill the void, would prefer to avoid uncertainty and be satisfied with a smaller slice of the pie that they could control, say, the trade routes along the South China Sea. Perhaps globalization would make this impossible—trying to separate the strands of economic interdependence—but that doesn’t mean Beijing might not try, leading to unknown responses on the part of India, Japan, ASEAN countries, etc. The possibility of band-wagoning on the part of smaller nations would increase dramatically, further complicating the responses of bigger powers.

Impacts- Econ Bad- A2: Space

Space budget already cut- impacts empirically denied- and mars doesn’t matter

McMaken 10 (Ryan, political science at Arapahoe Community College, apr 13, 10, *The LRC Blog*, http://www.lewrockwell.com/blog/lewrw/archives/55600.html ) ET

Obama has done one decent thing and moved to cut funds to the space program. Neil Armstrong has condemned Obama for it. There are two thoughts that immediately come to me as a result: 1. “So what?” and 2. “Who cares what Neil Armstrong thinks?” Arguments in favor of the space program are based on two things: sentimentalism and militarism. The militaristic argument is the more sophisticated one. The space program, behind its veneer of civilian purpose, has always been a military program founded to improve rocket technology, and eventually, to provide the United States with military superiority over space itself. The sentimentalism is the rationale that most Americans subscribe to as they get misty eyed over fantasies about “the human spirit” and “destiny” and all those other concepts from Hollywood adventure films. From a pragmatic point of view, the space program is nothing more than a massive socialist spending program with militaristic intent, but which benefits handsomely from hysterical and maudlin appeals to hope in the government’s ability to accomplish anything provided enough time and taxpayers’ loot. In this age of budding private space travel, thanks to organizations like Virgin Galactic, government space travel is more unjust and obsolete than ever. Yet, glorified crash test dummies like Neil Armstrong feel free to throw hissy fits if someone dares to slow the flow of taxpayer dollars to his pet projects. Having spent decades of his life as a military bureaucrat on the government dole, it is beyond comprehension to Armstrong that government spending on the space program is unnecessary and totally wasteful. And, even if one granted that space exploration were a good thing, one would still be a long way from demonstrating the need for manned space flight. Armstrong and others who have walked on the moon have done absolutely nothing that a robot could not have done. The Mars missions are a perfect example of just how superfluous humans are to space exploration in the early 21st century. Having a human wander around on the surface of Mars will tell us nothing more about the air, the soil, or the gravitational pull than we already know. But, in the end, it’s all just special-interest and partisan politics. Broadly speaking, the Dems’ primary power base comes from Unions and non-whites and environmentalists. The GOPs power base comes from white males and the military establishment. It’s only natural that Obama would cut some military spending, in the form of NASA dollars, to throw some money to some of his base. Armstrong can rest assured that the next GOP president will shovel plenty of pork toward the space program.

Imapcts- Econ Bad- Space

Economic growth allows for space militarization

Anzera 05 (Giuseppe, Contributor to the Asian Times Online, Star Wars, http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Front\_Page/GH18Aa01.html) ET

The second problem is economic. Orbital weapons - as the Strategic Defense Initiative showed in the 1980s - are extremely expensive. It has been estimated that a space defense system against weak ballistic missile strikes could cost between $220 billion and $1 trillion. A laser-based system to be used against ballistic missiles would cost about $100 million for each target.

And space mil leads to nuclear wars.

Deblois 03 (Bruce M. Deblois, Director of Systems Integration at BAE SYSTEMS, 7-5-03, “The Advent of Space Weapons,” Astropolitics, http://www.cfr.org/content/publications/attachments/Bergman\_11ast03.pdf) ET

The simple unilateral posturing of space weapons creates global instability in the form of encouraging adversaries to respond symmetrically or asymmetrically, heightening tensions, while at the same time crippling alliances. In this less stable global environment, there is also the prospect of space weapons causing less stable regional environments. Integrating space weapons into military operations could have unexpected consequences for the progression of conflict situations, prompting significant regional instability. In most war games that include space assets, commanders discover that preemptively destroying or denying an opponent's space-based assets with space weapons is appealing, yet often leads to rapid escalation into full-scale war, even triggering nuclear weapons use. One commander commented: '[If] I don't know what's going on, I have no choice but to hit everything, using everything I have'. That this conclusion surprised strategists suggests that the full implications of space weapons have not yet been fully explored. What is common knowledge, derived from years of experience in futuristic war games, is that permanently based space weapons invite pre-emption and escalation. Local to a specific situation of heightened tensions, the existence of space weapons on one side, the other, or both could be the determining catalyst for escalatory war.

Impacts- Econ Bad- Terrorism

Growth creates terrorists – empirically proven – all the big guns are loaded

Radu 9 (Michael is a senior fellow at the Foreign Policy Research Institute Ph.D.,), The futile search for “root causes” of Terrorism, http://www.unc.edu/depts/diplomat/archives\_roll /2002\_07-09 /radu\_futile/radu\_futile.html

Those who hold to "poverty as the root cause" do so even though the data does not fit their model. Even leaving aside multimillionaire Osama bin Laden, the backgrounds of the September 11 killers indicates that they were without exception scions of privilege: all were either affluent Saudis and Egyptians, citizens of the wealthy Gulf statelets, or rich sons of Lebanon, trained in and familiar with the ways of the West—not exactly the victims of poverty in Muslim dictatorships. Many poor Egyptians, Moroccans, and Palestinians may support terrorists, but they do not—and cannot—provide them with recruits. In fact, Al Qaeda has no use for illiterate peasants. They cannot participate in World Trade Center-like attacks, unable as they are to make themselves inconspicuous in the West and lacking the education and training terrorist operatives need.

Terrorism will escalate into extinction

Morgan 9 (Dennis, Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, Yongin Campus - South Korea Futures, Volume 41, Issue 10, December 2009, Pages 683-693, World on Fire) LL

Moore points out what most terrorists obviously already know about the nuclear tensions between powerful countries. No doubt, they’ve figured out that the best way to escalate these tensions into nuclear war is to set off a nuclear exchange. As Moore points out, all that militant terrorists would have to do is get their hands on one small nuclear bomb and explode it on either Moscow or Israel. Because of the Russian “dead hand” system, “where regional nuclear commanders would be given full powers should Moscow be destroyed,” it is likely that any attack would be blamed on the United States” Israeli leaders and Zionist supporters have, likewise, stated for years that if Israel were to suffer a nuclear attack, whether from terrorists or a nation state, it would retaliate with the suicidal “Samson option” against all major Muslim cities in the Middle East. Furthermore, the Israeli Samson option would also include attacks on Russia and even “anti-Semitic” European cities In that case, of course, Russia would retaliate, and the U.S. would then retaliate against Russia. China would probably be involved as well, as thousands, if not tens of thousands, of nuclear warheads, many of them much more powerful than those used at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, would rain upon most of the major cities in the Northern Hemisphere. Afterwards, for years to come, massive radioactive clouds would drift throughout the Earth in the nuclear fallout, bringing death or else radiation disease that would be genetically transmitted to future generations in a nuclear winter that could last as long as a 100 years, taking a savage toll upon the environment and fragile ecosphere as well. And what many people fail to realize is what a precarious, hair-trigger basis the nuclear web rests on. Any accident, mistaken communication, false signal or “lone wolf’ act of sabotage or treason could, in a matter of a few minutes, unleash the use of nuclear weapons, and once a weapon is used, then the likelihood of a rapid escalation of nuclear attacks is quite high while the likelihood of a limited nuclear war is actually less probable since each country would act under the “use them or lose them” strategy and psychology; restraint by one power would be interpreted as a weakness by the other, which could be exploited as a window of opportunity to “win” the war. In other words, once Pandora's Box is opened, it will spread quickly, as it will be the signal for permission for anyone to use them. Moore compares swift nuclear escalation to a room full of people embarrassed to cough. Once one does, however, “everyone else feels free to do so. The bottom line is that as long as large nation states use internal and external war to keep their disparate factions glued together and to satisfy elites’ needs for power and plunder, these nations will attempt to obtain, keep, and inevitably use nuclear weapons. And as long as large nations oppress groups who seek self-determination, some of those groups will look for any means to fight their oppressors” In other words, as long as war and aggression are backed up by the implicit threat of nuclear arms, it is only a matter of time before the escalation of violent conflict leads to the actual use of nuclear weapons, and once even just one is used, it is very likely that many, if not all, will be used, leading to horrific scenarios of global death and the destruction of much of human civilization while condemning a mutant human remnant, if there is such a remnant, to a life of unimaginable misery and suffering in a nuclear winter.

Impacts- Econ Bad- A2: Democracy- Freidman Indicts

Friedman analysis flawed – doesn’t take into account multiple job factors

Etzioni 6 (Amitai, Department of International Affairs, The Moral Limits of Economic Growth, http://www.amitaietzioni.org/documents/D79.pdf, 12/5/06, AD: 7/6/09)

As I see it, high economic growth, especially in developed nations, entails sacrificing ever more of the elements that make for a good society. The way this comes about is vividly illustrated by a silly but delightful story in Jules Vern’s Around the World in Eight Days. On the last leg of the trip, the locomotive that serves the race is running out of coal. To keep it running, first the walls of the wagons are fed into the fire and then those of the caboose itself, leaving the racing passengers sitting on a bare rod, in the cold with barely anything to hold onto. The West, especially the United States, is moving in this direction by sacrificing ever more for efficiency. The “24/7 society” is an exaggerated but proper term for the direction in which the “have” societies are moving in order to engage in unfettered competition with people who have few health care benefits, no retirements funds, no worker compensation, and pay no mind to the environment. They hence work longer and harder and have less time for their children, spouses, elderly parents, communities, cultures and much else. Friedman argues that over the past 200 years the workweek in the United States has declined. However, since 1964 the average workweek has hardly changed. Above all, over the past 30 years or so, household income has increased while per capita income has barely changed because more and more women have turned to gainful employment, so that now it takes about 1.7 workers to earn the same household income that one worker used to earn. Moreover, given that most women are now gainfully employed, further increases in household income must come from somewhere else. It is now achieved by more and more high school students working as many as 20 hours a week or more in fast food restaurants and other such jobs, and more and more senior citizens being forced to work (although often off the books and hence to reflected in many statistics). In addition, more people are taking work home with them, to PTA and rare town hall meetings, and even to the beach, in what might be called the “Blackberry culture.” The result is that there are few human resources to attend to the members of the household, the sick, the elderly, friends, and social and cultural activities.

Friedman doesn’t take into account basic survival instincts

Etzioni 6 (Amitai, Department of International Affairs, The Moral Limits of Economic Growth, http://www.amitaietzioni.org/documents/D79.pdf, 12/5/06, AD: 7/6/09)

Unfortunately, Friedman’s argument cannot accommodate the Maslowian notion that at some point, once one’s needs for basic creature comforts are sated, one might be better off- and indeed a better human being, one much more willing to allow others to catch up-if one's satisfactions were driven by greater "investment" in relationships and culture, which require few economic resources. For instance, embracing a set of values defined by voluntary simplicity (a moderate version of the counterculture) or a civic religion of communitarianism can serve as a normative counterweight to reference groups that spur people to work harder for goods they do not truly need. This in turn may release such goods to those who have not yet gained whatever creature comforts they require-without any sense of loss or sacrifice in other sectors of society.

Impacts- Econ bad- A2: Democracy- Friedman Indicts Cont’d

Analysis flawed and arbitrary – no interpretation of moral consequences

Wilkinson 6 (Will, Cato Institute, Book Reviews, http://www.cato.org/pubs/journal/cj26n1/cj26n1-11.pdf, 4/10/06, AD: 7/6/09)

Benjamin Friedman’s The Moral Consequences of Economic Growth is magnificent and flawed. It is a work of astounding scholarship and exhilarating intellectual imagination as well as disappointing partisanship and theoretical fragility. Moral Consequences is primarily an extended defense of the hypothesis that steady economic growth “fosters greater opportunity, tolerance of diversity, social mobility, commitment to fairness and dedication to democracy” (p. 4). The hypothesis is defended with a spectacular range of evidence from disciplines including economic and political history as well as popular culture and literature. However, as the book proceeds, it becomes increasingly difficult to say what exactly Friedman means by “moral consequences.” And that in a nutshell is the big problem for this big book. As Friedman shifts without comment or justification from a broad Enlightenment conception of moral progress to a rather parochial American welfare-statist conception of political morality, the nature and importance of the dependent variable in Friedman’s equation becomes ever more elusive. Without a rather more rigorous normative framework, the reader is left arguing with the author about whether the examples he has chosen to prove his point really count for or against it.

Friedman’s work is to arbitrary and contradictory

Wilkinson 6 (Will, Cato Institute, Book Reviews, http://www.cato.org/pubs/journal/cj26n1/cj26n1-11.pdf, 4/10/06, AD: 7/6/09)

The Moral Consequences of Economic Growth is an enormously ambitious book that suffers from a lack of ambition, like the Sistine ceiling in black and white. The overarching logic—Adam Smith’s logic—is impeccable. Friedman deserves credit for marshaling a huge quantity of historical evidence to flesh out the case for growth. But his rigorous economic and historical scholarship is in the end undermined by theoretical laxity on the normative side of the equation. Someday someone will write the book on the moral dimensions of economic growth.

Impacts- Econ Bad- Environment

Economic growth causes environment degradation making environmental regulations irrelevant

Booth 95 (Douglas E., professor of economics at Marquette University, 1995, *Review of Social Economy*, Vol. 54)

 After a quarter century of environmental regulation in this country under the auspices of the Environmental Protection Agency and other government agencies, significant environmental threats remain. Ambient standards for ozone and other air pollutants are frequently violated in urban areas, lakes and rivers continue to be heavily polluted, groundwater is increasingly threatened with contamination, ambient levels of toxic chemicals in the biotic food chain are at high levels, little has been done about the potentially serious problem of greenhouse warming, and biodiversity is threatened as a consequence of reduced and fragmented natural habitats. Why has the regulatory system failed to fully address our environmental problems? The goal of this paper is to suggest that the roots of environmental problems, and the failure of environmental regulation, are deeply embedded in the processes that generate economic growth. The logic of the argument to be presented will take the following form: long-run economic growth relies on the creation of new industries and new forms of economic activity; these new forms of economic activity create new kinds of environmental problems; and new forms of economic activity constitute vested political interests that oppose environmental regulation. Each of the three main sections of the paper will provide theoretical and empirical justification for each component part of the basic argument.

Impacts- Econ Bad- Environment

Economic increase can cause a decrease in the environment

Ravenswaay 99 (Eileen O. van, Michigan State University, , <https://www.msu.edu/course/eep/255/relationship_between_the_economy_and_the_environment.htm>, )

One troubling fact should be apparent from the last few paragraphs. While it is true that the more developed economic system produces more goods and services for more people, some of the goods and services it produces are merely substitutes for ones that are no longer provided by the undeveloped or natural environment. Consequently, the total amount and variety of goods produced by the economy do not necessarily indicate whether people are getting more goods and more needs are being met. The quality and quantity of goods that would have been produced by the natural environment, but are no longer being produced because of the transformation of that system, must be subtracted to be able to say whether more people are better off. For example, suppose a population in a particular territory moves from a hunter-gatherer economic system to an agrarian one. The latter system provides more food, but at the expense of food that would have been available for hunting and gathering anyway. Thus, some food the agrarian system produces simply substitutes for food that would have been available naturally if the natural ecosystem were intact. This part of the output of the agrarian system should not be counted as a net gain from having adopted that system. Likewise, water purification systems established in an industrial system may produce the same amount of drinking water that would have been available naturally in the hunter-gatherer system. The only reason the industrial system has to purify the water is because it has become contaminated with sewage, agricultural runoff, and industrial wastes. Thus, the water produced by the purification system is not a net gain over what would have been available in the hunter-gatherer system. The loss of the naturally available drinking water is a cost of the more developed economic system. Another troubling fact apparent from the paragraphs above is that the more developed economy produces more goods only by using and degrading more matter and energy. Consequently, more economic development means more transformation of the natural environmental system. Is it possible to develop the economic system without harming the environment? Answering this question requires an understanding of how economic development occurs. In other words, we need to understand how a population in a given territory develops its economic system so that it can produce and consume more goods and satisfy more needs and wants of its people. Economic Development and Environmental Improvement The basic way an economy develops is actually very simple. Namely, people can consume more and better goods only if they produce more and better goods. Thus, economic development requires either increasing output per worker (i.e., labor productivity) or expanding the resource base available to workers. Output per worker is increased by developing manufactured capital (e.g., tools, machines, buildings, structures, knowledge and social institutions), creating new technologies, and training people how to use the capital to produce goods. The resource base is expanded by enlarging the territory (e.g., acquiring new land), discovering more about the resource base within the existing territory (e.g., exploring for minerals or discovering new types of matter), or trading with other territories. Unfortunately, increasing output per worker and the size of the resource base, not only increases the quantity and quality of goods available per person. It also increases the amount of matter, energy, and space used by the economic system. This means more environmental damage. Fortunately, there is a way to address this problem because it is also possible to increase the productivity of energy and matter used in the economy. One strategy is to recycle resources within the economic system so that fewer virgin resources must be extracted from the environment and fewer degraded materials are discharged into the environment. A second strategy called dematerialization is to invent new technologies which use and degrade less matter and energy. A third way to increase natural resource productivity is to invent technologies that utilize less polluting resources. This strategy is known as material substitution. A fourth strategy known as waste mining involves finding new uses for waste materials. Increasing natural resource productivity requires investments similar to those for increasing labor productivity. New types of capital and labor must be developed. New systems must be devised to collect and process used materials. Ways of using these recycled materials to produce goods must also be found. Energy-efficient methods for recycling and producing goods must be developed. New materials and production technologies must be found. New ways of locating and siting production facilities also need to be developed. The key to achieving economic development while protecting the environment is improving both labor and natural resource productivity. But many people believe there is another key as well, and that is limiting population size. If population increases, total output of goods and services must increase or per capita consumption must fall. But increasing output means more energy and matter must be extracted from the environment. Improvements in natural resource productivity may slow the rate of extraction over time, but inevitably more people means more extraction. This course focuses on developing productivity gains, not population control.

Impacts- Econ Bad- Environment

Economic Growth Destroys the Environment

North 5 (Peter, engineer and with qualifications in economics and accountancy , http://www.pacificecologist.org/archive/growthenvi.html ) ET

Where are we ecologically speaking? In this debate, for the most part the economists hold sway. Some governments are more active than others in addressing looming problems of environmental degradation and resource shortages. But this has made little difference to the economic policies that rule the world. On the economic front, almost all nations pursue economic growth as their number one objective. Growth policies that increase consumption of the world's resources are encouraged, the environment continues to degrade and the global population continues to grow at about 80 million per annum. There are many ways to look at the question of man's impact on the planet. One of the most common is the ecological "footprint." For the purpose of the ecological debate, the "footprint" of a country is defined as the area of land needed to support the average individual of that country. Many studies have been published on the subject of footprints. A 1997 study by the Earth Council found the world was using up its renewable resources at a rate of about 2.3 hectares per world citizen, whereas the space available was around 1.7 hectares per world citizen. From this, the Earth Council study concluded the earth was running a 35% "ecological deficit" at that time - meaning the sustainable limits of the earth had already been exceeded. Studies by bodies such as the U.N. and Australia's CSIRO reached similar conclusions. The Earth Council report studied 52 countries with about 80% of total global population. It found countries using up their resources unsustainably were spread fairly indiscriminately across rich and poor countries alike. The country with the highest impact on its environment, was the USA (1997 population 268m), with a consumption footprint of 10.3 ha per capita and a capacity of 6.7 ha per capita - indicating an ecological deficit of 3.6 ha per capita. At the bottom of table was Bangladesh, with 0.5ha per capita consumption, 0.3 ha per capita and a deficit of 0.2ha per capita. Only 20% of the countries studied - all geographically large countries with low-population density - were living sustainably.

Impacts- Econ Bad- Climate Change

Economic growth fuels climate change- root cause

Godhaven 9 (Merrick, staff writer, *Organic Consumers assocociation*, http://www.organicconsumers.org/articles/article\_18583.cfm , 7.15.10) ET

Technology is part of the solution to climate change. But only part. Techno-fixes like some of those in the Guardian's Manchester Report simply cannot deliver the carbon cuts science demands of us without being accompanied by drastic reductions in our consumption. That means radical economic and social transformation. Merely swapping technologies fails to address the root causes of climate change. We need to choose the solutions that are the cheapest, the swiftest, the most effective and least likely to incur dire side effects. On all counts, there's a simple answer - stop burning the stuff in the first place. Consume less. There is a certain level of resources we need to survive, and beyond that there is a level we need in order to have lives that are comfortable and meaningful. It is far below what we presently consume. Americans consume twice as much oil as Europeans. Are they twice as happy? Are Europeans half as free? Economic growth itself is not a measure of human well-being, it only measures things with an assessed monetary value. It values wants at the same level as needs and, while it purports to bring prosperity to the masses, its tendency to concentrate profit in fewer and fewer hands leaves billions without the necessities of a decent life. Techno-fixation masks the incompatibility of solving climate change with unlimited economic growth. Even if energy consumption can be reduced for an activity, ongoing economic growth eats up the improvement and overall energy consumption still rises. We continue destructive consumption in the expectation that new miracle technologies will come and save us.

And, continued accelerated climate change will annihilate humanity

Tickel 8

(Oliver, , Climate Researcher. The Gaurdian, 8-11-2008 “”, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/aug/11/climatechange>) ET

We need to get prepared for four degrees of global warming, Bob Watson told the Guardian last week. At first sight this looks like wise counsel from the climate science adviser to Defra. But the idea that we could adapt to a 4C rise is absurd and dangerous. Global warming on this scale would be a catastrophe that would mean, in the immortal words that Chief Seattle probably never spoke, "the end of living and the beginning of survival" for humankind. Or perhaps the beginning of our extinction. The collapse of the polar ice caps would become inevitable, bringing long-term sea level rises of 70-80 metres. All the world's coastal plains would be lost, complete with ports, cities, transport and industrial infrastructure, and much of the world's most productive farmland. The world's geography would be transformed much as it was at the end of the last ice age, when sea levels rose by about 120 metres to create the Channel, the North Sea and Cardigan Bay out of dry land. Weather would become extreme and unpredictable, with more frequent and severe droughts, floods and hurricanes. The Earth's carrying capacity would be hugely reduced. Billions would undoubtedly die. Watson's call was supported by the government's former chief scientific adviser, Sir David King, who warned that "if we get to a four-degree rise it is quite possible that we would begin to see a runaway increase". This is a remarkable understatement. The climate system is already experiencing significant feedbacks, notably the summer melting of the Arctic sea ice. The more the ice melts, the more sunshine is absorbed by the sea, and the more the Arctic warms. And as the Arctic warms, the release of billions of tonnes of methane – a greenhouse gas 70 times stronger than carbon dioxide over 20 years – captured under melting permafrost is already under way. To see how far this process could go, look 55.5m years to the Palaeocene-Eocene Thermal Maximum, when a global temperature increase of 6C coincided with the release of about 5,000 gigatonnes of carbon into the atmosphere, both as CO2 and as methane from bogs and seabed sediments. Lush subtropical forests grew in polar regions, and sea levels rose to 100m higher than today. It appears that an initial warming pulse triggered other warming processes. Many scientists warn that this historical event may be analogous to the present: the warming caused by human emissions could propel us towards a similar hothouse Earth.

Impacts- Econ Bad- Overpopulation

Economic growth bad – overpopulation

Hickerson 5/4 (Jeremy, Statesman Journal, Economic growth might be bad, as well, 5/4/09, AD: 7/6/09 nexis)

I couldn't agree more with the April 29 letter from David Ellis, "Population growth might be bad." I suggest "Economic growth might be bad." In both cases, it depends on where you're at in the spectrum of the physical limits of your environment. For the population issue, experts concluded in the 1970s that we were nearing our planet's population limit (see the 1972 "The Limits to Growth" report to the Club of Rome). The idea that economic growth might not be desirable is just an extension of the population growth discussion. Continual economic growth depends on a growing population to supply more labor and more consumers. Likewise, a continually growing population depends on economic growth to provide jobs. Overpopulation implies economic growth is no longer good, though it remains a necessity for some of the undeveloped world. So if we can't have an economy based on continual growth, what should we do? (See Bill McKibben's "Deep Economy.") We must only manufacture what we need and end marketing ploys aimed at getting people to buy new gadgets; dismantling the economy we have known and beginning a totally different way of life. This can't be accomplished solely by the free market.

Rich countries consume more than poor countries

Ramphal 97 (Sir Shridath, 15 years Secretary-General of the Commonwealth, is Co-Chairman of the Commission on Global Governance, and author of Our Country, The Planet, written for the Earth Summit, Now the rich must adjust, http://www.unep.org/ourplanet/imgversn/91/ramphal.html, June 1997, AD: 7/6/09)

So far in the global discussion of our environmental predicament, the tendency has been to put the focus on human numbers, on population growth, as the crucial source of environmental stress. Population is undoubtedly part of the picture, and the developing world, where the growth in numbers is predominantly taking place, must hold its growth down. But it is through consumption that people impact on the environment, and because people in industrial countries consume much more per head, the one-quarter of the world population living in them presses far more heavily on the environment than the poorer three-quarters who live in the developing world. Five years after Rio, we need a wider acceptance that how much we consume - and therefore how aggressively, and often unthinkingly, we go for growth - is critical to our common future on this planet.

Rich countries consume more and allow poor countries to bandwagon

Jhunjhunwala 3/31 (Bharat, Bachelor's Degree in Science (Physics, Chemistry and Mathematics) from Kanpur University and doctorate in Food and Resource Economics from University of Florida and Assistant Professor of Economics at the Indian Institute of Management, Bangalore, Let the poor suffer more, http://www.expressbuzz.com/edition/story.aspx?title=Let%20the%20poor%20suffer%20more&artid=trgZhqqYRy0=&type=, 3/31/09, AD: 7/6/09)

The development of countries follows this pattern too. Again, there are two models. One is that a [high rate](http://www.expressbuzz.com/edition/story.aspx?title=Let%20the%20poor%20suffer%20more&artid=trgZhqqYRy0=&type=) of growth in rich countries opens markets for the goods of poor countries and pulls them out of poverty. The second model is of independent development of scores of poor countries. The second model alone delivers true development. Twenty per cent of the world’s people living in the rich countries consume 80 per cent of the world’s resources. If they reduce consumption more resources are available for the poor. A reduction in growth of the rich, as is happening in the present recession, will open up opportunities for poor countries but the World [Bank](http://www.expressbuzz.com/edition/story.aspx?title=Let%20the%20poor%20suffer%20more&artid=trgZhqqYRy0=&type=) does not like this.

Impacts- Econ Bad- Famine

Economic growth ensures famine through resource depletion—this will spark global resource wars.

Milbrath 89 (Lester, Professor Emeritus of Political science and Sociology at SUNY-Buffalo, Envisioning a Sustainable Society, pp. 343-344, AD: 7-6-9) BL

Trying to solve our nested set of ecological/economic problems only with technological fixes is like treating an organic failure with a bandage. The key difficulties, which will be ignored by that strategy are that biospheric systems will change their patterns and there will be an increasing squeeze on resources. As global human population continues to grow, and these new people demand economic growth to fulfill their needs, there will be unbearable pressure for resources. Soils will be depleted. Farmland will be gobbled up into urban settlements. Water will become scarce, more polluted, and very high priced. Forests will be depleted faster than they can regenerate. Wilderness will nearly disappear. The most easily extracted mineral deposits will be exhausted. We will search the far corners of the globe, at very high economic and environmental cost, for more minerals and possible substitutes for those that are being depleted. Fossil fuels, especially petroleum, will constantly diminish in supply and rise in price. Worst of all, biospheric systems will react to our interference by no longer working the way we have counted on. International competition for scarce mineral and fuel resources could become intense and bloody. The highly developed nations are likely to try using their money and/or military power to garner the bulk of the resources for their own use. (It is difficult to imagine that a big power would allow its supply of critical fuels or minerals to be cut off without putting up a fight.) At best, those actions will only postpone the inevitable adjustment. The poorest nations (usually those with the densest populations) will be unable to maintain even subsistence levels—they are likely to suffer widespread famine and disease. All of this frantic activity will have devastating impacts on the ecosphere. Climate change will debilitate every ecosystem and economy. Ultraviolet radiation will increase, as will acid rain and toxic poisoning of our air, soil, and water. In addition, we can expect more and more soil depletion, loss of crop land, mismanagement of water resources, oil spills, devastating accidents (Bhopal, Chernobyl), deforestation, spreading deserts, extinction of species, loss of wildlife, and air and water pollution. With disrupted biospheric systems and severe resource shortages, I cannot imagine that it will be possible to sustain growth in material throughput. We may be able to grow in nonmaterial ways (increasing knowledge, artistic output, games, and so forth), but material growth cannot continue. Our endeavor not to change will have failed to forestall change; instead, we will become victims of change.

Impacts- Econ Bad- Health

Growth bad – health

Elkins 4 (Jules, Department of Agricultural and Consumer Economics and University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Is Economic Growth Bad for Your Health?, http://paa2005.princeton.edu/download.aspx?submissionId=50706, 9/22/04, AD: 7/6/09)

The type of industrialization underway in today’s developing countries provides a poignant example of the pernicious side of economic growth. It is a process marked by rapid urbanization, crowding, poor access to clean water, and high levels of industrial pollution. The adverse health consequences of these by-products of industrial growth have proven difficult to accurately measure, since industrialization also has positive effects, the most salient of which lie in rising incomes. Moreover, there is little available data from developing countries to analyze this relationship. But it is an important relationship, given the rapid pace of industrialization in many developing countries over the last several decades. This study employs a purpose-built dataset rich in health, socioeconomic and manufacturing data that allows us to circumvent the lack of credible pollution data, by linking pollution to health outcomes via industrial activity in a rapidly industrializing developing country, Indonesia. The research design builds upon work using ‘natural experiments’ to circumvent problems in identification due to omitted variables. In the case of health and pollution, the omitted variables problem arises because pollution is not random, and so it has proven difficult to control for all the variables that may impact health other than pollution, but that incidentally accompany pollution. The natural experiment this paper exploits is the Indonesian financial crisis in 1997-98, which caused large reductions in manufacturing and pollution in some areas of the country and little change in others. A plausible presumption is that the omitted variables problem is drastically reduced when the research design is based on comparisons of changes across districts during a short time of rapid change. Results from the quasi-experimental design show that the change in incidence of all respiratory problems, coughing, and breathing difficulty was positively correlated with the sub-district’s change in pollution, and was significant at the one percent level. Other health problems, including fever, headache, flu, accidents, mortality, disruptions of daily activities, doctor visits, and medication were insignificant or negative, except for the change in incidence of diarrhea (significant at 1 percent) and overall poor health (barely significant at 5 percent, t=2.05). Results from the quasi-experimental design tend to be insensitive to the inclusion of a wide variety of controls, which provides an indirect measure of the validity of the main assumption of this study design – that the treatment is close to randomly assigned.

Globalization causes disease- extinction

Neubauer 5 (Deane, 5/18, http://www.international.ucla.edu/africa/grca/publications/article.asp?parentid=107420) ET

Contemporary globalization is reproducing the classic conditions historically associated with the emergence of infectious diseases and the periodically recurring pattern of epidemics and pandemics. This chapter explores the current relationship of rapid globalization with emergent infectious disease and links it to other globalization elements that both define and impinge on the generalized notion of “health infrastructure.” The dynamics of contemporary globalization are contributing to various institutional gaps that make dealing with infectious disease increasingly difficult and threaten concentrated human populations with potential calamity.

Historically, the classic conditions associated with epidemics include rapid increases and migration of populations, crowded urban conditions that concentrate the poor, weak regulatory structures that inhibit effective intervention, climate changes associated with higher temperatures, and dislocation of traditional boundaries between microbial and human populations. (McNeill, 1976) Very rapid urbanization and its persistent association with increased poverty act to reproduce many of these conditions. What Kofi Annan has called “the urbanization of poverty” [1] results from the pattern of growth without development that Fantu Cheru situates at the core of the complex of events in which increasing numbers of the world’s poor find themselves. Growth without development leads to a weak state in which “public health” broadly defined struggles to gain an effective institution foothold.

Impacts- Econ Bad- A2: Health

Economic Growth doesn’t solve disease

Szreter 97 (Simon, http://www.jstor.org/stable/2137377)

Over the Long Term the processes of reapid economic growth seem to be strongly correlated with improvements in the prosperity and health of a society. Hence derives the commonplace notion that economic growth results in development. This essay argues that, contrary to this widely held opinion, economic growth entails critical challenges and threats to the health and welfare of the populations involved and does not, therefore, necessarily produce development. Since the 1940’s economic and demographic historians, social scientists, and policymakers have broadly accepted that each national trajectory of sustained economic growth has always been attended by a “demographic transition,” a process in which a pronounced fall in national mortality levels (and also fertility levels) occurs as a result of the gains to national wealth. In fact the idea of a demographic transition, both as a theory and as a general historical model, has been subjected both to fundamental conceptual criticism and to empirical refutation. Important counter-examples have been uncovered, such as historic France with its fertility decline occurring before either rapid economic growth or mortality decline, and contemporary states such as Kerala, Costa Rica, Sri Lanka, and china. .

Impacts- Econ Bad- Poverty

Growth increases poverty and hurts health

Jacobs and Podobny 7 (IA and MT, Universal Corporation: Alpha and Beta Division (Australia) and Australian Red Cross: Blood Service, Australia, University of South Australia, Australia, Do all benefit from economic growth?, http://ije.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/36/2/470, 3/21/07, AD: 7/6/09) JC

Whilst, economic growth has the potential to reduce poverty, history records that not all American citizens have necessarily benefited from ‘economic growth reducing poverty by the elevation of real incomes’.[20](http://ije.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/36/2/470#B20) Yates had identified that for American working class persons, real hourly wages were lower in the 1990s than in 1970s[25](http://ije.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/36/2/470#B25) and that between 1977 and 1990 the real family income fell for the poorest 60% of all families but increased by a third for the wealthiest 20% of families.[26](http://ije.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/36/2/470#B26) These figures are more recently supported by Dooley and Prause who reveal that American males in the 25th percentile earned less in real terms in 1997 (a year of supposedly ‘good’ economic times) than their 25th percentile peers did in 1967 (p. 3).[27](http://ije.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/36/2/470#B27) To further illustrate that employment need not contribute to poverty reduction for all members of society, thereby better health for all, [Figure 1](http://ije.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/36/2/470#F1) illustrates the annual income of a full-time worker in America, single with two qualifying children, working at minimum wages and receipt of Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) from 1970 till 2004.[28](http://ije.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/36/2/470#B28) From this graph it is evident that although working on a full-time basis, such families have not been able to maintain living above the poverty level, even after receiving the EITC. This reinforces findings by others[27,](http://ije.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/36/2/470#B27)[29](http://ije.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/36/2/470#B29) that not all individuals in societies necessarily benefit from economic development, hence not all are able to benefit from ‘economic status improvement’ as a result of (official) economic growth, consequently such subpopulations would not experience better health (lower morbidity and mortality rates) as implied by Brenner (p. 1215).[20](http://ije.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/36/2/470#B20) Given that not all members of society necessarily benefit from economic growth, it is not surprising that there is widening in life expectancy between socioeconomic groups in US,[30,](http://ije.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/36/2/470#B30)[31](http://ije.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/36/2/470#B31) which reconciles the vast literature on socioeconomic status[23,](http://ije.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/36/2/470#B23)[32,](http://ije.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/36/2/470#B32)[33](http://ije.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/36/2/470#B33) and supports Wilkinson's[34](http://ije.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/36/2/470#B34) observation that ‘among the rich developed countries, health is indeed related to relative rather than absolute income, and that, as a consequence, health may not be strongly related to economic growth’ (p. 257). As a result of such environmental factors operating in most western countries, and given that inadequately employed workers may reflect similar health outcomes as the unemployed,[35](http://ije.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/36/2/470#B35) future health-economy research should consider utilizing more comprehensive labour market measures.

Impacts- Econ Bad- A2: Poverty

Alternate causalities to poverty

Fane and Warr 2 (Geroge and Peter, Australian National University, How Economic Growth Reduces Poverty, http://www.ciaonet.org/wps/wap02/wap02.pdf, WIDER, Discussion Paper No. 2002/19, Feb 2002, AD: 7/6/09)

The results and methodology reported here suggest that large oversimplifications are involved in relating poverty reduction directly to GDP growth, without distinguishing among different possible sources of growth. Contrary to the implicit assumptions of many commentators, the poor do much better if a given amount of GDP growth is produced by technical progress in services, or manufacturing, than if it is due to technical progress in agriculture. Although more work needs to be done to improve on the parameter values assumed in this study, these qualitative results are robust with respect to wide variations in assumptions about elasticities of substitution among goods and factors. The results also imply that growth in broad sectors—agriculture, manufacturing, services, etc.—will be associated with very different effects on poverty and inequality depending on whether the exogenous shocks affect demand or supply. For example, an increase in the supply of factors used intensively in agriculture depresses the real returns to these factors while raising agricultural output; whereas an increase in demand for agricultural products, perhaps due to policy changes, would raise both agricultural output and the real returns to the factors used intensively in agriculture.

Growth is not the only factor to poverty

Madan 2 (Anisha, Financial analyst for GE and MBA at Kellogg School, Northwestern University, The Relationship between Economic Freedom and Socio – Economic Development, http://www.econ.ilstu.edu/uauje/PDF's/CarrolRound/madanpost.pdf, UAUJE, pg 8-10, 2002, AD: 7/6/09)

There is a vast amount of literature and studies performed that show that economic growth is not the end-all and be-all of economic development. Focus needs to be on social indicators that depict the quality of life of people. The Basic Needs approach to development formulated by Paul Streeten attempts to provide opportunities for the full physical, mental, and social development of the human personality and then derives ways of meeting this objective. The emphasis is on ends rather than means and non-material needs are recognized. (Streeten, 1981). Thus, mere economic growth rates cannot be a proxy for the quality of life and cannot indicate that basic needs are met. This is explained as follows: (1) The income or economic growth approach to measuring human progress deals only with the quantity of products but not with the appropriateness of those goods and services. (2) Some basic needs can only be satisfied, or more effectively satisfied through public services (education, water, and sanitation), through subsidized goods and services, or through transfer payments. (3) Consumers, both poor and rich are not always efficient in optimizing nutrition and health. Additional income can be spent on foods with lower nutritional value leading to a decrease in health. (4) The manner in which additional income is earned may affect the quality of life adversely. Compared to others, certain production choices can increase income more but have a greater negative impact on human and environmental well being. One example of this is female employment. Although the mother's income can rise, breast-feeding may reduce, which decreases the nutrition of babies. (5) Increased income does not guarantee a reduction in the mal-distribution of wealth within society or households. Therefore, the Basic Needs Approach shows that the economic growth approach neglects the importance of non-material needs and ignores the significance of socio-economic development.

Impacts- Econ Bad- Structural Violence

Growth leads to structural violence that outweighs nuclear war

Abu-Jamal 98 (Mumia, activist, 9-19, http://www.flashpoints.net/mQuietDeadlyViolence.html)

We live, equally immersed, and to a deeper degree, in a nation that condones and ignores wide-ranging "structural' violence, of a kind that destroys human life with a breathtaking ruthlessness. Former Massachusetts prison official and writer, Dr. James Gilligan observes; By "structural violence" I mean the increased rates of death and disability suffered by those who occupy the bottom rungs of society, as contrasted by those who are above them. Those excess deaths (or at least a demonstrably large proportion of them) are a function of the class structure; and that structure is itself a product of society's collective human choices, concerning how to distribute the collective wealth of the society. These are not acts of God. I am contrasting "structural" with "behavioral violence" by which I mean the non-natural deaths and injuries that are caused by specific behavioral actions of individuals against individuals, such as the deaths we attribute to homicide, suicide, soldiers in warfare, capital punishment, and so on. --(Gilligan, J., MD, Violence: Reflections On a National Epidemic (New York: Vintage, 1996), 192.) This form of violence, not covered by any of the majoritarian, corporate, ruling-class protected media, is invisible to us and because of its invisibility, all the more insidious. How dangerous is it--really? Gilligan notes: [E]very fifteen years, on the average, as many people die because of relative poverty as would be killed in a nuclear war that caused 232 million deaths; and every single year, two to three times as many people die from poverty throughout the world as were killed by the Nazi genocide of the Jews over a six-year period. This is, in effect, the equivalent of an ongoing, unending, in fact accelerating, thermonuclear war, or genocide on the weak and poor every year of every decade, throughout the world.

Impacts- Econ Bad- China- US Heg

Chinese economic growth endangers US heg

O'Connell 6 (Meghan, Research Associate at the Rudd Center for Food Policy and Obesity at Yale University, “China Threatens To Rival American Power Status,” United Press International, June 22, http://www.spacewar.com/reports/China\_Threatens\_To\_Rival\_American\_Power\_Status.html, AD: 7-6-9) ET

But the gap between America's dominance and China's power seems to be lessening. The debate is no longer about whether China has the military strength to pose a threat, but what to do about it, said Daniel Blumenthal, commissioner of the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission. "China is probably the only country in the world that can compete with the United States militarily and actually pose a challenge to its hegemony," Blumenthal said, pointing to what he called a serious peacetime military buildup by China over the last 10 years. The United States has been shoring up its alliances around the region, he continued, with countries such as Japan, India, Vietnam and Mongolia all concerned about what China's military rise means. Because of the nation's military expansion, intervention should China attack Taiwan can no longer be accomplished at a low cost, said Randall Schriver, former deputy assistant secretary of state for East Asian and Pacific affairs. And though China has been bulking up its military presence along borders near Taiwan, Schriver said that the nation's vision extends far beyond the small island to regional and global contingencies. "The game is on in Asia, and the United States has to be engaged," Schriver said, emphasizing the growing global importance of Asia. According to the National Intelligence Council, Schriver said, by 2020, Asia will hold 56 percent of the world's population, six of the 10 largest militaries, three of the four largest economies, and six of the 10 largest energy consumers. By contrast, Schriver added, the NIC expects the population of the Middle East to compose only 4 percent of the world's total in 2020. "The whole center of gravity of the earth and human existence is moving to Asia," Schriver said, explaining that the United States needs a policy that will develop relations with the rest of Asia while confronting China. You get Asia right by getting China right and you get China right by getting Asia right, Schriver said. Yet in an age of globalization, any moves by China or the United States would have grand influence in areas beyond the military. "Economic setbacks and crises of confidence could slow China's emergence as a full-scale great power," the National Intelligence Council wrote in its 2020 Project report on global trends for the future. "Beijing's failure to maintain its economic growth would itself have a global impact."

U.S. hegemony prevents nuclear war

Khalilizad 95 (Zalmay Khalilizad, director of the Strategy and Doctrine Program @ RAND & former US Ambassador to Afghanistan) "Losing the Moment? The United States and the World After the Cold War," Washington Quarterly, Spring, Proquest, AD: 7-7-09 CS

Under the third option, the United States would seek to retain global leadership and to preclude the rise of a global rival or a return to multipolarity for the indefinite future. On balance, this is the best long-term guiding principle and vision. Such a vision is desirable not as an end in itself, but because a world in which the United States exercises leadership would have tremendous advantages. First, the global environment would be more open and more receptive to American values — understood as democracy, free markets, and the rule of law. Second, such a world would have a better chance of dealing cooperatively with the world's major problems, such as nuclear proliferation, threats of regional hegemony by renegade states, and low-level conflicts. Finally, U.S. leadership would help preclude the rise of another hostile global rival, enabling the United States and the world to avoid another global cold or hot war and all the attendant dangers, including a global nuclear exchange. U.S. leadership would therefore be more conducive to global stability than a bipolar or a multipolar balance of power system.

Impacts- Econ Bad- China- US Heg

Chinese growth destroys US heg

Straka 9, (Toni, INDEPENDENT Certified Financial Analyst), The Prudent Investor, June 30, http://www.nuwireinvestor.com/blogs/investorcentric/2009/06/chinas-economic-strategy-to-become.html

China is taking advantage of the global recession to position themselves to eventually become the world's number 1 superpower. They are lending out massive amounts of money to countries like the US, and stockpiling gold in order to prepare for the possible fall of the dollar. Tony Straka from The Prudent Investor explains China's economic strategy and why we should all be watching very closely. Shocked by the fact that lamestream media and Twitter are all about Michael Jackson's death from what appears to be a drug overdose, I enjoy being the spoiler for a world that seemingly does not know how to set its priorities anymore. While 33 of the 42 commercial media I regularly read headline with Jacko, it is Chinese media that published the truly important news of the day. Here's the executive version of Chinese economic news picked from the English language People's Daily Online. 1. China takes public ownership as the main body and the other (issue) is to adhere to the common growth of economy belonging to diverse forms of ownership. 2. The People's Bank of China (PBoC) will stick to an appropriately easy monetary policy but will ensure reasonable growth in money and credit, the central bank said yesterday. 3. New credit in the first half of 2009 will definitely surpass 6 trillion yuan, and some experts even predict the figure to be up to 6.5 trillion yuan. This means that total credit in the first half of this year will be more than the total amount invested in any year since China was founded. 4. China should buy more gold because the dollar is poised for a fall and the metal is needed to support the greater international role envisaged for the yuan, a senior researcher with the ruling Communist Party said. You can now go back to watch CNN's US propaganda broadcast and remain in the "don't worry, be happy" camp which still has a solid majority in the Western world. Or would you prefer to gather a little more intel on the next #1 power in the world? Then read on. Bullet point #1 appears to point to a struggle of ideologies in the Chinese communist party. Chinese entrepreneurs certainly favor a more liberal business climate but one must not forget that there is still a gap as wide as the Amazon river between the Ferrari driving riches in towns and a rural hinterland where oxcarts and bicycles remain to be seen as signs of prosperity. In order to prevent social upheaval China needs to bridge this gap or it risks falling apart. The anonymous commenter in the People's Daily reminds the world that China still favors a hands-on approach:

Impacts- Econ Bad- China- Agression

And Chinese economic growth would spur nationalism and US aggression

Brzezkninski 5 (Zbigniew, Counselor @ Center 4 Strategic & Internt’l Studies, Jan/Feb 5, *Foreign Policy,*

, <http://www.carnegieendowment.org/publications/index.cfm?fa=view&id=16538>) ET

China is rising—peacefully so far. For understandable reasons, China harbors resentment and even humiliation about some chapters of its history. Nationalism is an important force, and there are serious grievances regarding external issues, notably Taiwan. But conflict is not inevitable or even likely. China’s leadership is not inclined to challenge the United States militarily, and its focus remains on economic development and winning acceptance as a great power. China is preoccupied, and almost fascinated, with the trajectory of its own ascent. When I met with the top leadership not long ago, what struck me was the frequency with which I was asked for predictions about the next 15 or 20 years. Not long ago, the Chinese Politburo invited two distinguished, Western-trained professors to a special meeting. Their task was to analyze nine major powers since the 15th century to see why they rose and fell. It’s an interesting exercise for the top leadership of a massive and complex country. This focus on the experience of past great powers could lead to the conclusion that the iron laws of political theory and history point to some inevitable collision or conflict. But there are other political realities. In the next five years, China will host several events that will restrain the conduct of its foreign policy. The 2008 Olympic Games is the most important, of course. The scale of the economic and psychological investment in the Beijing games is staggering. My expectation is that they will be magnificently organized. And make no mistake, China intends to win at the Olympics. A second date is 2010, when China will hold the World Expo in Shanghai. Successfully organizing these international gatherings is important to China and suggests that a cautious foreign policy will prevail. More broadly, China is determined to sustain its economic growth. A confrontational foreign policy could disrupt that growth, harm hundreds of millions of Chinese, and threaten the Communist Party’s hold on power. China’s leadership appears rational, calculating, and conscious not only of China’s rise but also of its continued weakness.

US – China war would escalate into nuclear extinction

Straits Times 2k ( *Strait Times,* 6.25.2k) ET

THE high-intensity scenario postulates a cross-strait war escalating into a full-scale war between the US and China. If Washington were to conclude that splitting China would better serve its national interests, then a full-scale war becomes unavoidable. Conflict on such a scale would embroil other countries far and near and -horror of horrors -raise the possibility of a nuclear war. Beijing has already told the US and Japan privately that it considers any country providing bases and logistics support to any US forces attacking China as belligerent parties open to its retaliation. In the region, this means South Korea, Japan, the Philippines and, to a lesser extent, Singapore. If China were to retaliate, east Asia will be set on fire. And the conflagration may not end there as opportunistic powers elsewhere may try to overturn the existing world order. With the US distracted, Russia may seek to redefine Europe's political landscape. The balance of power in the Middle East may be similarly upset by the likes of Iraq. In south Asia, hostilities between India and Pakistan, each armed with its own nuclear arsenal, could enter a new and dangerous phase. Will a full-scale Sino-US war lead to a nuclear war? According to General Matthew Ridgeway, commander of the US Eighth Army which fought against the Chinese in the Korean War, the US had at the time thought of using nuclear weapons against China to save the US from military defeat. In his book The Korean War, a personal account of the military and political aspects of the conflict and its implications on future US foreign policy, Gen Ridgeway said that US was confronted with two choices in Korea -truce or a broadened war, which could have led to the use of nuclear weapons. If the US had to resort to nuclear weaponry to defeat China long before the latter acquired a similar capability, there is little hope of winning a war against China 50 years later, short of using nuclear weapons. The US estimates that China possesses about 20 nuclear warheads that can destroy major American cities**.** Beijing also seems prepared to go for the nuclear option.A Chinese military officer disclosed recently that Beijing was considering a review of its "non first use" principle regarding nuclear weapons. Major-General Pan Zhangqiang, president of the military-funded Institute for Strategic Studies, told a gathering at the Woodrow Wilson International Centre for Scholars in Washington that although the government still abided by that principle, there were strong pressures from the military to drop it. He said military leaders considered the use of nuclear weapons mandatory if the country risked dismemberment as a result of foreign intervention. Gen Ridgeway said that should that come to pass**,** we would see the destruction of civilisation.

Impacts- Econ Bad- China Arms Build Up

Chinese economic growth is used to increase defense budgets and build up military

Shah 7/7 (Anup, founder of global issues, 7.7.10, *global issues,* http://www.globalissues.org/article/75/world-military-spending*,*) ET

Also, “China and India, the world’s two emerging economic powers, are demonstrating a sustained increase in their military expenditure and contribute to the growth in world military spending. In absolute terms their current spending is only a fraction of the USA’s. Their increases are largely commensurate with their economic growth.”

Chinese economic growth allows it to spend more on weapons- 2008 proves

Shah 7/7 (Anup, founder of global issues, 7.7.10, *global issues,* http://www.globalissues.org/article/75/world-military-spending*,*) ET

The last point refers to rapidly developing nations like China and India that have seen their economies boom in recent years. In addition, high and rising world market prices for minerals and fossil fuels (at least until recently) have also enabled some nations to spend more on their militaries. China, for the first time, ranked number 2 in spending in 2008.

Arms races cause global war

Cross 6/17 (Giles, *Our Future Planet*, 6.17.10, http://www.ourfutureplanet.org/news/400-war-the-global-arms-race-is-one-of-the-more-shocking-aspects-of-humanity- ) ET

There are plenty of campaigning organisations out there looking to put an end to profit from war. Among them is the International Crisis Group (ICS), which works to put an end to worldwide conflict. Back in 2008 the group reported on how and why arms races can potentially boil over; ‘Two states wedged between Europe and Iran are locked in an arms race and preparing for war. The international community, particularly the EU, might be able to slow down Armenia and Azerbaijan’s slide toward another devastating conflict. ‘Attempts to broker peace over the past dozen years have failed, and worse, a massive arms build up has started. Boosted by oil revenues, Azerbaijan increased its military spending by a record 51 per cent in 2004/05, and then raised it a further 82 per cent in 2006. ‘The shopping spree has so far included large numbers of multi launch rocket systems, new artillery, tanks and both F-15 and Mig-29 fighters. In 2007 President Ilham Aliyev promised to make Azerbaijan’s military spending equal to Armenia’s entire state budget. ‘But Armenia is hardly a tortoise in this race. Though its military budget is only about a quarter of its neighbour’s, it last year spent some $280 million on weapons, another record.’

More recently, in March 2009, the same group reported on fears that a space arms race was developing in Korea. ‘Space race dynamics are among the likely Pyongyang motivations for the Taepodong-2 launch.’ explained the report, describing North Korean aspirations. ICS reckoned every advance in technology and development raised the risks of an arms race.

Impacts- Econ bad- China Arms Build Up I/L

Economic growth in china leads it to build up its military

Shah 7/7 (Anup, founder of global issues, 7.7.10, *global issues,* http://www.globalissues.org/article/75/world-military-spending*,*) ET

Some nations like China and India have not experienced a downturn, but instead enjoyed economic growth Most developed (and some larger developing) countries have boosted public spending to tackle the recession using large economic stimulus packages. Military spending, though not a large part of it, has been part of that general public expenditure attention (some also call this “Military Keynesianism” Geopolitics and strategic interests to project or maintain power: “rising military spending for the USA, as the only superpower, and for other major or intermediate powers, such as Brazil, China, Russia and India, appears to represent a strategic choice in their long-term quest for global and regional influence; one that they may be loath to go without, even in hard economic times”, SIPRI adds.

And, china spends half their defense budget on weapons- increases in defense budget directly increase weapons

Global Security.org 10 (Mar. 5, *Global Security.org,* http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/china/budget.htm) ET

United States Department of Defense officials in 1986 estimated Chinese defense spending by resources and force categories for the 1967 to 1983 period. Roughly 50 percent of defense expenditures were for weapons, equipment, and new facilities; 35 percent for operating costs; and 15 percent for research, development, and testing and evaluation. By service, these costs broke down to 25 percent for the ground forces; 15 percent for the Navy; 15 percent for strategic air defenses; 5 percent for ballistic missile forces; 5 percent for tactical air forces; and about 35 percent for command, logistics, personnel, intelligence, medical care, administration, research, development, testing and evaluation, and other support. Beginning in the late 1970s, China devoted more resources to its Strategic Missile Force, indicating an effort to increase its strategic security while modernizing the economy, and to national command and support activities, reflecting an emphasis on modernization of the defense structure

Impacts- Econ Bad- A2: China Arms

Non Unique- China increasing military spending now- no impacts

Umbach 9 ( Frank, analyst at German council on foreign relations, *IP Global*, http://www.ip-global.org/archiv/volumes/200/winter2000/china---s-destabilizing-arms-buildup.html , Spring 9 ) ET

Out of the limelight, China has been increasing its military spending and weapons dramatically. Double-digit growth in military budgets far outstrips GDP growth. Especially if the US and Russia carry out projected nuclear reductions, China could soon be a major nuclear power in the region. Its smaller neighbors see Beijing as an increasing threat–but Beijing refuses to recognize this. The threats of war just before the Taiwanese presidential election last March, the recent increase in China’s official defense budget by 12.7 percent to 120.5 billion yuan ($15 billion)–for a huge real defense budget in 1999 of more than $40 billion, according to the latest Military Balance of the International Institute for Strategic Studies–plus this year’s enlarged gap between double-digit military spending increases and overall growth of the gross domestic product of an official 7.1 percent–have all heightened the sense of latent threat among China’s neighbors.

Non unique impacts- china’s budget increasing even in recession

Umbach 9 ( Frank, analyst at German council on foreign relations, *IP Global*, http://www.ip-global.org/archiv/volumes/200/winter2000/china---s-destabilizing-arms-buildup.html , Spring 9 ) ET

Independent surveys that also include factors like energy consumption as reliable indicators of economic growth point to an even greater military burden in reducing calculations of GDP growth below six percent. This year’s increase in the defense budgetthe double digits of each year in the past decade–confirms the recent trend away from the former supreme leader Deng Xiaoping’s earlier priority for economic development over modernization of the Chinese People’s Liberation Army (PLA).

Non unique- Chinese arsenals going to grow immensely

Umbach 9 ( Frank, analyst at German council on foreign relations, *IP Global*, http://www.ip-global.org/archiv/volumes/200/winter2000/china---s-destabilizing-arms-buildup.html , Spring 9 ) ET

As the West imposed a comprehensive arms embargo on China after the Tien An Men confrontation in 1989, Beijing had no choice other than intensifying its traditional armaments links with Israel and, in particular, with Russia. With the Chinese military elite still deeply dissatisfied with the products of its own armaments industry, China has since the beginning of the 1990s been acquiring the latest Russian weapons systems especially for its navy and air force. The most spectacular purchases include 72 fighter aircraft, two state-of-the-art destroyers, each equipped with eight modern cruise missiles of the type SS-N-22 Sunburn (range 120 km), and four submarines of the Kilo class. Additionally, in July of 1999 an agreement was reached to purchase 40 to 60 fighter aircraft of the type Su-30 MKK, fitted with the latest missiles, at a cost of $2 billion. Other investment plans are for two to three submarines of the Kilo or Amur class, two to three more Sovremenny destroyers, and an additional 40 fighter planes. While the destroyers with their cruise missiles constitute an effective threat to the American aircraft carriers and destroyers, the purchase of modern Russian fighter planes (range 1600 km.) is intended to achieve and then consolidate strategic air dominance, which is essential for successful maritime operations in the South China Sea and for posing an effective threat of invasion to Taiwan. By 2010-2015 Beijing is likely to have more than 1000 modern fighter aircraft and a corresponding number of tank transport aircraft and maritime patrol aircraft; this would bring about a gradual shift in the balance of military power between China on the one hand and Taiwan and the ASEAN countries on the other.

Impacts- Econ Bad- A2: China Arms I/L

Non unique- china building arsenals up now

Umbach 9 ( Frank, analyst at German council on foreign relations, *IP Global*, http://www.ip-global.org/archiv/volumes/200/winter2000/china---s-destabilizing-arms-buildup.html , Spring 9 ) ET

Thus, in recent years China has built up its nuclear weapons and missile potential in the Taiwan Straits; by 2005 the number of systems it has in this area will have risen from 650 to 800. Beijing is also accelerating the development of land- and sea-launched cruise missiles, which will be available for the army in just a few years. At the same time, it has stationed long-range anti-aircraft missiles of the Russian type S-300 PMU1 in the region, with the intent of severely restricting Taiwanese and American air operations during any conflict.

Non unique impact turn- china increasing nuclear warheads now

Umbach 9 ( Frank, analyst at German council on foreign relations, *IP Global*, http://www.ip-global.org/archiv/volumes/200/winter2000/china---s-destabilizing-arms-buildup.html , Spring 9 ) ET

In the global arena, too, China is trying to change the strategic military balance in coming years, and to this end has given priority to the expansion of its nuclear-strike capability. At present China has only 300 strategic and 150 tactical nuclear warheads, but in the next decade the number of strategic nuclear warheads could rise to between 600 and 900. While the other four declared nuclear powers have either frozen nuclear-weapons programs at their current level (Great Britain and France), or, like the US and Russia, have contractually undertaken to reduce their strategic nuclear arms potential to fewer than 1500 warheads each in the third Strategic Arms Reductions Talks (START III), China is so far not party to any START or Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) agreement and can therefore continue to expand its nuclear weapons arsenal both qualitatively and quantitatively, with virtually no restrictions. An increase to between 600 and 900 warheads would by the year 2010 dramatically change the ratio of China’s warheads, especially to the nuclear arsenal of Russia. As Russia may have only 800 to 900 warheads after 2007, military and strategic parity in the nuclear weapons arsenal is now only a question of time. Russia would then have made a considerable contribution itself to the shift in the balance of military power in Asia and the world through its own armaments exports and, in particular, through technology transfer to China. This could negatively influence Russia’s own mid- and long-term security above all–a consequence that many Russian security experts are still unwilling to acknowledge at present.

Non unique impact turn- china building arms now

Umbach 9 ( Frank, analyst at German council on foreign relations, *IP Global*, http://www.ip-global.org/archiv/volumes/200/winter2000/china---s-destabilizing-arms-buildup.html , Spring 9 ) ET

As China is also increasingly linking nuclear and conventional strike options in its own nuclear doctrine of “flexible response,” its nuclear-weapons capability acts primarily as a deterrent in regional high-tech wars. It is thus intended to deter external powers like the US from military intervention, while enabling China to use its superior conventional forces effectively in the pursuit of its political goals. The development of the nuclear-weapons arsenal therefore also has high relevance to the security of China’s smaller neighbors. The People’s Republic is less interested in creating a true military balance than in building up effective military deterrent capabilities against the United States, in order to increase sharply the US vulnerability and thus raise the threshold of American intervention through a scenario of “asymmetric warfare.” Against this background of antagonistic security perceptions and concepts, the security dilemmas in East Asia could be further aggravated.

Impacts- Econ Bad- China - US/ China Rel

Chinese Economic growth causes US/ China conflict over power- escalation ensured

Hileman 7/5 (Garrick, financial consultant and trader for private corporations, 7.5.10, *Seeking Alpha*, http://seekingalpha.com/article/213101-is-a-u-s-china-economic-war-on-its-way ) ET

The Chinese have been driving a very hard bargain with the rest of the world with their managed currency policy. China has benefitted tremendously from joining the open world economy. However, free trade is not an inalienable sovereign right. China's growing economic power comes with the role of being a responsible global actor by playing by the same rules as its trading partners. The U.S. has grown weary of waiting for the Chinese government to come around at a time when it is also economically weakened. In short, the time has come for the renminbi to be revalued upward or U.S. action will occur. What is China's realpolitik calculation? China's leadership, emboldened for example by the failure of the U.S. to navigate the world away from a near financial collapse and Google's recent blink, is growing more confident. It is reasonable to assume that China will increasingly flex its economic muscles and may reject the U.S.'s request for a change in its currency policy. The Chinese government stubbornly detests public pressure from foreign government officials. Yet the Chinese leadership appears to only move when they are forced to do so. And often when they do finally make a change, as with the most recent renminbi move, they barely budge. At the same time, it is highly unlikely the U.S. will quietly surrender its role as the world's dominant superpower. And the pressure is growing to take swift, assertive action on the renminbi as calls to "do something" grow louder in the face of a deteriorating domestic economy.

US – China war would escalate into nuclear extinction

Straits Times 2k ( *Strait Times,* 6.25.2k) ET

THE high-intensity scenario postulates a cross-strait war escalating into a full-scale war between the US and China. If Washington were to conclude that splitting China would better serve its national interests, then a full-scale war becomes unavoidable. Conflict on such a scale would embroil other countries far and near and -horror of horrors -raise the possibility of a nuclear war. Beijing has already told the US and Japan privately that it considers any country providing bases and logistics support to any US forces attacking China as belligerent parties open to its retaliation. In the region, this means South Korea, Japan, the Philippines and, to a lesser extent, Singapore. If China were to retaliate, east Asia will be set on fire. And the conflagration may not end there as opportunistic powers elsewhere may try to overturn the existing world order. With the US distracted, Russia may seek to redefine Europe's political landscape. The balance of power in the Middle East may be similarly upset by the likes of Iraq. In south Asia, hostilities between India and Pakistan, each armed with its own nuclear arsenal, could enter a new and dangerous phase. Will a full-scale Sino-US war lead to a nuclear war? According to General Matthew Ridgeway, commander of the US Eighth Army which fought against the Chinese in the Korean War, the US had at the time thought of using nuclear weapons against China to save the US from military defeat. In his book The Korean War, a personal account of the military and political aspects of the conflict and its implications on future US foreign policy, Gen Ridgeway said that US was confronted with two choices in Korea -truce or a broadened war, which could have led to the use of nuclear weapons. If the US had to resort to nuclear weaponry to defeat China long before the latter acquired a similar capability, there is little hope of winning a war against China 50 years later, short of using nuclear weapons. The US estimates that China possesses about 20 nuclear warheads that can destroy major American cities**.** Beijing also seems prepared to go for the nuclear option.A Chinese military officer disclosed recently that Beijing was considering a review of its "non first use" principle regarding nuclear weapons. Major-General Pan Zhangqiang, president of the military-funded Institute for Strategic Studies, told a gathering at the Woodrow Wilson International Centre for Scholars in Washington that although the government still abided by that principle, there were strong pressures from the military to drop it. He said military leaders considered the use of nuclear weapons mandatory if the country risked dismemberment as a result of foreign intervention. Gen Ridgeway said that should that come to pass**,** we would see the destruction of civilisation.

Impacts- Econ Bad- China - Warming

Chinese growth destroys ecosystems and is one of the biggest contributors to global warming

Manila 9 (writing about a speech by Haruhiko Kuroda, President of the Asian Development Bank), http://www.spacedaily.com/2006/090616061106.c4k3t4t7.html , Space Daily)

Asia's rapid economic growth in recent years has contributed significantly to climate change and environmental pollution, the head of the Asian Development Bank (ADB) warned on Tuesday. In response to this, "it is imperative that we escalate our efforts to put the region on a path of low-carbon growth," bank president Haruhiko Kuroda told an ADB forum on climate change. "Rapid development has lifted hundreds of millions of people out of poverty while bringing the region as a whole to higher living standards. Along with this economic expansion, however, has been a rise in environmental pollution including greenhouse gas emissions," he said. He said the developing countries of Asia now account for one-third of global emissions brought about by energy consumption, deforestation and land use. "Unless measures are taken now, Asia's share of global greenhouse gas emissions could increase to more than 40 percent by 2030," he said. The ADB was trying to address this and had provided almost 1.7 billion dollars for "projects with clean energy components," including wind power projects in China and India, he said. Asian countries are also seeking ways to stimulate growth without hurting the environment, "including development of renewable energy and other environmentally sustainable technologies," he said.

Warming forms a high way to extinction, slaughtering billions through starvation, flooding and disease

Hui Min 7 (Neo Straits Times Europe Bureau staff writer) http://www.wildsingapore.com/news/20070304/070406-14.htm#st)

TOP climate scientists issued their bleakest assessment yet on global warming yesterday, with a warning that billions of people could go thirsty as water supplies dry up and millions more may starve as farmlands become deserts. Poor tropical countries that are least to blame for causing the problem will be worst hit, said the report. Small island states, Asia's big river deltas, the Arctic, and sub- Saharan Africa are also at risk. Global warming could also rapidly thaw Himalayan glaciers that feed rivers from India to China, and bring heat waves to Europe and North America. The dire warnings came from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). The final text of a 21-page Summary for Policymakers was agreed on after an all-night session marked by serious disputes. Scientists from more than 100 countries made up the panel. Their report forms the second of a four-part climate assessment, with the final section to be released early next month in Bangkok. Its findings are approved unanimously by governments and will guide policy on issues such as extending the United Nation's Kyoto Protocol, the main plan for capping greenhouse gas emissions, beyond 2012. The grim 1,400-page report issued yesterday said change, widely blamed on human emissions of greenhouse gases, was already under way in nature. The IPCC noted that damage to the earth's weather systems was changing rainfall patterns, punching up the power of storms and boosting the risk of drought, flooding and stress on water supplies. Some scientists even called the degree-by-degree projection a 'highway to extinction'. Add 1 deg C to the earth's average temperatures and between 400 million and 1.7 billion more people cannot get enough water. Add another 1.8 deg C and as many as two billion people could be without water, and about 20 per cent to 30 per cent of the world's species face extinction. More people will also start dying because of malnutrition, disease, heat waves, floods and droughts. This could happen as early as 2050. 'Changes in climate are now affecting physical and biological systems on every continent,' said the report. University of Michigan ecologist Rosina Bierbaum, former head of the United States' IPCC delegation, said: 'It is clear that a number of species are going to be lost.' Mr Rajendra Pachauri, chairman of the IPCC, said: 'It's the poorest of the poor in the world, and this includes poor people even in prosperous societies, who are going to be the worst hit. 'This does become a global responsibility in my view.' Still, some scientists accused governments of watering down the forecasts. They said China, Russia and Saudi Arabia had raised most objections overnight, seeking to tone down some findings. Other participants also said the US, which pulled out of the Kyoto Protocol in 2001 saying it was too costly, had toned down some passages. Dr Pramod Kumar Aggarwal, one of the authors of the report, told The Straits Times that temperature increases could lead to crop failure and rising prices, with dire consequences for the poor. 'In Asia, you are talking about millions or billions of people,' he said.

Impacts- Econ Bad- India Bad- Arms

And India uses economic growth to increase weapons modernization

Arnett 97 (Eric, *Arms Control Today vol 27 no. 5*, http://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/arnett.htm , Aug 97) ET

First, Pakistani planners may not be as sanguine about Indian capabilities, and the fears and perceptions of Pakistanis are the central issue. From Islamabad's perspective, it increasingly appears that most of the major arms suppliers are cooperating with India, even those that have already sold systems to Pakistan. Some of the systems that have been supplied, especially the Armat anti-radar missile, can be very effective even in the hands of less-skilled pilots. The quality and likely effectiveness of other systems are very difficult to judge without much greater transparency on the part of the IAE Second, Indian society is set to progress at an unprecedented rate, potentially enjoying economic growth and modernization that are likely to dramatically increase the budget and competence of the country's armed forces. As relations with China improve, even more of India's military potential can be focused on Pakistani contingencies. Even if IAF strike squadrons have some weaknesses now, U.S. policymakers should not be betting against substantial improvements in Indian technological proficiency in the near future, especially since U.S. firms are contributing to the technological base of both the civilian and military sectors.

And most of India’s economy goes to arms- economic growth would be funneled there

Arnett 97 (Eric, *Arms Control Today vol 27 no. 5*, http://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/arnett.htm , Aug 97) ET

India and Pakistan have been rivals since their creation as separate states in 1947. Even though there have been many small scale conflicts between the two countries, the nuclearization of the region is believed to bring stability at higher levels of violence. The retarded economic growth in both countries could be associated with the ongoing arms race between the two countries, as scarce resources are allocated for military purposes. In this paper the nature of the arms race between India and Pakistan has been examined by employing Toda-Yamamoto’s approach to VAR non-causality for the time period 1949-2000. The empirical findings indicate that there is bi-directoral causality between the two countries military expenditures. Moreover, the causality between military expenditure and economic growth has been investigated. The empirical results indicate that there is a bi-directional causality between military burden and economic growth in India. However, for Pakistan causality is from economic growth to military expenditure. There is no empirical evidence of causality from military burden to economic growth in Pakistan.

And, the impact is extinction

Fai 1 (Ghulam Nabi, director of Kashmiri American Council¸*WA Times*, 7.8.1) ET

The most dangerous place on the planet is Kashmir, a disputed territory convulsed and illegally occupied for more than 53 years and sandwiched between nuclear-capable India and Pakistan.  It has ignited two wars between the estranged South Asian rivals in 1948 and 1965, and a third could trigger nuclear volleys and a nuclear winter threatening the entire globe.  The United States would enjoy no sanctuary. This apocalyptic vision is no idiosyncratic view.  The Director of Central Intelligence, the Department of Defense, and world experts generally place Kashmir at the peak of their nuclear worries.  Both India and Pakistan are racing like thoroughbreds to bolster their nuclear arsenals and advanced delivery vehicles. Their defense budgets are climbing despite widespread misery amongst their populations.  Neither country has initialed the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, or indicated an inclination to ratify an impending Fissile Material/Cut-off Convention.

Impacts- Econ Bad- Iran Build Up

And iran nuclearization sparks a middle east arms race culminating in extinction

Finn 8 (Peter, WA Post staff writer, *The Washington Post,* 11.21.8, http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/11/21/AR2008112100091.html ) ET

The prospect of a nuclear-armed Iran spawning a nuclear arms race in the greater Middle East will bring new security challenges to an already conflict-prone region, particularly in conjunction with the proliferation of long-range missile systems," the report says. ". . . If nuclear weapons are used destructively in the next 15-20 years, the international system will be shocked as it experiences immediate humanitarian, economic, and political-military repercussions."

Impacts- Econ Bad- Russia - Kyoto

Russian economic growth would disable it from selling “hot air” credits to Japan

Sejo 5 (Roger, senior fellow and the director of RFF's forest economics, *Resources for the* Future, http://www.rff.org/Events/Pages/The-End-of-Kyoto-Or-Why-It-Doesnt-Really-Matter-What-the-Russians-Do-about-Kyoto.aspx ) ET

Russia’s hesitancy to ratify the Kyoto Protocol only confirms what has already become obvious: the Kyoto Protocol is in very deep trouble. But regardless of what Russia does, many countries are unlikely to even begin to meet their targeted emission reductions commitments. These targets, designed to reduce atmospheric greenhouse gases (GHG) in order to restrain global warming, call for emission level reductions in the period 2008– 2012 of about 6–8% below the levels of the base year, 1990. To be sure, not all industrial countries chose to ratify Kyoto. President Bush received strong criticism for his decision that the United States will not participate. Other industrial countries, such as Australia, also chose not to participate. And Russia, whose membership is required to meet the 55% participation rate by industrial countries, remains a wild card. Even with Russian ratification, however, the fundamental failure of the Protocol is almost assured. The recent admonition by the European Union (EU) environmental commissioner "that the trend is going in the wrong direction," is indicative of the lack of progress. The European Union has a collective target of GHG reductions of 8% below 1990 levels and has made strides to reach that goal. But with the exception of the United Kingdom—which is in the process of converting its energy sector from coal to natural gas—and Sweden the EU is not on a path to reach its targets. The United Kingdom was quite successful, achieving the target reduction of 12.5% percent in the year 2000 largely due to North Sea gas reserves. Spain, by contrast, is allowing a 15% increase in emissions by the 2008–2012 period, but actual emissions in 2000 were 32 % above the 1990 base. However, the European Union is still hoping to meet its collective target and then undertake internal trades among surplus and deficit countries to allow lagging countries to meet their individual targets. The likelihood of success remains open to question. Failure to stay on target is not limited EU countries. Japan has a targeted reduction of 6%, which it plans meet though a combination of new technologies and the use of capturing carbon dioxide in forest sequestration. The Japanese plan assumes that overall energy emissions will remain at their 1990 levels, based on a 30% increase in nuclear power, which does not emit greenhouse gases. However, by 2000 Japan found itself with actual emissions 11% above the 1990 base, despite an economy that stagnated through most of the 1990s. With the Japanese economy finally picking up, the requisite increases in nuclear facilities not progressing at a rate adequate to meet the 30% target, and anticipated large gains from voluntary activities, such as home insulation, unlikely to be forthcoming on the scale required, Japan will be severely tried to meet her targets. Similarly, Canada will find it extremely difficult to meet its greenhouse gas emission target of a 6 % reduction from 1990 levels. Since that year Canada has experienced modest economic expansion and correspondingly reasonably large increases in greenhouse gas emissions. Canadian emissions in 2000 were 19.6 percent above those of 1990. Another business-as-usual decade would bring emissions in 2010 to about 35 percent above 1990. The domestic emission trading system proposed for Canada, together with a plethora of ad hoc measures are unlikely to produce the emission reductions required to meet its target. A senior Canadian official publicly boasted that Canada would meet its targets regardless of Russian involvement. Don’t bet on it. Until recently, the above estimates might have seemed moot. After the fall of the Soviet Union, Russia experienced dramatic declines in economic activity and coincidental large decreases in greenhouse gas emissions. Kyoto allows Russian emission declines below its 1990 base to be traded as so called "hot air" credits to countries having difficulty meeting their targets. Hence, countries missing their domestic targets could expect meet them through the purchase of Russian "hot air" and thereby declare compliance victory. No more. Even if Russian should ratify Kyoto, the availability of "hot air" could well be limited. Russian officials have stated publicly that, if their GDP grows as projected, it likely would utilize need all its hot air to meet its own Kyoto target. Such a public statement may simply be a negotiating tactic, but the Russian hot air surplus could quickly be expended in the face of continued economic expansion. More generally, Russian concerns about Kyoto inhibiting its future economic growth appear to be a serious reason for its apparent reluctant to quickly ratify Kyoto. Russian ratification is no guarantee of Kyoto success. Kyoto is on a path to fail to meet its GHG reduction targets with or without Russia. This failure will necessitate a complete rethinking of the approach for addressing the global warming issue.

Impacts- Econ Bad- Russia - Kyoto

**If Russia stopped selling permits because of economic expansion, the US would become the primary seller**

Mckibben 97 (Warwick, Senior Fellow, Global Economy and Development, *Brookings Institute*, June 97, http://www.brookings.edu/papers/1997/06energy\_mckibbin.aspx?rssid=climate+and+energy+economics ) ET

Moreover, the U.S. proposal would probably not even achieve the goal of stabilizing emissions. Britain, Germany, and especially Russia are all already below their 1990 emission levels and would be able to sell their unused permits abroad. In that case the permit system would really amount to nothing more than an elaborate accounting mechanism for counting increases in emissions in countries like the United States against the 1990 allocation for Russia. There would be little or no overall reduction. If Russian economic growth begins to recover, the demand for permits within Russia would increase, sharply driving up the world price of permits. This could add an ironic twist to an international permit policy: if Russia were to grow quickly, the United States could soon become the developed world's low-cost emissions abater. In that case the United States would be a net seller of permits, and the rest of the industrial world would end up paying it to reduce its emissions.

And using many models, the US will become the prime permit seller

Mckibben 99 (Warwick, Senior Fellow, Global Economy and Development, *Brookings Institute,*Feb 99, http://www.brookings.edu/papers/1999/02globaleconomics\_mckibbin.aspx ) ET

We use an econometrically-estimated multi-region, multi-sector general equilibrium model of the world economy to examine the effects of using a system of internationally-tradable emissions permits to control world carbon dioxide emissions. We focus, in particular, on the effects of the system on flows of trade and international capital. Our results show that international trade and capital flows significantly alter projections of the domestic effects of emissions mitigation policy, compared with analyses that ignore international capital flows, and that under some systems of international permit trading the United States is likely to become a significant permit seller, the opposite of the conventional wisdom.

And japan is under pressure to meet their Kyoto goals- without permits, they can’t meet them

Lies 8 (Elaine, journalist , *Reuters,* feb. 10-8, http://uk.reuters.com/article/idUKT26372920080210 ) ET

Japan is the world's fifth-biggest emitter of greenhouse gases blamed for global warming, and while officials have pledged to meet its obligations under the international pact to fight global warming, critics say this may be difficult. Japanese Foreign Minister Masahiko Komura and Russian First Deputy Premier Sergei Ivanov agreed in a meeting on the sidelines of a Munich conference that the first round of vice-ministerial talks on the issue would be held on February 27 in Tokyo, Japanese officials were quoted by Kyodo news agency as saying. Separately, the Yomiuri Shimbun daily said the talks aimed at reaching a deal under which Japan would buy surplus emissions quotas from Russia, a key step towards helping Tokyo meet its Kyoto goals. The trading could take place under several options possible under the Kyoto Protocol, including one in which Japan -- one of the world's most energy-efficient nations -- takes part in work to reduce Russian emissions and then is allowed to count that cut as its own, the Yomiuri added. Officials at the Environment and Foreign Ministries were not available for comment. Japan has pledged to cut emissions by 6 percent from 1990 levels over the 2008-2012 period. A government panel said in December that Japan would be able to reach its goals if additional measures, such as extra voluntary agreements with industries, are carried out. The United States, China, India and Russia all emit more greenhouse gases than Japan, but of the top five emitting nations, only Japan is under pressure to meet a Kyoto goal.

Impacts- Econ Bad- Russia - Kyoto

**If japan looks like it isn’t going to meet its Kyoto goals it will shorten inspection times of nuclear reactors**

Arita 4 (Eriko, Japan Times staff writer, *the Japan Times*, http://search.japantimes.co.jp/cgi-bin/nn20040618f1.html , 6.18.4) ET

Yet factors such as local opposition and relatively slack growth in electricity demand have delayed the construction of new nuclear reactors, jeopardizing the government's carefully crafted plans to meet its Kyoto Protocol target of trimming emissions by 6 percent from 1990 levels between 2008 and 2012. The government now says that only four new reactors are likely to be built by fiscal 2010, whereas previous projections had put the figure at as many as 13. This scenario will probably lead to a rise in thermal power generation using fossil fuels, boosting carbon dioxide emissions by an additional 20 million to 30 million tons by fiscal 2010, according to government data. In an effort to counteract this, the Environment Ministry proposed in April that Japan produce thermal energy by making better use of natural gas, which releases 40 percent less carbon dioxide than coal. Yoshiteru Sakaguchi, assistant head of the ministry's Climate Change Policy Division, said that 19.2 million tons of carbon dioxide emissions can be cut by fiscal 2010 if the operation rate of natural gas thermal power plants is raised from the current 50.3 percent to 59.3 percent and that of power plants powered by coal is cut from the current 64.3 percent to 50.1 percent. "In Japan, nuclear power and coal thermal power plants operate around the clock" as core power suppliers, Sakaguchi explained. "But in Britain, it is the natural gas thermal power plants that operate all day." Britain's carbon dioxide emissions dropped 7 percent in 2000 compared with 1990 levels, according to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. Sakaguchi said this decline was helped by the greater role played by gas. However, the Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry suggested earlier this month that the expected shortfall in emissions cuts should be covered by improving the operation rate of existing nuclear reactors by shortening the period in which operations are halted for regular inspections.

Japan has 52 nuclear reactors that are all instable- less inspection would be a massive mistake

Moret 4 (Leuren, Special reporter @ Japan Times, *Japan Times,* 5.23.4, http://search.japantimes.co.jp/cgi-bin/fl20040523x2.html ) ET

Of all the places in all the world where no one in their right mind would build scores of nuclear power plants, Japan would be pretty near the top of the list. An aerial view of the Hamaoka plant in Shizuoka Prefecture, "the most dangerous nuclear power plant in Japan" The Japanese archipelago is located on the so-called Pacific Rim of Fire, a large active volcanic and tectonic zone ringing North and South America, Asia and island arcs in Southeast Asia. The major earthquakes and active volcanoes occurring there are caused by the westward movement of the Pacific tectonic plate and other plates leading to subduction under Asia. Japan sits on top of four tectonic plates, at the edge of the subduction zone, and is in one of the most tectonically active regions of the world. It was extreme pressures and temperatures, resulting from the violent plate movements beneath the seafloor, that created the beautiful islands and volcanoes of Japan. Nonetheless, like many countries around the world -- where General Electric and Westinghouse designs are used in 85 percent of all commercial reactors -- Japan has turned to nuclear power as a major energy source. In fact the three top nuclear-energy countries are the United States, where the existence of 118 reactors was acknowledged by the Department of Energy in 2000, France with 72 and Japan, where 52 active reactors were cited in a December 2003 Cabinet White Paper. The 52 reactors in Japan -- which generate a little over 30 percent of its electricity -- are located in an area the size of California, many within 150 km of each other and almost all built along the coast where seawater is available to cool them. However, many of those reactors have been negligently sited on active faults, particularly in the subduction zone along the Pacific coast, where major earthquakes of magnitude 7-8 or more on the Richter scale occur frequently. The periodicity of major earthquakes in Japan is less than 10 years. There is almost no geologic setting in the world more dangerous for nuclear power than Japan -- the third-ranked country in the world for nuclear reactors. "I think the situation right now is very scary," says Katsuhiko Ishibashi, a seismologist and professor at Kobe University. "It's like a kamikaze terrorist wrapped in bombs just waiting to explode." Last summer, I visited Hamaoka nuclear power plant in Shizuoka Prefecture, at the request of citizens concerned about the danger of a major earthquake. I spoke about my findings at press conferences afterward. Because Hamaoka sits directly over the subduction zone near the junction of two plates, and is overdue for a major earthquake, it is considered to be the most dangerous nuclear power plant in Japan. Together with local citizens, I spent the day walking around the

facility, collecting rocks, studying the soft sediments it sits on and tracing the nearly vertical faults through the area -- evidence of violent tectonic movements. The next day I was surprised to see so many reporters attending the two press conferences held at Kakegawa City Hall and Shizuoka Prefecture Hall. When I asked the reporters why they had come so far from Tokyo to hear an American geoscientist, I was told it was because no foreigner had ever come to tell them how dangerous Japan's nuclear power plants are.

Impacts- Econ Bad- Russia - Kyoto

**And a nuclear reactor collapse causes apocalyptic extinction**

Wasserman 2 (Harvey, Senior Editor – Free Press, *Earth Island Journal*, Spring 2002, http://www.earthisland.org/journal/index.php/eij/article/nuclear\_power\_and\_terrorism/ ) ET

The intense radioactive heat within today's operating reactors is the hottest anywhere on the planet. Because Indian Point has operated so long, its accumulated radioactive burden far exceeds that of Chernobyl. The safety systems are extremely complex and virtually indefensible. One or more could be wiped out with a small aircraft, ground-based weapons, truck bombs or even chemical/biological assaults aimed at the work force. A terrorist assault at Indian Point could yield three infernal fireballs of molten radioactive lava burning through the earth and into the aquifer and the river. Striking water, they would blast gigantic billows of horribly radioactive steam into the atmosphere. Thousands of square miles would be saturated with the most lethal clouds ever created, depositing relentless genetic poisons that would kill forever. Infants and small children would quickly die en masse. Pregnant women would spontaneously abort or give birth to horribly deformed offspring. Ghastly sores, rashes, ulcerations and burns would afflict the skin of millions. Heart attacks, stroke and multiple organ failure would kill thousands on the spot. Emphysema, hair loss, nausea, inability to eat or drink or swallow, diarrhea and incontinence, sterility and impotence, asthma and blindness would afflict hundreds of thousands, if not millions. Then comes the wave of cancers, leukemias, lymphomas, tumors and hellish diseases for which new names will have to be invented. Evacuation would be impossible, but thousands would die trying. Attempts to quench the fires would be futile. More than 800,000 Soviet draftees forced through Chernobyl's seething remains in a futile attempt to clean it up are still dying from their exposure. At Indian Point, the molten cores would burn uncontrolled for days, weeks and years. Who would volunteer for such an American task force? The immediate damage from an Indian Point attack (or a domestic accident) would render all five boroughs of New York City an apocalyptic wasteland. As at Three Mile Island, where thousands of farm and wild animals died in heaps, natural ecosystems would be permanently and irrevocably destroyed. Spiritually, psychologically, financially and ecologically, our nation would never recover. This is what we missed by a mere 40 miles on September 11. Now that we are at war, this is what could be happening as you read this. There are 103 of these potential Bombs of the Apocalypse operating in the US. They generate a mere 8 percent of our total energy. Since its deregulation crisis, California cut its electric consumption by some 15 percent. Within a year, the US could cheaply replace virtually all the reactors with increased efficiency. Yet, as the terror escalates, Congress is fast-tracking the extension of the Price-Anderson Act, a form of legal immunity that protects reactor operators from liability in case of a meltdown or terrorist attack. Do we take this war seriously? Are we committed to the survival of our nation? If so, the ticking reactor bombs that could obliterate the very core of our life and of all future generations must be shut down

Impacts- Econ Bad- Russia- Arms Buildup

**When Russia experiences economic growth they buy more arms to increase their military influence**

Saradzhyan 8 (Simon, research fellow @ Harvard, *Warfare.RU*, http://warfare.ru/?linkid=2279&catid=239 ) ET

There are cardinal changes in what is going on in the world and the armed forces need to be prepared for […] wars of the future," according to the minister, who also holds the rank of deputy prime minister and is one of the possible contesters in the 2008 presidential race. In line with the Defense Ministry's 2007-2015 armament program, the Russian military will spend a total of 300 billion rubles on procurement this year alone, according to Ivanov. Russia's defense budget has been growing steadily thanks to economic growth fuelled by high oil prices and a consumer boom. As a result of the surge in federal budget revenues, the Defense Ministry quadrupled its budget from 214 billion rubles in 2001 to 821 billion this year. Experts say the Defense Ministry's shopping spree reflects the Kremlin's desire to transform the continuing economic resurgence into geopolitical dividends by beefing up conventional forces while maintaining the strategic nuclear forces' so-called assured destruction capability of in order to flex muscles in the adjacent neighborhoods in the short-to-medium term and across the globe in the longer term. "The procurement plan demonstrates that Russia at least wants to acquire capability to project military-political influence at least on the regional level [..]," Ruslan Pukhov, director of the Centre for Analysis of Strategies and Technologies (CAST) and member of the Defense Ministry's Public Council, told ISN Security Watch in a Saturday phone interview. Ivan Safranchuk, director of the Moscow office of the Washington, DC-based World Security Institute, concurred. "This is a sign that Russia wants to expand projection of its influence in the world, " Safranchuk told ISN Security Watch in a Wednesday phone interview. The experts specifically pointed out that talk of procuring new aircraft carriers was one sign that Russia was seeking to expand its zone of influence. The decision to procure more could be made in 2009, the statement quoted Ivanov as saying. The Russian navy currently has one Soviet-era aircraft carrier and would have to build new ones from scratch since the sole maker of this ship in Soviet times is located in now-independent Ukraine. As part of the shopping spree, the military will procure a total of 31 ships for the navy in 2007-2015, according to Ivanov. The ministry will also procure new arms for 40 tanks, 97 infantry and 50 airborne battalions in line with the 2007-2017 programs, he said.

And increased arms in Russia would embolden other enemies to attack the us- causes global war and crashes US heg

Simes, 7 (Dimitri, Pres of Nixon center, pub of Nat’l Interest, *Foreign Affairs,* nov/dec 7) ET

But if the current U.S.-Russian relationship deteriorates further, it will not bode well for the United States and would be even worse for Russia. The Russian general staª is lobbying to add a military dimension to the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, and some top officials are beginning to champion the idea of a foreign policy realignment directed against the West. There are also quite a few countries, such as Iran and Venezuela, urging Russia to work with China to play a leading role in balancing the United States economically, politically, and militarily. And post-Soviet states such as Georgia, which are adept at playing the United States and Russia officials against each other, could act in ways that escalate tensions. Putin’s stage management of Moscow’s succession in order to maintain a dominant role for himself makes a major foreign policy shift in Russia unlikely. But new Russian leaders could have their own ideas—and their own ambitions—and political uncertainty or economic problems could tempt them to exploit nationalist sentiments to build legitimacy. If relations worsen, the un Security Council may no longer be available—due to a Russian veto—even occasionally, to provide legitimacy for U.S. military actions or to impose meaningful sanctions on rogue states. Enemies of the United States could be emboldened by new sources of military hardware in Russia, and political and security protection from Moscow. International terrorists could find new sanctuaries in Russia or the states it protects.And the collapse of U.S.- Russian relations could give China much greater flexibility in dealing with the United States. It would not be a new Cold War, because Russia will not be a global rival and is unlikely to be the prime mover in confronting the United States. But it would provide incentives and cover for others to confront Washington, with potentially catastrophic results. It would be reckless and shortsighted to push Russia in that direction by repeating the errors of the past, rather than working to avoid the dangerous consequences of a renewed U.S.-Russian confrontation. But ultimately,Moscow will have to make its own decisions.Given the Kremlin’s history of poor policy choices, a clash may come whether Washington likes it or not.And should that happen, the United States must approach this rivalry with greater realism and determination than it has displayed in its halfhearted attempts at partnership.

Impacts- Econ Bad- Russia- Arms Buildup

And Russia spends every penny they can from their budget on arms- economic growth increases use

Warfare.Ru 9 (*Warefare.Ru*, http://warfare.ru/?lang=&linkid=2279&catid=239 , 9) ET

A government official said there would also be more short-range missiles, combat planes, helicopters, tanks and naval vessels. In all, Russia will spend nearly $140bn (?94.5bn) on buying arms. Russia plans a massive increase in its weapons procurement for three years beginning in 2009, with 300 tanks, 14 warships and almost 50 airplanes on the shopping list, a senior government official said on Monday. Vladislav Putilin, deputy head of the military-industrial commission, told journalists after a cabinet meeting the government planned to allocate 4 trillion roubles ($141.5 billion)in 2009-11 to bankroll equipment purchases to modernize its army. Putilin said that over the three-year period Russia's armed forces would receive more than 400 new types of weapons, including 48 aircraft, six spy drones, 60 helicopters, 14 warships, 300 tanks and more than 2,000 auto vehicles.

Impacts- Econ Bad- SE Asia Arms Build up

South asian countries use military growth to increase arms including missiles and jets

Global military 10 ( 3.17.10, *Global Military News*, http://www.global-military.com/southeast-asian-countries-to-purchase-weapons-and-the-possibility-of-war-greatly-increased-the-south-china-sea.html) ET

A report from the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute’s report on the security situation in South Asia, causing the relevant foreign media reports. British “Financial Times” reported that China’s military rise, the South Asian countries have increased their armaments, large-scale imports of modern weapons. The Reuters news agency predicts that due to recently discovered in the South Hey marine resources, making the conflict broke out between the countries concerned the possibility of greatly increased dramatically in some countries to buy modern weapons, but also neighboring countries and even caused a chain reaction throughout the region. Britain’s “Financial Times” published on March 15 article said that the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) Arms Transfers Project senior research fellow Simon – Weizmann Institute (Siemon Wezeman) Military analysts have warned that China is growing modernization of military forces, neighboring Southeast Asian countries have increased investment in national defense and procurement. In recent years, some Southeast Asian countries in recent years, “substantial” to buy advanced submarines, fighter jets and long-range missiles, its aim is to possible future rainy day conflict in the South China Sea, the region’s territorial disputes are likely to evolve into a war. He said: “Although the Southeast Asian countries have not publicly expressed concerns about China’s military buildup, but they are thought to this issue, and are used to purchase advanced weapons and ways to express their position. 15 years ago, in the South China Sea, the same conflicting time, these countries do not have the ability to compete. Now, if someone in the area and attack these fields, things will become very dangerous. ”Many Southeast Asian countries because of the armed forces resigned to the 1997 Asian financial crisis led to the situation of military equipment behind the building, in the recent economic upturn began to have to buy arms. According to the article, although these countries to buy advanced weapons from the driving force is the domestic, regional and more strategic considerations, most national governments, and not directly by name China as a direct target

Arms race in asia threatens extinction

Feffer 8 (John, co director of foreign policy in focus @ Institute for policy studies, 3.19.8, *Asia Pacific Journal*, http://www.japanfocus.org/-John-Feffer/2704) ET

The arms race in Northeast Asia and the Asia Pacific threatens to overwhelm all talk of peace in the region. Northeast Asia is where four of the world's largest military forces -- those of the United States, China, Russia, and Japan, three of them leading nuclear powers -- confront each other – in addition to the two Koreas that sit astride the most dangerous flash point. Together, the countries participating in the Six-Party Talks account for approximately 65% of world military expenditures, with the United States responsible for roughly half the global total.

Impacts- Econ Bad- SE Asia Arms Build up

These arms races will go nuclear and reignite conflicts in India and Pakistan, Korea, and Taiwan leading to extinction

Cirincione 2k (Joseph, president of Ploughshares Fund, *Foreign Policy*, 3.22.00) ET

The blocks would fall quickest and hardest in Asia, where proliferation pressures are already building more quickly than anywhere else in the world. If a nuclear breakout takes place in Asia**,** then the international arms controlagreements that have been painstakingly negotiated over the past 40 years will crumble. Moreover, the United States could find itself embroiled inits fourth waron the Asian continent in six decades--a costly rebuke to those who seek the safety of Fortress America by hiding behind national missile defenses. Consider what is already happening: North Korea continues to play guessing games with its nuclear and missile programs; South Korea wants its own missiles to match Pyongyang's; India and Pakistan shoot across borders while running a slow-motion nuclear arms race; China modernizes its nuclear arsenal amid tensions with Taiwan and the United States; Japan's vice defense minister is forced to resign after extolling the benefits of nuclear weapons; and Russia--whose Far East nuclear deployments alone make it the largest Asian nuclear power--struggles to maintain territorial coherence. Five of these states have nuclear weapons; the others are capable of constructing them. Like neutrons firing from a split atom, one nation's actions can trigger reactions throughout the region, which in turn, stimulate additional actions. These nations form an interlocking Asian nuclear reaction chain that vibrates dangerously with each new development.If the frequency and intensity of this reaction cycle increase, critical decisions taken by any one of these governments could cascade into the second great wave of nuclear-weapon proliferation, bringing regional and global economic and political instability and, perhaps, the first combat use of a nuclear weapon since 1945.

\*\* Economic Growth Good\*\*

Impacts- Econ Good- Extinction

Economic collapse causes nuclear war- extinction

Broward 9 ((Member of Triond) http://newsflavor.com/opinions/will-an-economic-collapse-kill-you/ AD: 7-7-09 )ET

Now its time to look at the consequences of a failing world economy. With five offical nations having nuclear weapons, and four more likely to have them there could be major consequences of another world war. The first thing that will happen after an economic collapse will be war over resources. The United States currency will become useless and will have no way of securing reserves. The United States has little to no capacity to produce oil, it is totatlly dependent on foreign oil. If the United States stopped getting foreign oil, the government would go to no ends to secure more, if there were a war with any other major power over oil, like Russia or China, these wars would most likely involve nuclear weapons. Once one nation launches a nuclear weapon, there would of course be retaliation, and with five or more countries with nuclear weapons there would most likely be a world nuclear war. The risk is so high that acting to save the economy is the most important issue facing us in the 21st century.

Economic collapse would lead to the spread of AIDs, famine, sickness, crime, and cause global ethnic wars leading to the extinction of civilization.

Silk 93 ( Leonard, Prof of Econ @ Pace U, *Foreign Affairs*, Wntr v72 n1 p167(16).) ET

In the absence of such shifts of human and capital resources to expanding civilian industries, there are strong economic pressures on arms-producing nations to maintain high levels of military production and to sell weapons, both conventional and dual-use nuclear technology, wherever buyers can be found. Without a revival of national economies and the global economy, the production and proliferation of weapons will continue, creating more Iraqs, Yugoslavias, Somalias and Cambodias - or worse. Like the Great Depression, the current economic slump has fanned the fires of nationalist, ethnic and religious hatred around the world. Economic hardship is not the only cause of these social and political pathologies, but it aggravates all of them, and in turn they feed back on economic development. They also undermine efforts to deal with such global problems as environmental pollution, the production and trafficking of drugs, crime, sickness, famine, AIDS and other plagues. Growth will not solve all those problems by itself But economic growth - and growth alone - creates the additional resources that make it possible to achieve such fundamental goals as higher living standards, national and collective security, a healthier environment, and more liberal and open economies and societies.

Impacts- Econ Good- Extinction

**Economic collapse culminates in extinction and complete destruction of the biosphere**

Bearden 2k (Liutenant Colonel, Lieutenant Colonel in the U.S. Army, www.cheniere.org/techpapers/Unnecessary%20Energy%20Crisis.doc) ET

Bluntly, we foresee these factors - and others { } not covered - converging to a catastrophic collapse of the world economy in about eight years. As the collapse of the Western economies nears, one may expect catastrophic stress on the 160 developing nations as the developed nations are forced to dramatically curtail orders. International Strategic Threat Aspects History bears out that desperate nations take desperate actions. Prior to the final economic collapse, the stress on nations will have increased the intensity and number of their conflicts, to the point where the arsenals of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) now possessed by some 25 nations, are almost certain to be released. As an example, suppose a starving North Korea launches nuclear weapons upon Japan and South Korea, including U.S. forces there, in a spasmodic suicidal response. Or suppose a desperate China - whose long range nuclear missiles can reach the United States - attacks Taiwan. In addition to immediate responses, the mutual treaties involved in such scenarios will quickly draw other nations into the conflict, escalating it significantly. Strategic nuclear studies have shown for decades that, under such extreme stress conditions, once a few nukes are launched, adversaries and potential adversaries are then compelled to launch on perception of preparations by one's adversary. The real legacy of the MAD concept is his side of the MAD coin that is almost never discussed. Without effective defense, the only chance a nation has to survive at all, is to launch immediate full-bore pre-emptive strikes and try to take out its perceived foes as rapidly and massively as possible. As the studies showed, rapid escalation to full WMD exchange occurs, with a great percent of the WMD arsenals being unleashed . The resulting great Armageddon will destroy civilization as we know it, and perhaps most of the biosphere, at least for many decades.

Impacts- Econ Good- War

Continued economic collapse will exacerbate tensions in Asia – China may regress to a 1930s Japan-style governance, and North Korea and Iran will advance their interests with loose nukes

Green, 9 (Michael J., Senior Advisor and Japan Chair at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) and Associate Professor at Georgetown University. Asia Times Online, “March 26 2009. http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Asian\_Economy/KC26Dk01.html AD 6/30/09) JM

Facing the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression, analysts at the World Bank and the US Central Intelligence Agency are just beginning to contemplate the ramifications for international stability if there is not a recovery in the next year. For the most part, the focus has been on fragile states such as some in Eastern Europe. However, the Great Depression taught us that a downward global economic spiral can even have jarring impacts on great powers. It is no mere coincidence that the last great global economic downturn was followed by the most destructive war in human history. In the 1930s, economic desperation helped fuel autocratic regimes and protectionism in a downward economic-security death spiral that engulfed the world in conflict. This spiral was aided by the preoccupation of the United States and other leading nations with economic troubles at home and insufficient attention to working with other powers to maintain stability abroad. Today's challenges are different, yet 1933's London Economic Conference, which failed to stop the drift toward deeper depression and world war, should be a cautionary tale for leaders heading to next month's London Group of 20 (G-20) meeting. There is no question the US must urgently act to address banking issues and to restart its economy. But the lessons of the past suggest that we will also have to keep an eye on those fragile threads in the international system that could begin to unravel if the financial crisis is not reversed early in the Barack Obama administration and realize that economics and security are intertwined in most of the critical challenges we face. A disillusioned rising power? Four areas in Asia merit particular attention, although so far the current financial crisis has not changed Asia's fundamental strategic picture. China is not replacing the US as regional hegemon, since the leadership in Beijing is too nervous about the political implications of the financial crisis at home to actually play a leading role in solving it internationally. Predictions that the US will be brought to its knees because China is the leading holder of US debt often miss key points. China's currency controls and full employment/export-oriented growth strategy give Beijing few choices other than buying US Treasury bills or harming its own economy. Rather than creating new rules or institutions in international finance, or reorienting the Chinese economy to generate greater long-term consumer demand at home, Chinese leaders are desperately clinging to the status quo (though Beijing deserves credit for short-term efforts to stimulate economic growth). The greater danger with China is not an eclipsing of US leadership, but instead the kind of shift in strategic orientation that happened to Japan after the Great Depression. Japan was arguably not a revisionist power before 1932 and sought instead to converge with the global economy through open trade and adoption of the gold standard. The worldwide depression and protectionism of the 1930s devastated the newly exposed Japanese economy and contributed directly to militaristic and autarkic policies in Asia as the Japanese people reacted against what counted for globalization at the time. China today is similarly converging with the global economy, and many experts believe China needs at least 8% annual growth to sustain social stability. Realistic growth predictions for 2009 are closer to 5%. Veteran China hands were watching closely when millions of migrant workers returned to work after the Lunar New Year holiday last month to find factories closed and jobs gone. There were pockets of protests, but nationwide unrest seems unlikely this year, and Chinese leaders are working around the clock to ensure that it does not happen next year either. However, the economic slowdown has only just begun and nobody is certain how it will impact the social contract in China between the ruling communist party and the 1.3 billion Chinese who have come to see President Hu Jintao's call for "harmonious society" as inextricably linked to his promise of "peaceful development". If the Japanese example is any precedent, a sustained economic slowdown has the potential to open a dangerous path from economic nationalism to strategic revisionism in China too. Dangerous states It is noteworthy that North Korea, Myanmar and Iran have all intensified their defiance in the wake of the financial crisis, which has distracted the world's leading nations, limited their moral authority and sown potential discord. With Beijing worried about the potential impact of North Korean belligerence or instability on Chinese internal stability, and leaders in Japan and South Korea under siege in parliament because of the collapse of their stock markets, leaders in the North Korean capital of Pyongyang have grown increasingly boisterous about their country's claims to great power status as a nuclear weapons state. The junta in Myanmar has chosen this moment to arrest hundreds of political dissidents and thumb its nose at fellow members of the 10-country Association of Southeast Asian Nations. Iran continues its nuclear program while exploiting differences between the US, UK and France (or the P-3 group)

<Continues…>
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and China and Russia - differences that could become more pronounced if economic friction with Beijing or Russia crowds out cooperation or if Western European governments grow nervous about sanctions as a tool of policy. It is possible that the economic downturn will make these dangerous states more pliable because of falling fuel prices (Iran) and greater need for foreign aid (North Korea and Myanmar), but that may depend on the extent that authoritarian leaders care about the well-being of their people or face internal political pressures linked to the economy. So far, there is little evidence to suggest either and much evidence to suggest these dangerous states see an opportunity to advance their asymmetrical advantages against the international system.

Impacts- Econ Good- War

Economic growth actually checks war – empirically proven

Griswold 5(Daniel- Director of Center for Trade @ Cato Institute, *Free Trade,* 12.29.5, http://www.freetrade.org/node/282) ET

Many causes lie behind the good news -- the end of the Cold War and the spread of democracy, among them -- but expanding trade and globalization appear to be playing a major role. Far from stoking a "World on Fire," as one misguided American author has argued, growing commercial ties between nations have had a dampening effect on armed conflict and war, for three main reasons. First, trade and globalization have reinforced the trend toward democracy, and democracies don't pick fights with each other. Freedom to trade nurtures democracy by expanding the middle class in globalizing countries and equipping people with tools of communication such as cell phones, satellite TV, and the Internet. With trade comes more travel, more contact with people in other countries, and more exposure to new ideas. Thanks in part to globalization, almost two thirds of the world's countries today are democracies -- a record high. Second, as national economies become more integrated with each other, those nations have more to lose should war break out. War in a globalized world not only means human casualties and bigger government, but also ruptured trade and investment ties that impose lasting damage on the economy. In short, globalization has dramatically raised the economic cost of war. Third, globalization allows nations to acquire wealth through production and trade rather than conquest of territory and resources. Increasingly, wealth is measured in terms of intellectual property, financial assets, and human capital. Those are assets that cannot be seized by armies. If people need resources outside their national borders, say oil or timber or farm products, they can acquire them peacefully by trading away what they can produce best at home. Of course, free trade and globalization do not guarantee peace. Hot-blooded nationalism and ideological fervor can overwhelm cold economic calculations. But deep trade and investment ties among nations make war less attractive. Trade wars in the 1930s deepened the economic depression, exacerbated global tensions, and helped to usher in a world war. Out of the ashes of that experience, the United States urged Germany, France and other Western European nations to form a common market that has become the European Union. In large part because of their intertwined economies, a general war in Europe is now unthinkable. In East Asia, the extensive and growing economic ties among Mainland China, Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan is helping to keep the peace. China's communist rulers may yet decide to go to war over its "renegade province," but the economic cost to their economy would be staggering and could provoke a backlash among its citizens. In contrast, poor and isolated North Korea is all the more dangerous because it has nothing to lose economically should it provoke a war. In Central America, countries that were racked by guerrilla wars and death squads two decades ago have turned not only to democracy but to expanding trade, culminating in the Central American Free Trade Agreement with the United States. As the Stockholm institute reports in its 2005 Yearbook, "Since the 1980s, the introduction of a more open economic model in most states of the Latin American and Caribbean region has been accompanied by the growth of new regional structures, the dying out of interstate conflicts and a reduction in intra-state conflicts." Much of the political violence that remains in the world today is concentrated in the Middle East and Sub-Saharan Africa -- the two regions of the world that are the least integrated into the global economy. Efforts to bring peace to those regions must include lowering their high barriers to trade, foreign investment, and domestic entrepreneurship. Advocates of free trade and globalization have long argued that trade expansion means more efficiency, higher incomes, and reduced poverty. The welcome decline of armed conflicts in the past few decades indicates that free trade also comes with its own peace dividend.

Impacts- Econ Good- War

Economic downturn breeds wars

Mead 9 (Henry , Sr fellow in U.S. Foreign Policy at the Council on Foreign Relations, *The New Republic*, 2/4/09, http://www.tnr.com/politics/story.html?id=571cbbb9-2887-4d81-8542-92e83915f5f8&p=2) ET

So far, such half-hearted experiments not only have failed to work; they have left the societies that have tried them in a progressively worse position, farther behind the front-runners as time goes by. Argentina has lost ground to Chile; Russian development has fallen farther behind that of the Baltic states and Central Europe. Frequently, the crisis has weakened the power of the merchants, industrialists, financiers, and professionals who want to develop a liberal capitalist society integrated into the world. Crisis can also strengthen the hand of religious extremists, populist radicals, or authoritarian traditionalists who are determined to resist liberal capitalist society for a variety of reasons. Meanwhile, the companies and banks based in these societies are often less established and more vulnerable to the consequences of a financial crisis than more established firms in wealthier societies. As a result, developing countries and countries where capitalism has relatively recent and shallow roots tend to suffer greater economic and political damage when crisis strikes--as, inevitably, it does. And, consequently, financial crises often reinforce rather than challenge the global distribution of power and wealth. This may be happening yet again. None of which means that we can just sit back and enjoy the recession. History may suggest that financial crises actually help capitalist great powers maintain their leads--but it has other, less reassuring messages as well. If financial crises have been a normal part of life during the 300-year rise of the liberal capitalist system under the Anglophone powers, so has war. The wars of the League of Augsburg and the Spanish Succession; the Seven Years War; the American Revolution; the Napoleonic Wars; the two World Wars; the cold war: The list of wars is almost as long as the list of financial crises. Bad economic times can breed wars. Europe was a pretty peaceful place in 1928, but the Depression poisoned German public opinion and helped bring Adolf Hitler to power. If the current crisis turns into a depression, what rough beasts might start slouching toward Moscow, Karachi, Beijing, or New Delhi to be born? The United States may not, yet, decline, but, if we can't get the world economy back on track, we may still have to fight.

Impacts- Econ Good- War

The economy is in a continual downhill slide – unless we can make a recovery the world is destined for violent political unrest.

**Klare, 9** (Michael T., Professor of Peace and World Security Studies at Hampshire College, author of “Resource Wars” and “Blood and Oil”, serves on the board of directors of the Human Rights Wach, and is a columnist for Foreign Policy in Focus. The Pine Hills News, February 25 2009. http://thepinehillsnews.com/wp/2009/02/25/economic-crash-will-fuel-social-unrest/ AD 6/30/09)

While most such incidents are triggered by an immediate event — a tariff, the closure of local factory, the announcement of government austerity measures — there are systemic factors at work as well. While economists now agree that we are in the midst of a recession deeper than any since the Great Depression of the 1930s, they generally assume that this downturn — like all others since World War II — will be followed in a year, or two, or three, by the beginning of a typical recovery. There are good reasons to suspect that this might not be the case — that poorer countries (along with many people in the richer countries) will have to wait far longer for such a recovery, or may see none at all. Even in the United States, 54% of Americans now believe that “the worst” is “yet to come” and only 7% that the economy has “turned the corner,” according to a recent Ipsos/McClatchy poll; fully a quarter think the crisis will last more than four years. Whether in the U.S., Russia, China, or Bangladesh, it is this underlying anxiety — this suspicion that things are far worse than just about anyone is saying — which is helping to fuel the global epidemic of violence. The World Bank’s most recent status report, Global Economic Prospects 2009, fulfills those anxieties in two ways. It refuses to state the worst, even while managing to hint, in terms too clear to be ignored, at the prospect of a long-term, or even permanent, decline in economic conditions for many in the world. Nominally upbeat — as are so many media pundits — regarding the likelihood of an economic recovery in the not-too-distant future, the report remains full of warnings about the potential for lasting damage in the developing world if things don’t go exactly right. Two worries, in particular, dominate Global Economic Prospects 2009: that banks and corporations in the wealthier countries will cease making investments in the developing world, choking off whatever growth possibilities remain; and that food costs will rise uncomfortably, while the use of farmlands for increased biofuels production will result in diminished food availability to hundreds of millions. Despite its Pollyanna-ish passages on an economic rebound, the report does not mince words when discussing what the almost certain coming decline in First World investment in Third World countries would mean: “Should credit markets fail to respond to the robust policy interventions taken so far, the consequences for developing countries could be very serious. Such a scenario would be characterized by… substantial disruption and turmoil, including bank failures and currency crises, in a wide range of developing countries. Sharply negative growth in a number of developing countries and all of the attendant repercussions, including increased poverty and unemployment, would be inevitable.” In the fall of 2008, when the report was written, this was considered a “worst-case scenario.” Since then, the situation has obviously worsened radically, with financial analysts reporting a virtual freeze in worldwide investment. Equally troubling, newly industrialized countries that rely on exporting manufactured goods to richer countries for much of their national income have reported stomach-wrenching plunges in sales, producing massive plant closings and layoffs. The World Bank’s 2008 survey also contains troubling data about the future availability of food. Although insisting that the planet is capable of producing enough foodstuffs to meet the needs of a growing world population, its analysts were far less confident that sufficient food would be available at prices people could afford, especially once hydrocarbon prices begin to rise again. With ever more farmland being set aside for biofuels production and efforts to increase crop yields through the use of “miracle seeds” losing steam, the Bank’s analysts balanced their generally hopeful outlook with a caveat: “If biofuels-related demand for crops is much stronger or productivity performance disappoints, future food supplies may be much more expensive than in the past.” Combine these two World Bank findings — zero economic growth in the developing world and rising food prices — and you have a perfect recipe for unrelenting civil unrest and violence. The eruptions seen in 2008 and early 2009 will then be mere harbingers of a grim future in which, in a given week, any number of cities reel from riots and civil disturbances which could spread like multiple brushfires in a drought.

Impacts- Econ Good- War

Economic decline will result in global war.

Mead, 9 (Walter Russell Mead, [Henry A. Kissinger](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Henry_A._Kissinger) senior fellow for [U.S. foreign policy](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/U.S._foreign_policy) at the Council on Foreign Relations. *The New Republic*, 2.4.9.  http://www.tnr.com/politics/story.html?id=571cbbb9-2887-4d81-8542-92e83915f5f8&p=2 AD 6/30/09) ET

So far, such half-hearted experiments not only have failed to work; they have left the societies that have tried them in a progressively worse position, farther behind the front-runners as time goes by. Argentina has lost ground to Chile; Russian development has fallen farther behind that of the Baltic states and Central Europe. Frequently, the crisis has weakened the power of the merchants, industrialists, financiers, and professionals who want to develop a liberal capitalist society integrated into the world. Crisis can also strengthen the hand of religious extremists, populist radicals, or authoritarian traditionalists who are determined to resist liberal capitalist society for a variety of reasons. Meanwhile, the companies and banks based in these societies are often less established and more vulnerable to the consequences of a financial crisis than more established firms in wealthier societies. As a result, developing countries and countries where capitalism has relatively recent and shallow roots tend to suffer greater economic and political damage when crisis strikes--as, inevitably, it does. And, consequently, **financial crises often reinforce rather than challenge the global distribution of power and wealth.** This may be happening yet again. None of which means that we can just sit back and enjoy the recession. History may suggest that financial crises actually help capitalist great powers maintain their leads--but it has other, less reassuring messages as well.**If financial crises have been a normal part of life** during the 300-year rise of the liberal capitalist system under the Anglophone powers, **so has war**. The wars of the League of Augsburg and the Spanish Succession; the Seven Years War; the American Revolution; the Napoleonic Wars; the two World Wars; the cold war: The list of wars is almost as long as the list of financial crises. **Bad economic times can breed wars. Europe was a pretty peaceful place in 1928, but the Depression poisoned German public opinion and helped bring Adolf Hitler to power. If the current crisis turns into a** depression, what **rough beasts might start slouching toward Moscow, Karachi, Beijing, or New Delhi to be born**? The United States may not, yet, decline, but**, if we can't get the world economy back on track,** **we may still have to fight**.

Impacts- Econ Good- War

Economic collapse leads to global imperialism and war

Internationalist Perspective, 2 (Sander, 4/12/2002, http://users.skynet.be/ippi/3t15%20iptex.htm) ET

But let us now examine the consequences of a deep global economic crisis on the imperialist impulses of other countries. The worsening economic conditions would be felt most acutely in the periphery of the global order, where already now many capitals feel the knife of devalorization on their throats and many states are losing their authority over parts of their territories and their monopoly over the use of armies. Thus, the economic collapse will inevitably ignite more inter-imperialist fires, wars of states against states as well as so-called civil wars. Increasingly, the US and its main allies will face the dilemma whether to put them out or not. The line of what the sheriff of the global order permits will be constantly shifting. Given their own economic problems, the cost of intervening militarily will weigh increasingly heavily. The dispute over who should carry the burden will come on top of the other conflicts created by the economic crisis and further undermine the perception of commonality of interests between them. Furthermore the willingness of society and of the working class in particular to accept growing military intervention may throw up an impassable roadblock. What is and what is not in the vital national interest of the US and Europe will be constantly redefined. It seems very likely then, that an increasing number of conflicts will have to be allowed to go on without intervention of the major powers. Countries such as Russia, China, Iran and others would jump into the vacuum to advance their own imperialist interests. Alliances and connections between different conflicts would emerge. The deeper the economic crisis becomes and the more wars are permitted, the more the imperialist impulse would snowball. Even if the major powers would succeed in imposing a retrenched but hard line of defense of the global order, which is a very big ‘if’, and prevent war between the nuclear armed India and Pakistan, between China and Taiwan or Japan, an invasion of South-Korea by the North or wars that would endanger oil-production in the Middle East, the fire would burn wide and deep. To summarize: for many capitals, the cost-benefit analysis of imperialist undertakings would drastically change because the severity of their economic problems would increase the incentive to seek compensation through conquest and pillage, while the disincentive to do so would diminish because the global economy in crisis would offer them less benefits, especially if the developed capitals react to this crisis in a defensive, protectionist way. The military disincentive would progressively diminish by a growing reluctance and incapacity of the US and other powers to intervene and last but not least the social incentive would increase because through nationalist, racist and xenophobic war and ethnic/religious cleansing campaigns, capitalism would seek to channel the increasing unrest, anger and violence in society to protect its own rule and domestic order.

Impacts- Econ Good- Impact Calc & War

Economic collapse leads to Nazism, global starvation, WMD wars–best timeframe

Nyquist, 5 (economist, 2-4-05, weekly column, financial sense, http://www.financialsense.com/stormwatch/geo/pastanalysis/2005/0204.html) ET

Hayek acknowledged that political exigencies might take precedence over economic principles. As it happened, Röpke did not publish Hayek’s article. According to Hayek, “the political danger of increasing unemployment was so great that [Röpke] would risk the danger of causing further [economic] misdirections by more inflation in the hope of postponing the crisis.” Within three years of Hayek’s note to Röpke, Germany’s troubles led to the appointment of Hitler as Chancellor of Germany. The question may be asked: Why were two economists of the [Austrian School](http://cepa.newschool.edu/het/schools/austrian.htm) – Hayek and Röpke – willing to stifle their criticism of credit expansion in the face of political revolution? As it happens, political wisdom is not the same as economic wisdom. In politics the correct solution to a problem may not be acceptable to the voters. After all, the public does not understand economic principles. They do not recognize that pain is necessary to market correction and a healthy economy. Instead, they are frequently ready to reject good economic policy in favor of anti-market demagogues (like Hitler). From the point of view of practical politics, therefore, it is better to adopt bad economic policies and steal the demagogue’s thunder than allow a totalitarian party to win popular approval and destroy the republic. It is still remarkable, however, that Hayek and Röpke were willing to accept the necessity of credit expansion in the case of Weimar Germany. Their colleague, Ludwig von Mises, warned against credit expansion in the text of [Human Action](http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/ASIN/0930073185/financialsenseon): “A lowering of the gross market rate of interest as brought about by credit expansion always has the effect of making some projects appear profitable which did not appear so before.” In other words, credit expansion leads to bad investments and an inevitable market debacle. “If the credit expansion is not stopped in time,” Mises explained, “the boom turns into [a] crack-up boom; the flight into real values begins, [and] the whole monetary system founders.” Mises also stated: “The final outcome of the credit expansion is general impoverishment.” Sadly, the voters in Germany during the 1930s and the voters in America today do not understand the harmfulness of credit expansion. Worse yet, the Federal Reserve does not fully appreciate – or does not admit – that America must pass through a period of economic pain in order to regain its economic health. If the Federal Reserve cannot speak frankly, or act correctly in this regard, what can we expect from leading politicians? The party most associated with the free market – the Republican Party – will doubtless take the blame for future economic consequences. Logically, the political left – now in firm control of the Democratic Party – will make significant gains. In a book titled [Omnipotent Government](http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/ASIN/0910884153/financialsenseon), written during World War II, Ludwig von Mises noted that the Nazis initially triumphed because the “fundamental tenets of the Nazi ideology do not differ from the generally accepted social and economic ideologies.” According to Mises, these “generally accepted” ideologies embrace the following six points: “(1) Capitalism is an unfair system of exploitation. It injures the immense majority for the benefit of a small minority…. (2) It is therefore the foremost duty of popular government to substitute government control of business for the management of capitalists and entrepreneurs. (3) Price ceilings and minimum wage rates … are an adequate means for improving the lot of the consumers and permanently raising the standard of living…. (4) Easy money policy, i.e., credit expansion, is a useful method of lightening the burdens imposed by capital upon the masses and making a country more prosperous. It has nothing to do with the periodical recurrence of economic depression. Economic crises are an evil inherent in unhampered capitalism. (5) All those who … assert that capitalism best serves the masses … are ill-intentioned and narrow-minded apologists of the selfish class interests of the exploiters…. (6) The advantage derived from foreign trade lies exclusively in exporting. Imports are bad and should be prevented as much as possible.” (See pp. 222-223.)at a time of economic crisis, the appeal of Nazi economic ideas must prove irresistible. It stands to reason, therefore, that a future financial crash will benefit political extremists whose ideas coincide with those listed above. Please note: there is no appreciable difference between the six dogmas listed above and the rhetoric of the Democrats in Congress. Should the United States experience a severe economic contraction during the second term of President Bush, the American people will likely support politicians who advocate further restrictions and controls on our market economy – guaranteeing its strangulation and the steady pauperization of the country. In Congress today, Sen. Edward Kennedy supports nearly all the economic dogmas listed above. It is easy to see, therefore, that the coming economic contraction, due in part to a policy of massive credit expansion, will have serious political consequences for the Republican Party (to the benefit of the Democrats). Furthermore, an economic contraction will encourage the formation of anti-capitalist majorities and a turning away from the free market system. The danger here is not merely economic. The political left openly favors the collapse of America’s strategic position abroad. The withdrawal of the United States from the Middle East, the Far East and Europe would catastrophically impact an international system that presently allows 6 billion people to live on the earth’s surface in relative peace. Should anti-capitalist dogmas overwhelm the global market and trading system that evolved under American leadership, the planet’s economy would contract and untold millions would die of starvation. Nationalistic totalitarianism, fueled by a politics of blame, would once again bring war to Asia and Europe. But this time the war would be waged with mass destruction weapons and the United States would be blamed because it is the center of global capitalism. Furthermore, if the anti-capitalist party gains power in Washington, we can expect to see policies of appeasement and unilateral disarmament enacted. American appeasement and disarmament, in this context, would be an admission of guilt before the court of world opinion. Russia and China, above all, would exploit this admission to justify aggressive wars, invasions and mass destruction attacks. A future financial crash, therefore, must be prevented at all costs. But we cannot do this. As one observer recently lamented, “We drank the poison and now we must die.”

Impacts- Econ Good- Interdependence

Economic growth breeds interdependence with China

Aversa 6/8 (Jeannine, *AP Staff Writer*, *USA Today*, 6.8.10, http://www.usatoday.com/money/economy/2010-06-08-bernanke\_N.htm ) ET

Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke said Monday he is hopeful the economy will gain traction and not fall back into a "double dip" recession. "My best guess is we will have a continued recovery, but it won't feel terrific," Bernanke said. That's because economic growth won't be robust enough to quickly drive down the unemployment rate, now at 9.7%, he said in remarks to the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, a non-partisan research group. The economy grew at a 3% pace in the first quarter of this year. That's good growth during normal times. But coming out of such a deep recession, the economy must grow much more strongly to make a dent in the jobless rate. Fears have grown that the recovery could be derailed if Europe's debt crisis turns into a broader financial contagion, crimping lending in the United States and around the globe. The situation has spooked investors and sent Wall Street into fits of panic. Bernanke said the Fed is monitoring the European crisis carefully, and he believes European leaders are taking the right steps to deal with the problems. Asked when the Fed will start raising interest rates, Bernanke quipped "in the future." The Fed has pledged to hold rates at record lows to nurture the recovery. A growing number of economists now believe the Fed won't start to boost rates until next year given the European crisis and high unemployment. Bernanke didn't offer new clues about when the Fed would reverse course and start to tighten credit. However, he did say the Fed won't be able to wait until the jobs market is fully healed before it pushed rates up. Observing the economy, Bernanke said the news so far is "pretty good." Both consumers and companies are spending sufficiently to keep the recovery moving forward. The private sector, he said, is "picking up the baton" as government stimulus, which mainly powered the recovery in its earliest stage, starts to fade. On relations between the United States and China, Bernanke said there is a real desire between the two superpowers to work together to ease trade and economic tensions. Both countries sort of understand there is a "co-dependency relationship," Bernanke said. The United States snaps up Chinese goods and the Chinese is a major buyer of the U.S. government's debt.

And interdependence discourages war by making the marginal cost bigger than marginal benefit

O-Reilly 9 (Pierce, prof of poli-sci @ Columbia U, apr 29-9, *Columbia.edu* , http://www.columbia.edu/cu/polisci/pdf-files/miniapsa\_oreilly.pdf ) ET

Game theoretic perspectives on war argue that countries fight when the gains outweigh the costs.[?] Much research in international relations has focused on nation-states as rational actors who benefit from certain assets that can be gained from war. These assets may be territory, resolution of a dispute in their favour, international or domestic prestige, or greater security. States, as rational actors, weigh these gains against the costs of war, such as the cost of military operation, destruction of capital, disruption of economic activity, or the loss of territory or other assets in the event of defeat. The costs of war can also be less tangible, such as lost or disrupted alliances, reputational costs, or increased risks of war with other countries. A crucial type of the gain from war has historically been the acquisition of economic resources. Wars are of- ten fought to sustain the huge demand for primary inputs needed by growing economies. Thus resource-rich countries can be an attractive target for aggressors.

Impacts- Econ Good- Interdependence

Economic growth spurs international cooperation which, through free trade- causes peace

O-Reilly 9 (Pierce, prof of poli-sci @ Columbia U, apr 29-9, *Columbia.edu* , http://www.columbia.edu/cu/polisci/pdf-files/miniapsa\_oreilly.pdf ) ET

Now, wars are costly; in addition to the costs of military build-up and waging a war, natural and other

productive resources are often destroyed during war- fighting. Consider, for example, the Soviet Union's

scorched-earth policy during 1941-42, or the budget deficits incurred by the United States during the recent

war in Iraq. Reputational losses and international approbation must also be considered; consider the repu-tational dificulties encountered by Britain and France during their abortive attempt to seize the Suez canal in 1956. Given these deadweight losses, we are at pains to explain why countries face such strong incentives to go to war for resources. I argue that economic heterogeneity can be important part of an explanation of this. Economic asymmetries are instances where countries of similar gross output might be possessed of very resource endowments; Germany may have coal, France iron, or Japan may have high-skilled labour and capi- tal while China may have low-skilled labour and land. This should result in increased incentives for countries to wage wars in instances where their would-be opponent has a relatively large amount of a resource they lack. Trade, however, can allow natural resources to be shared between countries on an international market. Often, countries will prefer to buy resources their economy needs from another country rather than take them by force. Thus free trade can be a key mechanism in reducing the incentives for countries to go to war. Where trade is feasible (where tarrifs and shipping costs are low enough, and where economic resources are tradable) it can be cheaper to buy goods than to appropriate them by force. I will show that the gains to peace from trade are largest when war is most likely, and that the gains to peace are directly proportional to the `gains from trade', familiar from trade models.

Growth good- spurs international dependence that provides security- Kissinger and Cold war conclude

Franks 80 (Edward, assistant director @ Rand, *RAND,*Aug 80, http://www.rand.org/pubs/notes/2009/N1568.pdf ) ET

Events of the late 1960s and early 1970s resulted in significant changes in the international system. According to numerous policy-makers, these changes were at least in part due to increased economic interdependence. As a result, there ensued a proliferation of strategies linking the international economic and political arenas. Such linkage strategies were a prevalent feature of diplomacy during the Nixon/ Ford administration, especially with regard to the concept of détente. Kissinger envisioned that the interrelationship of issues, as expressed in the linkage concept, would develop a network of interests between the United States and the Soviet Union and make both sides conscious of what they would lose by reverting to policies of confrontation and crisis. One important aspect of this linkage phenomenon is the economic component. This is reflected in the widespread belief that economic interdependence brings political and security benefits. Indeed during the cold war, when contact between the United States and the USSR was severely limited, many argued that improved economic relations might mitigate international tensions, as evidenced by several congressional resolutions to that effect. The question, according to Kissinger, was, “ how could trade and economic contact serve the purpose of peace?” Kissinger (1977, p. 158) concluded that: Over time, trade and investment may lesson the autocratic tendencies of the soviet system, invite gradual association of the Soviet economy with the world economy, and foster a degree of interdependency that adds an element of stability to the political equation.

Impacts- Econ Good- A2: War- Goldstein

Goldstein’s argument is logically flawed- explains a nation state level argument in the context of systemic level factors

Cashman 2k (Greg, poli-sci @ Salisbury state U, *What causes war?: an introduction to theories of international conflict* , pg. 68) ET

Goldstein’s explanation for the link between K-waves and war is that increasing production produces a great demand for these resources. This competition occurs during a period when production increases have made increased supplies of war material available to the military sector, drastically increasing the probability of war. (This is essentially a lateral pressure argument without the emphasis on population growth.) Since war is a costly endeavor, states prefer to engage in it when the resources are relatively plentiful. War is most likely to occur, then, near the end of the long-wave upswing. Note, however, that Goldstein falls back on nation-state- level argument ( the presence of economic wherewithal) to help explain a theory based on systemic-level factors (K-waves).

Goldstein’s theory of upswing causing war is empirically wrong- 4 of the last 10 wars were in a downswing and only 2 were in an upswing

Cashman 2k (Greg, poli-sci @ Salisbury state U, *What causes war?: an introduction to theories of international conflict* , pg. 68) ET

What does this have to do with Modelski’s long-cycle theory? Goldstein argues that the hegemonic cycle and economic long-wave cycle, though they are not in phase with each other, operate in conjunction with each other. Thus, hegemonic decline does not by itself lead to war; it is only dangerous when it coincides with an expansionary phase of the economic cycle. Economic expansion by itself is not dangerous either; it must be accompanied by hegemonic stagnation. For example, the economic expansion of the 1960s was not associated with major wars because of the strong hegemonic position of the United States. Goldstein predicts new economic upswings to coincide with the continuation of American hegemonic decline between 2000 and 2030 Jack levy reexamines the issue, matching Goldstein’s data on economic production cycles against the ten general wars of the last 5 centuries. He is interested not in peaks of war severity, but in war initiation. When the production cycle alone is considered (after all, Goldstein’s theory is based on the rise and fall of production, rather than on prices or other variables), Levy discovers a picture at odds with Goldstein’s theory. Four of the ten wars were begun during the middle or end of a production downswing phase, and two occurred at the beginning of an upswing- rather than near the end of the upswing, as Goldstein’s theory suggests. Many of the wars broke out near the transition from downswing to upswing, so that the causalities associated with them belonged in the upswing phase even though the wars might have begun in the downswing- explaining why Goldsttein found an association between K-waves and severity of war, but not between k- waves and war initiation.

Impacts- Econ Good- A2: War- Goldstein

Goldstein is wrong- fails to take key authors into account

Midlarsky 89 ( Manus, political science @ Rutgers U, *Journal of Politics*, Vol 51 No. 4, Nov 89, http://www.jstor.org/stable/2131568 , pg 1068-9)ET

There are heartening and disappointing aspects to both books taken together. On the positive side, the study of systemic, world, or hegemonic wars is now receiving separate and, I might add, highly successful theoretical and empirical treatment. This is indicative of the maturation of a science. Cognate elements of a phenomenon are analyzed separately from the remainder to see how well they cohere in the attempt at explanation. Additionally and importantly, how successful is that explanatory effort? Fortunately, in the case of Goldstein treatment, the answer to both questions is yes. The disappointing aspect emerges in the danger that analysts of systemic wars may become increasingly divorced from those who treat smaller wars. This danger is already foreshadowed in the two books under review here. Neither Modelski, Levy, nor Doran are referenced in James' book. In turn, neither Bueno de Mesquita, Zinnes, nor Wilkenfeld are referred to in Goldstein's volume. The division already is appearing at this time, with unforeseen, but I suspect ultimately deleterious consequences for the field of international conflict research.

Goldstein’s statistical methods were flawed- wrong groupings and lack of quantitative methods

Rostow 88 (W.W., United States National Security Advisor, *Journal of Economic History*, vol 48 no. 4, Dec 1988, http://www.jstor.org/stable/2121682 , p.990 ) ET

This book is flawed in a number of respects. The review of long-cycle theories and evidence is complicated by the effort to link the character of theories to the political orientation of theorists. The grouping proves rather unsatisfactory, with a good many figures disposed of in a few unpersuasive phrases; and there are some curious anomalies as well. While respecting Goldstein's effort to survey and give shape to the whole long-cycle literature, I can only report that, for this reader, it didn't come off. The flaw in Part Two is much more serious. First, as indicated earlier, the data are not adequate for a test of his long-wave/war hypothesis, with respect to time periods, quality, or variables covered. Second, the statistical methods and results constitute a reduction and absurdum of the present fashion in political science of reliance on formal quantitative methods.

Goldstein is wrong- his empirics are based off of nominal rather than real figures- economically incorrect

Rostow 88 (W.W., United States National Security Advisor, *Journal of Economic History*, vol 48 no. 4, Dec 1988, http://www.jstor.org/stable/2121682 , p.990 ) ET

To get at the heart of the matter, it is simply not true that there is a systematic relation between the price trends which underlie Goldstein's "base dating scheme" and trends in production. There are good and bad price upswings and downswings. The first price downswing (1815-1848) was marked by a higher rate of growth in the British and world economies than the first upswing (1790-1815), when corrected for cyclical biases in dating. The second price downswing (1873-1896) was a period of deceleration in British production (not real wages) but accelerated growth in a good many other countries. The third price downswing (1920-1933) was, of course, accompanied by deceleration or decline in most parts of the world economy. The results of the upswings are similarly mixed. The clustering of major innovations is also erratic in relation to the "base dating scheme."

Goldstein is false- historical summaries incorrect

Rostow 88 (W.W., United States National Security Advisor, *Journal of Economic History*, vol 48 no. 4, Dec 1988, http://www.jstor.org/stable/2121682 , p.990 ) ET

Finally Goldstein's historical summaries are inevitably thin, given the long timeperiod covered, his speculations on the past and future as well, and the complexity of the issues he raises. The human race won't get from here to "common security" by incantation, or even the joint exploration of space. The peaceful phasing out of the Cold War; the absorption into the world economy and polity of technologically mature China, India, Brazil, and Mexico, and other upwardly mobile states; the preservation of a viable physical environment in the face of the strains imposed by global industrialization; the patient provision of support for countries not yet in take-off; and the maintenance of strong, vital societies in North America, Western Europe, and Japanworking in partnership-and much more are implied by the decent aspirations evoked by Goldstein at the close.

Impacts- Econ Good- A2: War- Goldstein

Goldstein only shows correlation- no causation claims

Midlarsky 89 ( Manus, political science @ Rutgers U, *Journal of Politics*, Vol 51 No. 4, Nov 89, http://www.jstor.org/stable/2131568 , pg 1065-1066)ET

The core of Goldstein's analysis is the relationship between elements of the long cycle and what has been called the hegemonic war (more on that usage momentarily). As conceived of by Nikolai Kondratieff in his first 1925 publication, long cycles are waves of economic activity which undergo long upswings and downswings as measured by prices, production, and trade, among other economic indices. His legacy, although not without substantial controversy, has been to bequeath his name to what is now frequently called the Kondratieff wave. More recently, George Modelski suggested theoretical relationships between the Kondratieff wave (or more generally, the long cycle) and world war, and William Thompson, among others, provided empirical support for aspects of this relationship. In this book, data on prices, production, wages, and other important economic indicators are collected over the period 1495-1975. A total of 55 economic time series are used to test a bevy of hypotheses that Goldstein has collected from the long-cycle literature. What is appealing about these hypotheses is that they are frequently paired with their obverse counterparts, also culled from that literature. Thus, the first hypothesis-that "long waves exist"-is paired with its obverse, namely, that "long waves do not exist" (164). Or "war concentrations occur on long wave upswings" is coupled with "war clusters early in the downswing" (168). The economic time series then are used to demonstrate the strong relationship between prices and, in a time-lagged effect, production, with periods of war severity (measured by battle fatalities) occurring on the long-wave upswing. This is the major contribution of Goldstein's study-not only to confirm or disconfirm hypotheses in the long-wave literature using a variety of straightforward as well as highly sophisticated methodologies-but finally to demonstrate a robust relationship between two of the most frequently used economic variables in longwave research, and periods of war severity. These points coincide with wars such as the Thirty Years' War, the Napoleonic Wars, and World War I. The findings are used to construct a theory of long waves with production growth and war severity at its core.

Goldstein wrong- based off the wrong hegemon

Midlarsky 89 ( Manus, political science @ Rutgers U, *Journal of Politics*, Vol 51 No. 4, Nov 89, http://www.jstor.org/stable/2131568 , pg 1066)ET

These accomplishments notwithstanding, there is a problematic area in the historical treatment of the book. And in fairness to Goldstein, this emerges not so much from his own analysis, as in his acceptance of the term hegemonic war, used by others, to characterize his periods of greatest war severity. The difficulty may be summarized in the question: Who is the hegemon at any given time? It is fairly easy to pinpoint hegemonic powers in the contemporary period, especially if one accepts the primacy of economic production and sea power in that determination. Great Britain during the nineteenth century or the United States during the latter part of the twentieth century easily comes to mind. But what of earlier time periods when the choice of a particular country is unclear and the criteria for selection are fuzzy? These difficulties lead Goldstein to choose Venice as the initial hegemon of the modern period beginning approximately in 1350 and ending in 1648. With a population only slightly in excess of 100,000 in the middle of this period, and a military size to match, it is difficult to conceive of Venice as a hegemonic power. True, in economic terms, and especially trade, she stood out from the remainder but is it sufficient to use only economic criteria and sea power in the Mediterranean, when the other bases of power are so meager? This problem points to the further difficulty of choosing either landbased or sea-based power as the principal basis for selecting the hegemon.

Impacts- Econ Good- A2: War- Goldstein- Wave theory

Kondratieff wave theory empirically false

North 6/27 (Gary, economist and publisher and PhD in history from the University of California, Riverside, The Myth of the Kondratieff Wave, http://www.lewrockwell.com/north/north725.html, 6/27/09, AD: 7/6/09) JC

THE K-WAVE These days, the Kondratieff Wave has a spiffy new name: the K-Wave. (I can almost hear it: "Attention: K-Wave shoppers!") The K-Wave is supposedly going to bring a deflationary collapse Real Soon Now. The Western world's debt structure will disappear in a wave of defaults. Kondratieff's 54-year cycle is almost upon us. Again. The last deflationary period ended in 1933. This became clear no later than 1940. World War II orders from Great Britain, funded by American loans and Federal Reserve policy, ended the Great Depression by lowering real wages. In 1942, price and wage controls were imposed by Washington, the FED began pumping out new money, ration stamps replaced the free market, the black market overcame shortages, and the inflationary era began. That was a long time ago. But the K-Wave is heralded as a 50 to 60-year cycle, or even more specifically, a 54-year cycle. That's the entire cycle, trough to trough or peak to peak. The K-Wave supposedly should have bottomed in 1933, risen for 27 years (1960), declined in economic contraction until 1987, and boomed thereafter. The peak should therefore be in 2014. There is a problem here: the cyclical decline from 1960 to 1987. It never materialized. Prices kept rising, escalating with a vengeance after 1968, then slowing somewhat – just in time for the longest stock market boom in American history: 1982–2000. OK, say the K-Wavers: let's extend the cycle to 60 years. Fine. Let's do just that. Boom, 1932–62; bust, 1963–93; boom, 1994–2024. Does this correspond to anything that happened in American economic history since 1932? No.

More empirical evi

North 6/27 (Gary, economist and publisher and PhD in history from the University of California, Riverside, The Myth of the Kondratieff Wave, http://www.lewrockwell.com/north/north725.html, 6/27/09, AD: 7/6/09) JC

You may think that I am devoting way too much space to this. But I want my readers to understand why Kondratieff was wrong in 1925. His popularizers were even more wrong in 1975–85, with their "idealized" chart, and their contemporary heirs' unwillingness to learn from the fact that the downward phase of the cycle is now 44 years late. It should have begun no later than Kennedy's administration: 1932+30=1962. This assumes that the original downward phase was due in 1932. It wasn't. It was due around 1926: 1896+30=1926. It should have lasted until 1956. But 1945–73 was a boom era, with mild recessions and remarkable economic growth per capita. Forget about a K-Wave which is going to produce price deflation. The Federal Reserve System remains in control. Sorry about that. It is creating new money. Long-term price deflation of 5% per annum is not in the cards or the charts – anywhere. I recommend that you not take seriously arguments to the contrary that are based on the latest updated version of the K-Wave. The K-Wave forecasted that secular deflation was just around the corner, repeatedly, ever since 1932. It wasn't.

Impacts- Econ Good- A2: War- Goldstein- Wave theory

Kondratieff wave theory fails – creator even admits the theory is false

North 6/27 (Gary, economist and publisher and PhD in history from the University of California, Riverside, The Myth of the Kondratieff Wave, http://www.lewrockwell.com/north/north725.html, 6/27/09, AD: 7/6/09) JC

Kondratieff admitted that there was no theoretical basis for his cycle. He also admitted that some of the price data revealed no traces in his cycle. He selected two groups of "elements of economic reality," as he called them. This is from [The Long Wave Cycle](http://www.amazon.com/gp/product/0943940079?ie=UTF8&tag=lewrockwell&linkCode=xm2&camp=1789&creativeASIN=0943940079) (Richardson & Snyder, 1984). The elements of the first group were characterized by the fact that, along with the fluctuating processes, their dynamic did not manifest any general growth or decline (secular trend), or else that trend was scarcely noticeable – at any rate, for the period under observation (p. 33). What was he talking about? For one thing, commodity prices. He admitted: "In processing the statistics on the dynamics of the series of this group, I used simple analytical methods to bring out the long cycles" (p. 33). In short, he manipulated the evidence until he obtained a pattern. He said he found patterns in other statistics. But was there an underlying economic reality, "some real trends in economic development? This is a very big question, and I cannot now elucidate it." Yet this is the heart of his supposed cycle. "We do not have a method for determining how accurately a theoretical curve reflects real evolutionary-economic trends" (p. 35). All that he could find in the pig iron and lead statistics was one and a half or maybe two cycles (p. 52). . . . we did not succeed at all if finding long cycles in the dynamics of cotton consumption in France, and wool and sugar production in the United States, or in the dynamics of certain other series (p. 58). As has already been noted, in my own investigation I discovered series in whose dynamics there were no long cycles (p. 62). As for the pattern of the long cycle, First, I emphasize its empirical character: as such, it is lacking in precision and certainly allows of exceptions. Second, in presenting it I am absolutely disinclined to believe that it offers any explanation of the causes of the long cycles (pp. 68–69). He was frank about the extreme limitations on his data and his findings. His disciples are not.

Depression empirically proves K-wave validity

Baranov 8 (Eric Von, Founder & CEO of The Kondratyev Theory Letter, An Introduction, http://www.kondratyev.com/reference/theory\_explained.htm, 1/3/08, AD: 7/6/09) JC

He was arrested in 1930 and sentenced to the Russian Gulag (prison); his sentence was reviewed in 1938, and he received the death penalty, which it is speculated was carried out that same year. Kondratieff’s major premise was that capitalist economies displayed long wave cycles of boom and busy ranging between 50-60 years in duration. Kondratieff’s study covered the period 1789 to 1926 and was centered on prices and interest rates. Kondratieff’s theories documented in the 1920’s were validated with the depression less than 10 years later.

Today, we are faced with another Kondratieff Winter (depression) when the majority of the world anticipates economic expansion. Each individual needs to weigh the risk of depression in light of Kondratieff's work.

Historical evidence proves the K-wave theory

Taylor 5/12 (Jay, Taylor Hard Money Advisors, Kondratieff Winter Is Here? Is This the Greater Depression, http://www.modavox.com/voiceamerica/vepisode.aspx?aid=38122, 5/12/09, AD: 7/5/09) JC

Nations and their economies run through 50 to 70 year credit expansion/contraction cycles known as a Kondratieff wave. Special guest Ian Gordon, Chairman of Long Wave Group and economic historian tells Jay Taylor why the U.S. and the global economy has entered into a credit contraction that will be as bad or worse than the deflationary depression of the 1930s. Ian will explain why polices geared to stimulating the economy will not only fail but will plunge us even deeper into a price collapsing depression. Ian will explain why he is betting on deflation, not inflation and why, in this environment, gold mining will be a portfolio savior as it was during the Great Depression when the Dow to gold ratio approached 1:1. Ian tells why he believes the Dow to gold ratio may well fall to an even more remarkable 0.25:1.0 in this depression and why gold stocks will make their owners truly wealthy. Ian may also name a few of his favorite gold mining stocks. [www.longwavegroup.com](http://www.longwavegroup.com)

Impacts- Econ Good- Space vsn 2

Economic growth is key to expanding space exploration

Elhefnawy 8 (Nader, prof @ u of Miami, *The Space Review*, Sep 29-8, http://www.thespacereview.com/article/1220/1 ) ET

No less important is the expansion of the economic base that would have to support such endeavors, a point which rarely gets much attention. There is an obvious reason why that approach is often ignored: the common claim that the limits to growth on Earth mandate a turn to the exploitation of space. (Such arguments are not exclusive to the writers of the 1970s. John S. Lewis posits that the failure to do so will mean “civilization collapses to subsistence agriculture by 2030” in his 1996 book Mining the Sky.) However, this is far from being the only reason. The plain truth is that relying on terrestrial economic expansion to endow us with the resources for eventual space expansion will mean admitting the most exciting things are further off than we would like, outside the time frame of “meaningful” discussions of what public policy should be or what private business can do. Besides, it makes for a less compelling and attractive story than the idea of a technological revolution just over the horizon that opens up the heavens to all of us—especially if one is a market romantic when it comes to these matters (see “Market romanticism and the outlook for private space development”, The Space Review, September 2, 2008)

Nonetheless, that is what one would have to assume given the state of the art. Additionally, however, while space launch costs (and other, related costs) may drop in real terms in the coming decades, it is safe to say that any viable future spacefaring society will also see them drop markedly in relative terms. The United Nations predicts the rise of Gross World Product (GWP) to about $140 trillion by 2050, more than twice today’s level, and this is still rather conservative next to some previous periods of comparable length. A repeat of the growth of 1950–1990, for instance, would likely result in a GWP in the $250–350 trillion range. And of course, if one goes in for that sort of thinking, the growth we could realize if the predictions of futurists like Ray Kurzweil pan out would absolutely explode those numbers. Of course, some caution is in order. Given the challenges the world now faces, including tight energy supplies, ecological degradation, and financial instability (and the huge uncertainties involved in not just space, but other technologies like molecular engineering and robotics), it is easy to picture even the modest numbers supplied by the UN proving overoptimistic.

An increased space budget is key to nuclear propulsion- key to mars

Lemos 7 (Robert, 9/20, “http://www.wired.com/print/science/space/news/2007/09/space\_nukes) ET

"We need to restart development into nuclear propulsion," said Maureen Heath, vice president of Northrup Grumman's Civil Space division. "This is an area where we need to spend more resources to enable the next era of exploration." Nuclear power and propulsion for spacecraft are nothing new. Since the 1960s, the United States has had the capabilities to launch vehicles powered by radioactive materials. Experiment packages on many of the Apollo missions used nuclear power systems as well. In 2006, NASA shut down most of its research into nuclear propulsion technologies, a project the agency had dubbed Prometheus. The agency had contracted with Northrup Grumman, Boeing and Lockheed Martin to propose future propulsion systems based on nuclear power.Nuclear propulsion encompasses any technology that uses a nuclear reactor to provide the energy for a rocket engine. The best-known engines are nuclear-thermal rockets, which use nuclear energy to heat a rocket propellant, and nuclear-electric propulsion, which uses the generator to ionize a propellant. Both outperform current chemical-based rockets and are currently under consideration only for spaceflight, not for lifting a rocket from the ground to orbit. Using a nuclear reactor for propulsion also solves energy problems for missions to the outer planets. Getting power from solar energy becomes increasingly problematic the farther the probe travels from the sun. Nuclear power would allow probes to stay active through planetary nights and not be threatened by any loss of light -- as happened during the recent sandstorms on Mars that almost doomed the two Martian rovers. "When people go to Mars, there is not enough sunlight" to satisfy the power requirements, said Scott Horowitz, associate administrator for NASA's Exploration Systems Mission Directorate. "You are in a place where you need nuclear."NASA's latest probe, the Dawn mission to the asteroids Vesta and Ceres in the asteroid belt, uses a solar-powered ion drive for propulsion. By using a nuclear version, the probe could get to the asteroids more quickly and have better and more-powerful scientific instruments, industry experts said. "Mapping missions that explore multiple celestial bodies like comets, asteroids and moons are made possible by the highly efficient use of propellant that nuclear propulsion offers," Northrup Grumman said in a statement sent to Wired News. "The available electrical power used for propulsion can also operate vastly more complex scientific instruments and return hundreds to thousands of times more scientific data than other technologies." Because of the concerns, as well as funding cutbacks, NASA has refocused its Prometheus nuclear program to concentrate on creating a power generator that would satisfy the needs of the first lunar outpost. Advancing the technology of nuclear propulsion will have to wait, said NASA's Horowitz. "Right now, it's not in the budget, because we don't have the budget to do it," he said. "But they (the scientists) are working on an important piece, so they are still engaged.

Impacts- Econ Good- Space vsn 2

Mars is the only place we have after earth- key to human survival

Zubrin 96 (former Chairman of the National Space Society, and President of the Mars Society, Robert, Ad Astra, “The Case for Colonizing Mars,” July/August, <http://nss.org/settlement/mars/zubrin-colonize.html>) ET

Among extraterrestrial bodies in our solar system, Mars is singular in that it possesses all the raw materials required to support not only life, but a new branch of human civilization. This uniqueness is illustrated most clearly if we contrast Mars with the Earth's Moon, the most frequently cited alternative location for extraterrestrial human colonization. In contrast to the Moon, Mars is rich in carbon, nitrogen, hydrogen and oxygen, all in biologically readily accessible forms such as carbon dioxide gas, nitrogen gas, and water ice and permafrost. Carbon, nitrogen, and hydrogen are only present on the Moon in parts per million quantities, much like gold in seawater. Oxygen is abundant on the Moon, but only in tightly bound oxides such as silicon dioxide (SiO2), ferrous oxide (Fe2O3), magnesium oxide (MgO), and aluminum oxide (Al2O3), which require very high energy processes to reduce. Current knowledge indicates that if Mars were smooth and all its ice and permafrost melted into liquid water, the entire planet would be covered with an ocean over 100 meters deep. This contrasts strongly with the Moon, which is so dry that if concrete were found there, Lunar colonists would mine it to get the water out. Thus, if plants could be grown in greenhouses on the Moon (an unlikely proposition, as we've seen) most of their biomass material would have to be imported. The Moon is also deficient in about half the metals of interest to industrial society (copper, for example), as well as many other elements of interest such as sulfur and phosphorus. Mars has every required element in abundance. Moreover, on Mars, as on Earth, hydrologic and volcanic processes have occurred that are likely to have consolidated various elements into local concentrations of high-grade mineral ore. Indeed, the geologic history of Mars has been compared to that of Africa, with very optimistic inferences as to its mineral wealth implied as a corollary. In contrast, the Moon has had virtually no history of water or volcanic action, with the result that it is basically composed of trash rocks with very little differentiation into ores that represent useful concentrations of anything interesting. You can generate power on either the Moon or Mars with solar panels, and here the advantages of the Moon's clearer skies and closer proximity to the Sun than Mars roughly balances the disadvantage of large energy storage requirements created by the Moon's 28-day light-dark cycle. But if you wish to manufacture solar panels, so as to create a self-expanding power base, Mars holds an enormous advantage, as only Mars possesses the large supplies of carbon and hydrogen needed to produce the pure silicon required for producing photovoltaic panels and other electronics. In addition, Mars has the potential for wind-generated power while the Moon clearly does not. But both solar and wind offer relatively modest power potential — tens or at most hundreds of kilowatts here or there. To create a vibrant civilization you need a richer power base, and this Mars has both in the short and medium term in the form of its geothermal power resources, which offer potential for large numbers of locally created electricity generating stations in the 10 MW (10,000 kilowatt) class. In the long-term, Mars will enjoy a power-rich economy based upon exploitation of its large domestic resources of deuterium fuel for fusion reactors. Deuterium is five times more common on Mars than it is on Earth, and tens of thousands of times more common on Mars than on the Moon. But on Mars there is an atmosphere thick enough to protect crops grown on the surface from solar flare. Therefore, thin-walled inflatable plastic greenhouses protected by unpressurized UV-resistant hard-plastic shield domes can be used to rapidly create cropland on the surface. Even without the problems of solar flares and month-long diurnal cycle, such simple greenhouses would be impractical on the Moon as they would create unbearably high temperatures. On Mars, in contrast, the strong greenhouse effect created by such domes would be precisely what is necessary to produce a temperate climate inside. Such domes up to 50 meters in diameter are light enough to be transported from Earth initially, and later on they can be manufactured on Mars out of indigenous materials. Because all the resources to make plastics exist on Mars, networks of such 50- to 100-meter domes couldbe rapidly manufactured and deployed, opening up large areas of the surface to both shirtsleeve human habitation and agriculture. That's just the beginning, because it will eventually be possible for humans to substantially thicken Mars' atmosphere by forcing the regolith to outgas its contents through a deliberate program of artificially induced global warming. Once that has been accomplished, the habitation domes could be virtually any size, as they would not have to sustain a pressure differential between their interior and exterior. In fact, once that has been done, it will be possible to raise specially bred crops outside the domes. The point to be made is that unlike colonists on any known extraterrestrial body, Martian colonists will be able to live on the surface, not in tunnels, and move about freely and grow crops in the light of day. Mars is a place where humans can live and multiply to large numbers, supporting themselves with products of every description made out of indigenous materials. Mars is thus a place where an actual civilization, not just a mining or scientific outpost, can be developed. And significantly for interplanetary commerce, Mars and Earth are the only two locations in the solar system where humans will be able to grow crops for export.

Impacts- Econ Good- Prolif

Economic growth solves proliferation

Burrows and Windram 94 (William & Robert, Critical Mass, p. 491-492) LL

Economics is in many respects proliferation’s catalyst. As we have noted, economic desperation drives Russia and some of the former Warsaw Pact nations to peddle weapons and technology. The possibility of considerable profits or at least balanced international payments also prompts Third World countries like China, Brazil, and Israel to do the same. Economics, as well as such related issues as overpopulation, drive proliferation just as surely as do purely political motives. Unfortunately, that subject is beyond the scope of this book. Suffice it to say that, all things being equal, well-of, relatively secure societies like today’s Japan are less likely to buy or sell superweapon technology than those that are insecure, needy, or desperate. Ultimately, solving economic problems, especially as they are driven by population pressure, is the surest way to defuse proliferation and enhance true national security.

Economic affluence deters proliferation – NK proves

Japan Times 8 (October 23, Lexis) LL

South Korea, which is enjoying unprecedented prosperity, is becoming increasingly uncomfortable with North Koreans' economic despair. Probably no two neighboring countries have such a huge economic gap, let alone countries that share the same ethnic and historical background. The danger is that such a discrepancy can become a source of instability and conflict. To overcome its economic deficiencies and attain social stability, the North has no choice but to abandon its nuclear weapons program and move toward reform and greater openness. South Korea is trying to persuade the North to make this strategic decision. We are more than willing to help the North achieve economic growth, which is almost always the source of peace and security. As such, North Korea's economic recovery is vital for an enduring peace on the Korean Peninsula.

And, prolif causes extinction from arms races and miscalculations

Utgoff 2 (Deputy Director of the Strategy Forces, and Resources Division of the Institute for Defense Analyses, Victor, “Proliferation, Missile Defence, and American Ambitions,” Survival, Volume 44, Number 2, Summer) ET

In sum, widespread proliferation is likely to lead to an occasional shoot-out with nuclear weapons, and that such shoot-outs will have a substantial probability of escalating to the maximum destruction possible with the weapons at hand. Unless nuclear proliferation is stopped, we are headed toward a world that will mirror the American Wild West of the, late 1800s. With most, if not all, nations wearing nuclear 'six-shooters' on their hips, the world may even be a more polite place than it is today, but every once in a while we will all gather on a hill to bury the bodies of dead cities or even whole nations.

Impacts- Econ Good- Terrorism

Economic collapse leads to terrorism

Bremmer, 9(Ian, - President of the Eurasia Group, sr. fellow @ World Policy Institute, , 3/4/09, *Foreign Policy,* http://eurasia.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2009/03/04/the\_global\_recession\_heightens\_terrorist\_risks) ET

But there's another reason why the financial crisis heightens the risk of global terrorism. Militants thrive in places where no one is fully in charge. The global recession threatens to create more such places. No matter how cohesive and determined a terrorist organization, it needs a supportive environment in which to flourish. That means a location that provides a steady stream of funds and recruits and the support (or at least acceptance) of the local population. Much of the counter-terrorist success we've seen in Iraq's al Anbar province over the past two years is a direct result of an increased willingness of local Iraqis to help the Iraqi army and US troops oust the militants operating there. In part, that's because the area's tribal leaders have their own incentives (including payment in cash and weaponry) for cooperating with occupation forces. But it's also because foreign militants have alienated the locals. The security deterioration of the past year in Pakistan and Afghanistan reflects exactly the opposite phenomenon. In the region along both sides of their shared border, local tribal leaders have yet to express much interest in helping Pakistani and NATO soldiers target local or foreign militants. For those with the power to either protect or betray the senior al-Qaeda leaders believed to be hiding in the region, NATO and Pakistani authorities have yet to find either sweet enough carrots or sharp enough sticks to shift allegiances. The slowdown threatens to slow the progress of a number of developing countries. Most states don't provide ground as fertile for militancy as places like Afghanistan, Somalia, and Yemen. But as more people lose their jobs, their homes, and opportunities for prosperity -- in emerging market countries or even within minority communities inside developed states -- it becomes easier for local militants to find volunteers. This is why the growing risk of attack from suicide bombers and well-trained gunmen in Pakistan creates risks that extend beyond South Asia. This is a country that is home to lawless regions where local and international militants thrive, nuclear weapons and material, a history of nuclear smuggling, a cash-starved government, and a deteriorating economy. Pakistan is far from the only country in which terrorism threatens to spill across borders.

Impacts- Econ Good- Terrorism I/L

Econ decline leads to terrorism

Bremmer 9

(Ian , president of Eurasia Group, a political-risk consultancy, *Foreign Affairs*, 3.4.9, <http://eurasia.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2009/03/04/the_global_recession_heightens_terrorist_risks>) ET

In the Pakistani city of Lahore on Tuesday, a dozen gunmen attacked a bus carrying members of Sri Lanka's cricket team, killing six policemen and a driver and injuring several of the athletes. Press accounts of the assault suggest a level of coordination similar to that used by the Pakistan-based militants who killed 173 people at several sites in Mumbai in September. Across Pakistan, suicide bombers killed two people in 2005, six in 2006, 56 in 2007, and 61 in 2008. Suicide attackers killed more people in Pakistan last year than in either Iraq or Afghanistan. There are two important reasons why the threat of global terrorism is growing. The first is long-term and structural. The second is more directly tied to the global financial crisis. Both have everything to do with what's happening in Pakistan. First, a report released in December from the U.S. Commission on the Prevention of Weapons of Mass Destruction, Proliferation, and Terrorism hints at both sets of problems. The report notes an increasing supply of nuclear technology and material around the world and warns that "without greater urgency and decisive action by the world community, it is more likely than not that a weapon of mass destruction will be used in a terrorist attack somewhere in the world by the end of 2013."Destructive (and potentially destructive) technologies are now more accessible than at any time in history for small groups and even individuals. This will dramatically increase the baseline threat of disruptive violence from non-state actors over time. It's not just biological and nuclear material. GPS tracking devices help pirates operating off Somalia's coast venture further from shore and undertake increasingly ambitious attacks on private and commercial vessels. Second, it's unlikely that we'll see the "greater urgency and decisive action by the world community" called for in the report. For the moment, political leaders around the world are too busy wrestling with the effects of the global financial crisis on their domestic economies (and their political standing) to coordinate action against such a diffuse threat. But there's another reason why the financial crisis heightens the risk of global terrorism. Militants thrive in places where no one is fully in charge. The global recession threatens to create more such places. No matter how cohesive and determined a terrorist organization, it needs a supportive environment in which to flourish. That means a location that provides a steady stream of funds and recruits and the support (or at least acceptance) of the local population. Much of the counter-terrorist success we've seen in Iraq's al Anbar province over the past two years is a direct result of an increased willingness of local Iraqis to help the Iraqi army and US troops oust the militants operating there. In part, that's because the area's tribal leaders have their own incentives (including payment in cash and weaponry) for cooperating with occupation forces. But it's also because foreign militants have alienated the locals. The security deterioration of the past year in Pakistan and Afghanistan reflects exactly the opposite phenomenon. In the region along both sides of their shared border, local tribal leaders have yet to express much interest in helping Pakistani and NATO soldiers target local or foreign militants. For those with the power to either protect or betray the senior al-Qaeda leaders believed to be hiding in the region, NATO and Pakistani authorities have yet to find either sweet enough carrots or sharp enough sticks to shift allegiances. The slowdown threatens to slow the progress of a number of developing countries. Most states don't provide ground as fertile for militancy as places like Afghanistan, Somalia, and Yemen. But as more people lose their jobs, their homes, and opportunities for prosperity -- in emerging market countries or even within minority communities inside developed states -- it becomes easier for local militants to find volunteers. This is why the growing risk of attack from suicide bombers and well-trained gunmen in Pakistan creates risks that extend beyond South Asia. This is a country that is home to lawless regions where local and international militants thrive, nuclear weapons and material, a history of nuclear smuggling, a cash-starved government, and a deteriorating economy. Pakistan is far from the only country in which terrorism threatens to spill across borders. But there's a reason why the security threats flowing back and forth across the Afghan-Pakistani border rank so highly on Eurasia Group's list of top political risks for 2009 -- and why they remain near the top of the Obama administration's security agenda.

Impacts- Econ Good- Terrorism I/L

Growth solves terrorism

Schaefer 2001 (Brett D., Jay Kingham Fellow in International Regulatory Affairs in the Center for International Trade and Economics at The Heritage Foundation, Heritage Foundation Backgrounder #1508, "Expand Freedom to Counter Terrorism", December 6, http:Ilwww.heritage.orglResearch~~radeandForeignAid/BGi 508.cfm)

The governments of those countries must be held reslponsible for policies that undermine or oppose freedom, stifle economic qrowth, and help create the circumstances under which terrorism flourishes. America's battle in Afghanistan against the Taliban regime and al-Qaeda terrorist network is merely the first skirmish in a long war. If the war on terrorism is to be won, and if this victory is to be sustainable, America must focus on encouraging the qovernments of developing countries to embrace economic liberty in order to counter the poverty and desperation upon which terrorist qroups depend.

Impacts- Econ Good- Terrorism I/L

Economic decline leads to increased risk of nuclear terrorism

Warrick, 8 (Joby, staff writer, *Washington Post*, 11/15/08)

Intelligence officials are warning that the deepening global financial crisis could weaken fragile governments in the world's most dangerous areas and undermine the ability of the United States and its allies to respond to a new wave of security threats. U.S. government officials and private analysts say the economic turmoil has heightened the short-term risk of a terrorist attack, as radical groups probe for weakening border protections and new gaps in defenses. A protracted financial crisis could threaten the survival of friendly regimes from Pakistan to the Middle East while forcing Western nations to cut spending on defense, intelligence and foreign aid, the sources said. The crisis could also accelerate the shift to a more Asia-centric globe, as rising powers such as China gain more leverage over international financial institutions and greater influence in world capitals. Some of the more troubling and immediate scenarios analysts are weighing involve nuclear-armed Pakistan, which already was being battered by inflation and unemployment before the global financial tsunami hit. Since September, Pakistan has seen its national currency devalued and its hard-currency reserves nearly wiped out. Analysts also worry about the impact of plummeting crude prices on oil-dependent nations such as Yemen, which has a large population of unemployed youths and a history of support for militant Islamic groups. The underlying problems and trends -- especially regional instability and the waning influence of the West -- were already well established, but they are now "being accelerated by the current global financial crisis," the nation's top intelligence official, Director of National Intelligence Mike McConnell, said in a recent speech. McConnell is among several top U.S. intelligence officials warning that deep cuts in military and intelligence budgets could undermine the country's ability to anticipate and defend against new threats.

Impacts- Econ Good- Heg

Downturn in econ causes spending cuts that destroy heg

Thompson 9 (Loren, chief executive officer of Lexington, Armed Forces Journal, Mar 9, <http://www.armedforcesjournal.com/2009/03/3922551>) ET

As if all this were not enough, the parts of the defense program that are politically easiest to cut — the investment accounts — are the parts that contribute most tangibly to long-term military power. If military pay and benefits are slashed, the consequences are felt quickly in the field and on Capitol Hill. The same is true if readiness accounts are cut. With military health care costs having risen 144 percent during the present decade, there are compelling reasons to try to restrain their further growth (one Pentagon panel called cost increases in military health care an “existential threat” to the future defense posture). But investment in the future is almost always easier to cut than current consumption, because the near-term consequences in the field are imperceptible, and the domestic impact is felt in only a handful of congressional districts. The bottom line, then, is that the current defense program will probably not be sustainable if the decline of the economy continues, and when the cutting begins to bring military outlays into closer alignment with available resources, the first items to go will be those that contribute most to the nation’s long-term military power. In other words, the erosion of national economic power will be paced by the erosion of national military power.

Economic downturn destroys heg

Pape 9 (Robert , poli sci @u of Chicago, *Chicago Tribune*, 3.8.9, http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/nationworld/chi-perspec0308diplomacymar08,0,4785661.story) ET

For nearly two decades, [the U.S.](http://www.chicagotribune.com/topic/politics/government/national-government/united-states-ORGOV0000001.topic) has been viewed as a global hegemon—vastly more powerful than any major country in the world. Since 2000, however, our global dominance has fallen dramatically. During the Bush administration, the self-inflicted wounds of the Iraq war, growing government debt, increasingly negative current account balances and other internal economic weaknesses cost the U.S. real power in a world of rapidly spreading knowledge and technology. Simply put, the main legacy of the Bush years has been to leave the U.S. as a declining power.  From Rome to the United States today, the rise and fall of great nations have been driven primarily by economic strength. At any given moment, a state's power depends on the size and quality of its military forces and other power assets. Over time, however, power is a result of economic strength—the prerequisite for building and modernizing military forces. And so the size of the economy relative to potential rivals ultimately determines the limits of power in international politics. The power position of the U.S. is crucial to the foreign policy aims that it can achieve. Since the Cold War, America has maintained a vast array of overseas commitments, seeking to ensure peace and stability not just in its own neighborhood, the Western hemisphere, but also in Europe, Asia and the oil-rich Persian Gulf. Maintaining these commitments requires enormous resources, but American leaders in recent years chose to pursue far more ambitious goals than merely maintaining the status quo.

And, hegemonic decline leads to transition wars – the impact is extinction

Nye 90 (Joe, Sultan of Oman Professor of International Relations and former Dean of the Kennedy School at Harvard and one of the most influential and respected contemporary IR scholars, pg 17) ET

Perceptions of change in the relative power of nations are of critical importance to understanding the relationship between decline and war. One of the oldest generalizations about international politics attributes the onset of major wars to shifts in power among the leading nations. Thus Thucydides accounted for the onset of the Peloponnesian War which destroyed the power of ancient Athens. The history of the interstate system since 1500 is punctuated by severe wars in which one country struggled to surpass another as the leading state. If as Robert Gilpin argues, international politics has not changed fundamentally over the millennia, “the implications for the future are bleak. And if fears about shifting power precipitate a major war in a world with 50,000 nuclear weapons, history as we know it may end.

Impacts- Econ Good- Heg- More I/L

Economic growth is key to heg—history proves.

Pietroburgo 9 (Anthony, Political Scientist, Apr 10, 9, http://ezinearticles.com/?The-End-of-American-Hegemony&id=2207395: Ad 7-6-9) BL

However we can learn from past hegemonic states, all of which, withered away with time just as the American one is currently in the process of doing. Great Britain was perhaps the last true hegemon before that of the United States. Back in 1890 the collapse of their empire had just began. David A. Lake's research on the issue is work that should be greatly analyzed due to the illustrious similarities between the British recession in to retirement and the United States' as well. For much of the 19th century Great Britain was dominating in the same fields as the U.S. did so in the 1950's through the late 1970's. Soon in the later 1800's The United States and Germany moved to a protectionist system to plant their economic seeds and soon after were surpassing British industries and abilities. The industrial base of Great Britain crumbled and forced them to invest heavily in the service, shipping and insurance sectors of the economy just to break-even when concerning their balance of payment statistics. For the time being the British were able to carry on with the pound as the dominant world currency. The frail system was already on the thinnest of ice, when WWI confounded the weak British economy (Lake 122). At the time of Great Britain's reign of power they also pursued operations to completely open up and liberalize the world economy. This did lead to substantial brief economic abundance but eventually the struggles of remaining a strong enough power to be considered an absolute hegemon wore off. Hegemonic powers are only sustainable during periods of constant economic growth. When growth is no longer the complete and utter status of the hegemony's economic functionality the power ceases to be consistent. We see this to be the case with Great Britain, as other world powers emerged and caught up in terms of economic status and influence, British power that was exerted was much more explicit and coercive, just like it was during the American hegemonic era under President Nixon (Lake 121). It is safe to say that the U.S. is headed down the same path that will eventually end up being the ultimate de-throning of the American empire and it's hegemonic capabilities. If you think back to all the complications that the United States is experiencing in this very moment concerning obvious financial difficulties and others in the areas of education, technological innovation and healthcare respectively. Other nations have clearly started their own catch up phase and are impeding on American power as we speak. The irony between the situations leading up to the collapse of the British hegemonic state and the current burdens that are being placed upon a contemptuous American hegemon are too similar for coincidence. It took the disaster of WWI to finally destabilize the British hegemon and the United States is one major crisis away from experiencing the same fate (Bartilow Lecture).

Economic growth is key to hegemony

Hunt 7 (Michael, Professor of History at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 5.21.7, http://hnn.us/articles/37486.html) ET

If in the U.S. case empire is genetic, hegemony is an acquired characteristic. Hegemony was made possible by a rate of economic growth over the course of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries that had no precedent in human history. This achievement created the preconditions for a U.S.-inspired, designed, and regulated international system that took shape during the first two thirds of the twentieth century. American economic and cultural clout remade societies and reshaped the practices of daily life around the world.

Impacts- Econ Good- A2: China Heg Turn

China is not going to be able to compete with the US long-term—labor shortages.

French 6 (Howard, Associate Professor of Journalism at Columbia University, Former Foreign Correspondent for the NYT, “As China Ages, a Shortage of Cheap Labor Looms,” New York Times, June 30, 2006, http://www.nytimes.com/2006/06/30/world/asia/30aging.html, AD: 7-6-9)

The world's most populous nation, which has built its economic strength on seemingly endless supplies of cheap labor, China may soon face manpower shortages. An aging population also poses difficult political issues for the Communist government, which first encouraged a population explosion in the 1950's and then reversed course and introduced the so-called one-child policy a few years after the death of Mao in 1976. That measure has spared the country an estimated 390 million births but may ultimately prove to be another monumental demographic mistake. With China's breathtaking rise toward affluence, most people live longer and have fewer children, mirroring trends seen around the world. Those trends and the extraordinarily low birth rate have combined to create a stark imbalance between young and old. That threatens the nation's rickety pension system, which already runs large deficits even with the 4-to-1 ratio of workers to retirees that it was designed for. Demographers also expect strains on the household registration system, which restricts internal migration. The system prevents young workers from migrating to urban areas to relieve labor shortages, but officials fear that abolishing it could release a flood of humanity that would swamp the cities. As workers become scarcer and more expensive in the increasingly affluent cities along China's eastern seaboard, the country will face growing economic pressures to move out of assembly work and other labor-intensive manufacturing, which will be taken up by poorer economies in Asia and beyond, and into service and information-based industries. "For the last two decades China has enjoyed the advantage of having a high ratio of working-age people in the population, but that situation is about to change," said Zuo Xuejin, vice president of the Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences. "With the working-age population decreasing, our labor costs will become less competitive, and industries in places like Vietnam and Bangladesh will start becoming more attractive."

Impacts- Econ Good- Democracy

Economic decline causes multiple sites of state failure and democratic backsliding

Ferguson 9 Niall ,Senior Fellow at the Hoover Institution at Stanford University, *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 87 Issue 7/8, July/aug 9) ET

Will this financial crisis make the world more dangerous as well as poorer? The answer is almost certainly yes. Apart from the usual trouble spots -- Afghanistan, Congo, Gaza, Iraq, Lebanon, Pakistan, Somalia, and Sudan -- expect new outbreaks of instability in countries we thought had made it to democracy. In Asia, Thailand may be the most vulnerable. At the end of 2007 it reverted to democracy after a spell of military rule that was supposed to crack down on corruption. Within a year's time the country was in chaos, with protesters blocking Bangkok's streets and the state banning the People's Power Party. In April 2009 the capital descended into anarchy as rival yellow-shirted and red-shirted political factions battled with the military. Expect similar scenes in other emerging markets. Trouble has already begun in Georgia and Moldova. Then there's Ukraine, where economic collapse threatens to trigger political disintegration. While President Viktor Yushchenko leans toward Europe, his ally-turned-rival Prime Minister Yulia Tymoshenko favors a Russian orientation. Their differences reflect a widening gap between the country's predominantly Ukrainian west and predominantly Russian east. Meanwhile, in Moscow, Putin talks menacingly of "ridding the Ukrainian people of all sorts of swindlers and bribe-takers." The Crimean peninsula, with its ethnic Russian majority, is the part of the "Near Abroad" (the former Soviet Union) that Putin most covets. January's wrangle over gas supplies to Western Europe may have been the first phase of a Russian bid to destabilize, if not to break up, Ukraine. The world's increasing instability makes the United States seem more attractive not only as a safe haven but also as a global policeman. Many people spent the years from 2001 to 2008 complaining about U.S. interventions overseas. But if the financial crisis turns up the heat in old hot spots and creates new ones at either end of Eurasia, the world may spend the next eight years wishing for more, not fewer, U.S. interventions.

Economic decline collapses democracy - empirically proven

Friedman '5(Benjamin, Prof of Political Econ @ Harvard, *The Atlantic*, http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2005/07/meltdown-a-case-study/4049/ Aug 5, ) ET

Not just in America but in the other Western democracies, too, history is replete with instances in which a turn away from openness and tolerance, often accompanied by a weakening of democratic institutions, has followed economic stagnation. The most familiar example is the rise of Nazism in Germany, following that country's economic chaos in the 1920s and then the onset of worldwide depression in the early 1930s. But in Britain such nasty episodes as the repression of the suffragette movement under Asquith, the breaking of Lloyd George's promises to the returning World War I veterans, and the bloody Fascist riots in London's East End all occurred under severe economic distress. So did the ascension of the extremist Boulangist movement in late-nineteenth-century France, and the Action Française movement after World War I. Conversely, in both America and Europe fairness and tolerance have increased, and democratic institutions have strengthened, mostly when the average citizen's standard of living has been rising. The reason is not hard to understand. When their living standards are rising, people do not view themselves, their fellow citizens, and their society as a whole the way they do when those standards are stagnant or falling. They are more trusting, more inclusive, and more open to change when they view their future prospects and their children's with confidence rather than anxiety or fear. Economic growth is not merely the enabler of higher consumption; it is in many ways the wellspring from which democracy and civil society flow. We should be fully cognizant of the risks to our values and liberties if that nourishing source runs dry.

Impacts- Econ Good- Democracy

Direct correlation between economic growth and social/political progress

Friedman 6 (Benjamin, William Joseph Maier Professor of Political Economy at Harvard University, THE MORAL CONSEQUENCES OF ECONOMIC GROWTH, http://www.economics.harvard.edu/faculty/friedman/files/The%20Moral%20Consequences%20of%20Economic%20Growth.pdf, February 6, AD: 7/6/09)

The link between economic growth and social and political progress in the developing world has yet other practical implications as well. For example, the continuing absence of political democracy and basic personal freedoms in China has deeply troubled many observers in the West. Until China gained admission to the World Trade Organization in 2002, these concerns regularly gave rise in the United States to debate on whether to trade with China on a “most favored nation” basis. These concerns still cause questions about whether to give Chinese firms advanced American technology, or allow them to buy an American oil company. Both sides in this debate share the same objective: to foster China’s political liberalization. How to do so, however, remains the focus of intense disagreement. But if a rising standard of living leads a society’s political and social institutions to gravitate toward openness and democracy—as the evidence mostly shows— then as long as China continues its recent economic expansion, Chinese citizens will eventually enjoy greater political democracy together with the personal freedoms that democracy brings. Since 1978, when Deng Xao-Ping’s economic reforms began, the Chinese have seen a fivefold increase in their material standard of living. The improvement in nutrition, housing, sanitation, and transportation has been dramatic, while the freedom of Chinese citizens to make economic choices—where to work, what to buy, whether to start a business—is already far broader than it was. With continued economic advance (the average Chinese standard of living is still only oneeighth that in the United States), greater freedom to make political choices, too, will probably follow. Indeed, an important implication of the idea that it is in significant part the growth rather than just the level of people’s living standards that matters for this purpose is that the countries in the developing world whose economies are actually developing, like China, will not have to wait until they achieve Western-level incomes before they experience significant political and social liberalization.

Impacts- Econ Good- Democracy

Economic growth key to democracy

Friedman 6 (Benjamin, William Joseph Maier Professor of Political Economy at Harvard University, THE MORAL CONSEQUENCES OF ECONOMIC GROWTH, http://www.economics.harvard.edu/faculty/friedman/files/The%20Moral%20Consequences%20of%20Economic%20Growth.pdf, February 6, AD: 7/6/09)

How the citizens of any country think about economic growth, and what actions they take in consequence, are therefore a matter of far broader importance than we conventionally assume. In many countries today, even the most basic qualities of any society— democracy or dictatorship, tolerance or ethnic hatred and violence, widespread opportunity or economic oligarchy— remain in flux. In some countries where there is now a democracy, it is still new and therefore fragile. Because of the link between rising or falling living standards and just these aspects of social and political development, the absence of growth in so many of what we usually call “developing economies,” even though many of them are not actually developing, threatens their prospects in ways that standard measures of national income do not even suggest. The same concern applies, albeit in a more subtle way, to mature democracies as well. Even in the United States, I believe, the quality of our democracy—more fundamentally, the moral character of American society—is similarly at risk. The central economic question for the U.S. at the outset of the twentyfirst century is whether the nation in the generation ahead will again achieve increasing prosperity, as in the decades immediately following World War II, or lapse into the stagnation of living standards for the majority of our citizens that persisted from the early 1970s until the early 1990s. And the more important question that then follows concerns how these different economic paths would affect our democratic political institutions and the broader character of our society. As the economic historian Alexander Gerschenkron once observed, “even a long democratic history does not necessarily immunize a country from becoming a ‘democracy without democrats.’” Our own experience, as well as that of other countries, demonstrates that merely being rich is no bar to a society’s retreat into rigidity and intolerance once enough of its citizens lose the sense that they are getting ahead. The familiar balancing of material positives against moral negatives when we discuss economic growth is therefore a false choice, and the parallel assumption that how we value material versus moral concerns neatly maps into whether we should eagerly embrace economic growth or temper our enthusiasm for it is wrong as well. Economic growth bears moral benefits as well, and when we debate the often hard decisions that inevitably arise—in choosing economic policies that either encourage growth or retard it, and even in our reactions to growth that takes place apart from the push or pull of public policy—it is important that we take these moral positives into account.

Impacts- Econ Good- Famine

Economic growth is the only solution to famine

.

Mahder 8 (Ethiopian Development Website, “Addressing the root cause of famine and poverty in Ethiopia,” September 27, 2008, http://mahder.com/pdf/Addressing\_the\_root\_cause\_of\_famine\_and\_poverty\_in\_Ethiopia..pdf, AD: 7-6-9)

It is well established that there is a strong correlation between famine and economic development or growth. Economic growth leads to development and reduction in poverty and famine. Real economic growth embracing and benefiting all the citizens of a country produces safety mechanisms which are of vital importance in alleviating or avoiding displacements and live destruction emanating from famine. The suffering and significant loss of lives resulting from persistent famines which are hitting Ethiopia could not be avoided or even mitigated owing to the shrinking economy or increasing poverty in the country. On the other hand, one can can not avoid but face the irony of Ethiopia failing to be self sufficient and feed its population despite possessing all the potential to do so. Thus a critical examination of the major stumbling block or factor acting as a bottleneck and preventing the country from eradicating or even coping with famine is necessary.

Economic development empirically averts famine.

Norberg 3 (Johan, Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute, In Defense of Global Capitalism, p. 33-34, AD: 7-6-9)

Such is the triumph of the “green revolution.” Higher-yield, more-resistant crops have been developed, at the same time as sowing, irrigation, manuring, and harvesting methods have improved dramatically. New, efficient strains of wheat account for more than 75 percent of wheat production in the developing countries, and farmers there are estimated to have earned nearly $5 billion as a result of the change. In southern India, the green revolution is estimated to have boosted farmers' real earnings by 90 percent and those of landless peasants by 125 percent over 20 years. Its impact has been least in Africa, but even there the green revolution has raised maize production per acre by between 10 and 40 percent. Without this revolution, it is estimated that world prices of wheat and rice would be nearly 40 percent higher than they are today and that roughly another 2 percent of the world's children—children who are now getting enough to eat—would have suffered from chronic malnourishment. Today's food problem has nothing to do with overpopulation. Hunger today is a problem of access to the available knowledge and technology, to wealth, and to the secure background conditions that make food production possible. Many researchers believe that if modern farming techniques were applied in all the world's agriculture, we would already be able, here and now, to feed another billion or so people. 10 The incidence of major famine disasters has also declined dramatically, largely as a result of the spread of democracy. Starvation has occurred in states of practically every kind—communist regimes, colonial empires, technocratic dictatorships, and ancient tribal societies. In all cases they have been centralized, authoritarian states that suppressed free debate and the workings of the market. As Amartya Sen observes, there has never been a famine disaster in a democracy. Even poor democracies like India and Botswana have avoided starvation, despite having a poorer food supply than many countries where famine has struck. By contrast, communist states like China, the Soviet Union, Cambodia, Ethiopia, and North Korea, as well as colonies like India under the British Raj, have experienced starvation. This shows that famine is caused by dictatorship, not by food shortage. Famine is induced by leaders destroying production and trade, making war, and ignoring the plight of the starving population. Sen maintains that democracies are spared starvation for the simple reason that it is easily prevented if the rulers of a society wish to prevent it. Rulers can refrain from impeding the distribution of food, and they can create jobs for people who would not be able to afford food purchases in times of crisis. But dictators are under no pressure: they can eat their fill however badly off their people are, whereas democratic leaders will be unseated if they fail to address food distribution problems. Additionally, a free press makes the general public aware of the problems, so that they can be tackled in time. In a dictatorship, even the leaders may be deceived by censorship. Much evidence suggests that China's leaders were reassured by their own propaganda and their subordinates' laundered statistics while 30 million people died of starvation during “the Great Leap Forward” between 1958 and 1961.

Impacts- Econ Good- Health

Economic Productivity solves Poverty, Disease, and War

Bailey 7 (Ronald, Ronald Bailey is the award-winning science correspondent for Reason magazine and Reason.com, where he writes a weekly science and technology column , August 1, “Peace and Prosperity Through Productivity Can economic growth solve all the problems in the world?”, http://www.reason.com/news/show/121697.html) ET

Productivity can save the planet and produce peace and prosperity for all. Productivity is the tool that can eliminate all of the scourges of humanity—poverty, hunger, disease and war. Norwegian-American economist and business consultant Tor Dahl passionately made this argument in his keynote presentation at the World Future Society's annual meeting. Dahl is the chairman emeritus of the World Confederation of Productivity Science. One must be on guard against the exaggerated claims of the mavens of any discipline for the significance of their field. Of course, mavens believe that what they do is vitally important, otherwise why would they do it? That said, Dahl was very persuasive.

Economic decline turns disease- kills health

Robinson 9 (Andrew, fellow of Wolfson College, Cambridge,  *Emerging Health Threats Journal*, 6.12.9, tp://www.physorg.com/news163993567.html) ET

There are concerns that the financial crisis has already hit tuberculosis control, which has global ramifications, says Robertson.“There are already indications that funding for TB diagnosis and management is decreasing in [developing countries](http://www.physorg.com/tags/developing%2Bcountries/) and a surge of new cases there may flow onto the US and other countries,” he says.Healthcare in developed countries will also suffer if budgets are cut and incomes fall. Fewer people are accessing private health services in the USA, which will increase the burden on public health services.Resources for disease surveillance are often cut back during difficult economic times, jeopardising the systems we rely on to identify and deal with emerging diseases - including the current swine flu epidemics.The 1995 economic crisis in Mexico led to 27,000 excess deaths in that country alone - but the effect of this far greater, global downturn is currently “impossible to quantify,” according to Robertson.

Economic decline leads to disease spread

Alexander, 9 (Brian, MSNBC staff writer, *msnbc*, www.msnbc.msn.com/id/29599786) ET

To most Americans, diseases with names like dengue fever, chikungunya, malaria, Chagas and leishmaniasis might sound like something out of a Victorian explorer’s tales of hacking through African jungles. Yet ongoing epidemics of these diseases are killing millions of people around the world. Now, disease experts are increasingly concerned these and other infections may become as familiar in the United States as West Nile or Lyme disease. Few believe Americans face a killer epidemic from tropical diseases. But scientists who specialize in emerging infectious diseases say such illnesses may become more common here as the economic downturn batters an already weakened public health system, creating environmental conditions conducive to infectious diseases spread by insects or other animals. At the same time, such vector-borne diseases are capable of spreading around the world much more rapidly due to massive south-to-north immigration, rapid transportation, and global trade.

Impacts- Econ Good- Health

Deteriorating economies hurt women’s maternity and AIDS prevention

International People’s Health Council 94[Third World Network, http://www.twnside.org.sg/title/sap-ch.htm]

In addition to the negative impact on women's health associated with the general decline in communicable disease control and health care provision, there is evidence that morbidity and mortality associated with pregnancy has also been aggravated. In a number of countries the introduction of user charges for antenatal and maternity care has been associated with an increase in deliveries conducted at home, as well as those occurring in hospital without previous antenatal care or assessment. The rising costs of transport together with lack of money on the part of poor women have been other contributory factors. Finally, there is evidence, mainly of a qualitative nature, that risk behaviour in relation to HIV transmission has been influenced by deteriorating economic circumstances which have forced an increasing number of women into commercial sex activity.

Economic slump leads to disease spread and prevents treatment

International People’s Health Council 94[Third World Network, http://www.twnside.org.sg/title/sap-ch.htm]

The likely causes of these reversals derive from declines in incomes; increases in food prices; and reductions in health sector spending, which have led to the imposition of user charges for health care, cutbacks in preventive programmes' budgets and interruptions in supply of pharmaceuticals to public health care facilities. These have in turn resulted in inter alia: deterioration in both the quantity and quality of diets, and reductions in immunisation coverage and in utilisation of health services for acute conditions, as well as weakening of disease control programmes. Consequently, the incidence (and possibly the severity) of the vaccine-preventable diseases has probably increased together with mortality from diarrheal disease, respiratory infections and malaria. There has also been a resurgence of certain communicable diseases which were previously substantially under control, particularly malaria, tuberculosis and cholera. All of these have contributed to increased morbidity and mortality, especially amongst children and women.

Impacts- Econ Good- Poverty

Economic Productivity solves Poverty, Disease, and War

Bailey 7 (Ronald, Ronald Bailey is the award-winning science correspondent for Reason magazine and Reason.com, where he writes a weekly science and technology column , August 1, “Peace and Prosperity Through Productivity

Can economic growth solve all the problems in the world?”, http://www.reason.com/news/show/121697.html) ET

Productivity can save the planet and produce peace and prosperity for all. Productivity is the tool that can eliminate all of the scourges of humanity—poverty, hunger, disease and war. Norwegian-American economist and business consultant Tor Dahl passionately made this argument in his keynote presentation at the World Future Society's annual meeting. Dahl is the chairman emeritus of the World Confederation of Productivity Science. One must be on guard against the exaggerated claims of the mavens of any discipline for the significance of their field. Of course, mavens believe that what they do is vitally important, otherwise why would they do it? That said, Dahl was very persuasive.

Economic growth reduces poverty and saves the environment from destruction – prefer environmental think tank

World Institute 99 (*World resources institute*, winter 98-99, independent environmental think tank non profit, http://www.wri.org/publication/content/8372 ) ET

Economic growth is an important factor in reducing poverty and generating the resources necessary for human development and environmental protection. There is a strong correlation between gross domestic product (GDP) per capita and indicators of development such as life expectancy, infant mortality, adult literacy, political and civil rights, and some indicators of environmental quality. However, economic growth alone does not guarantee human development. Well-functioning civil institutions, secure individual and property rights, and broad-based health and educational services are also vital to raising overall living standards. Despite its shortcomings, though, GDP remains a useful proxy measure of human well-being. The world economy has grown approximately fivefold since 1950, an unprecedented rate of increase. The industrialized economies still dominate economic activity, accounting for US$22.5 trillion of the US$27.7 trillion global GDP in 1993 [1]. Yet a remarkable trend over the past 25 years has been the burgeoning role played by developing countries, in particular the populous economies of east and south Asia. (See Rapid Growth in Low Income Economies.)

Impacts- Econ Good- Poverty

Growth from social services solve poverty

Madan 2 (Anisha, Financial analyst for GE and MBA at Kellogg School, Northwestern University, The Relationship between Economic Freedom and Socio – Economic Development, http://www.econ.ilstu.edu/uauje/PDF's/CarrolRound/madanpost.pdf, UAUJE, pg 5-6, 2002, AD: 7/6/09)

Merely studying the relationship between economic freedom and economic growth rates, however, is not enough. Whether the benefits of freedom and "increased economic growth rates" translate into something real and make a significant contribution to socio-economic welfare of people is a matter of critical concern. Today, one in five of the world’s people - 1.2 billion - live on less than a dollar a day. It has been the experience of most of the countries that have seen positive growth rates that the number of people living in poverty has increased. The United Nations Development Program (UNDP) has developed the Human Development Index (HDI), which ranks countries based on the level of human development they have attained. (The HDI is explained in depth in Section IV.A.2 of this paper). The link between economic growth and human development is neither automatic nor obvious. For example, in 1998-99, Moldova had the highest economic growth rate of 16.5% but its HDI score in 1999 was only 0.69, which means that it had more than 30% shortfall in human development. Another example is Turkmenistan, which had the second highest growth rate of 14.9%, but its HDI score was only 0.68. As a counter example, Canada had the highest HDI rating of 0.932 buts its growth rate in 1998-99 was only 3.8%. Moreover, fifty-six percent of the developing world lacks the most basic sanitation, and more than 50 countries have lower real per capita incomes today than they did a decade ago. Where poverty is extreme and unending, human rights are eroded and the level of human capital deteriorates. Therefore, if progress does not benefit the citizens of the country, then it is not progress in concrete terms. Thus, it is important to look beyond economic growth and focus on the status of the people. The criteria for judging whether people are better off can be clearly delineated. This research study assumes that people will be better off if there is greater equality of income, if per capita income increases, and if they have better access to education and health care through which they can lead a more fulfilling life. The World Health Organization defines health as a state of complete physical, mental, and social well being and not merely the absence of disease and infirmity. Education is a basic need because it improves skills, improves productivity, and lowers reproductivity by improving the status of women. Education also contributes to meeting other basic needs. If the behavioral changes from education can be built into other welfare programs dealing with health, nutrition, and sanitation, savings by a factor of ten to twenty on the cost of implementing these other programs can be attained (Streeten, 1981). Only when people’s basic needs of health, education, and a reasonable standard of living are met, can they derive benefits from the country’s increased growth rates. When there is greater equality of income, then the poor are equally able to benefit. Therefore, for the purpose of this paper, socio-economic development can be said to consist of access to resources, health, education, and greater income equality. The level of socio-economic development indicates the quality of life.

Economic growth is the solution to global poverty.

Ben-Ami 6 (Daniel, Journalist with a Specialty in Economics, Editor of Fund Strategy, “Who’s afraid of economic growth?” May 4, 2006, http://www.spiked-online.com/Articles/0000000CB04D.htm, AD: 7-6-9)

Perhaps the best starting point is to remind ourselves that economic growth and affluence have had enormous social benefits. These are all too easily forgotten in a society with little sense of history. Our lives are substantially better than those of any previous generations. Anne Krueger, first deputy managing director of the International Monetary Fund (IMF), looked at some of the key global indicators over the previous half century in a speech in 2002. She is worth quoting at length 'Infant mortality has declined from 180 per 1000 births in 1950 to 60 per 1000 births. Literacy rates have risen from an average of 40 per cent in the 1950s to over 70 per cent today. World poverty has declined, despite still-high population growth in the developing world. Since 1980, the number of poor people, defined as those living on less than a dollar a day, has fallen by about 200 million, much of it due to the rapid growth of China and India. 'If there is one measure that can summarise the impact of these enormous gains, it is life expectancy. Only 50 years ago, life in much of the developing world was pretty much what it used in be in the rich nations a couple of centuries ago: "nasty, brutish and short." But today, life expectancy in the developing world averages 65 years, up from under 40 years in 1950. Life expectancy was increasing even in sub-Saharan Africa until the effects of years of regional conflicts and the AIDS epidemic brought about a reversal. The gap between life expectancy between the developed and developing world has narrowed, from a gap of 30 years in 1950 to only about 10 years today.' (22)

Impacts- Econ Good- A2: No Growth Solves Poverty

Zero growth is immoral – it dooms future generations to poverty and no access to resources

Florea 8 (Adrian, The Limits of Zero Economic Growth Strategy, University of Oradea, Faculty of Economics, http://imtuoradea.ro/auo.fmte/MIE\_files/FLOREA%20ADRIAN%201.pdf)

They noticed that in spite of the fact that the study wants to be a global one, it is built on premises and values belonging to the rich. But in spite of the fact that the bases of the study is about development world, the solutions claim to be valid everywhere, irrespective of the mosaic-like, political and economical landscape of world. It is well-known that every country and region has their own problems. And the problem of a majoritary part of this world was and still is underdevelopment. To propose to this world a zero economic growth is first of all an immoral act. Moreover, such a solution is totally opposed to the conception of lasting development. If zero growth were accepted, the next generations from the underdeveloped countries would be practically condemned to live not better but in continuous poverty. Edgar Faure’s words are memorable in this respect: „the hypocrisy of the rich countries will be immeasurable if on behalf of pollution and protection of raw material, they require the limiting of the economic growth.

Impacts- Econ Good- De Dev

Economic growth critical to resistance and positive moral economic revolution

Friedman 6 (Benjamin, prof of political econ @ Harvard U, http://www.economics.harvard.edu/faculty/friedman/files/The%20Moral%20Consequences%20of%20Economic%20Growth.pdf, February 6, AD: 7/6/09) ET

Greater affluence means, among many other things, better food, bigger houses, more travel, and improved medical care. It means that more people can afford a better education. It may also mean, as it did in most Western countries during the twentieth century, a shorter work-week that allows more time for family and friends. Moreover, these material benefits of rising incomes accrue not only to individuals and their families but to communities and even to entire countries. Greater affluence can also mean better schools, more parks and museums, and larger concert halls and sports arenas, not to mention more leisure to enjoy these public facilities. A rising average income allows a country to project its national interest abroad, or send a man to the moon. All these advantages, however, lie chiefly in the material realm, and we have always been reluctant to advance material concerns to the highest plane in our value system. Praise for the ascetic life, and admiration for those who practice self-denial have been continual themes in the religions of both West and East. So, too, have warnings about the dangers to man’s spiritual wellbeing that follow from devotion to money and luxury, or, in some views, merely from wealth itself. Even the aristocratic and romantic traditions, which rest on the clear presumption of having wealth, are nonetheless dismissive of efforts to pursue it. Furthermore, even when people plainly acknowledge that more is more, less is less, and more is better, economic growth rarely means simply more. The dynamic process that allows living standards to rise brings other changes as well. More is more, but more is also different. The qualitative changes that accompany economic growth—including changes in work arrangements, in power structures, in our relationship to the natural environment— have nearly always generated resistance. The anti-globalization protests in the streets of Seattle, Genoa, and Washington, D.C., and even on the outskirts of Davos, reflect a long-standing line of thinking. the forces that create “the wealth of nations,” Jean- Jacques Rousseau instead admired the “noble savage, arguing that mankind’s golden age had occurred not only before industrialization but before the advent of settled agriculture. Seventy-five years later, as prominent Victorians were hailing the “age of improvement,” Karl Marx observed the raw hardships that advancing industrialization had imposed on workers and their families, and devised an economic theory of how matters might (and in his mind, would) become better, together with a political program for bringing that supposedly better world into existence. Although Communism is now mostly a relic where it exists at all, romantic socialism, combining strains of Marx and Rousseau, continues to attract adherents, as do fundamentalist movements that celebrate the presumed purity of preindustrial society. The Club of Rome’s influential “Limits to Growth” report and the “Small is Beautiful” counterculture of the 1970s, the mounting concerns over the impact on the environment of economic expansion, especially since the 1980s, and most recently the antiglobalization movement mounted in opposition to the World Trade Organization and against foreign investment more generally are all echoes of the same theme, which is thoroughly familiar today. Environmental concerns in particular have expanded from their initial focus on the air and water to encompass noise pollution, urban congestion, and such fundamental issues as the depletion of nonrenewable resources and the extinction of species. In recent years, the force of competition in global markets and the turmoil of an unsettled world financial system have inflicted visible hardships on large numbers of people both in the developing world and in countries that are already industrialized, just as they have created opportunities and given advancement to many others. As in the past, the plight of those who are affected adversely—Indonesians who faced higher food prices when their currency plunged, Argentinians who found their savings blocked when the country’s banking system collapsed, textile workers throughout the developing world who cannot compete with low-cost factory production in China—has led not only to calls for reform of the underpinnings of economic growth but to outright opposition. What marks all these forms of resistance to the undesirable side effects of economic expansion or of the globalization of economic growth is that, just as with earlier strands of religious thinking, in each case they are accompanied by a distinctly moral overtone. Ever larger segments of our society accept that it is not just economically foolish but is morally wrong for one generation to use up a disproportionate share of the world’s forests, or coal, or oil reserves, or to deplete the ozone or alter the earth’s climate by filling the atmosphere with greenhouse gases. While pleas on behalf of biological diversity sometimes appeal to practical notions like the potential use of yet-to-be-discovered plants for medicinal purposes, we also increasingly question our moral right to extinguish other species. Opposition to the global spread of markets is often couched as much in terms of the moral emptiness of consumerism as in the tangible hardships sometimes imposed by world competition and unstable financial systems. But if a rising standard of living makes a society more open and tolerant and democratic, and perhaps also more prudent on behalf of generations to come, then it is simply not true that moral considerations argue wholly against economic growth. Growth is valuable not only for our material improvement but for how it affects our social attitudes and our political institutions— in other words, our society’s moral character, in the term favored by the Enlightenment thinkers from whom so many of our views on openness, tolerance, and democracy have sprung. The attitude of people toward themselves, toward their fellow citizens, and toward their society as a whole is different when their living standard is rising from when it is stagnant or falling. It is likewise different when they view their prospects and their children’s prospects with confidence as opposed to looking ahead with anxiety or even fear. When the attitudes of the broad majority of citizens are shaped by a rising standard of living, over time that difference usually leads to the positive development of—to use again the language of the Enlightenment— a society’s moral character. Hence questions about economic growth are not a matter of material versus moral values. Yes, economic growth often does have undesirable effects, such as the disruption of traditional cultures and damage to the environment, and yes, some of these are a proper moral concerns that we are right to take into account. But economic growth bears social and political consequences that are morally beneficial as well. Especially for purposes of evaluating different courses for public policy, it is important that we take into account not only the familiar moral negatives but these moral positives as well.

Impacts- Econ Good- Laundry List

Economic decline causes global instability, scenarios of conflict with china, and European Instability

**Green, 9** (Michael J., Senior Advisor and Japan Chair at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) and Associate Professor at Georgetown University*. Asia Times Online*, 3.26.9, http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Asian\_Economy/KC26Dk01.html AD 6/30/09) ET

Facing the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression, analysts at the World Bank and the US Central Intelligence Agency are just beginning to contemplate the ramifications for international stability if there is not a recovery in the next year. For the most part, the focus has been on fragile states such as some in Eastern Europe. However, the Great Depression taught us that a downward global economic spiral can even have jarring impacts on great powers. It is no mere coincidence that the last great global economic downturn was followed by the most destructive war in human history. In the 1930s, economic desperation helped fuel autocratic regimes and protectionism in a downward economic-security death spiral that engulfed the world in conflict. This spiral was aided by the preoccupation of the United States and other leading nations with economic troubles at home and insufficient attention to working with other powers to maintain stability abroad. Today's challenges are different, yet 1933's London Economic Conference, which failed to stop the drift toward deeper depression and world war, should be a cautionary tale for leaders heading to next month's London Group of 20 (G-20) meeting. There is no question the US must urgently act to address banking issues and to restart its economy. But the lessons of the past suggest that we will also have to keep an eye on those fragile threads in the international system that could begin to unravel if the financial crisis is not reversed early in the Barack Obama administration and realize that economics and security are intertwined in most of the critical challenges we face. A disillusioned rising power? Four areas in Asia merit particular attention, although so far the current financial crisis has not changed Asia's fundamental strategic picture. China is not replacing the US as regional hegemon, since the leadership in Beijing is too nervous about the political implications of the financial crisis at home to actually play a leading role in solving it internationally. Predictions that the US will be brought to its knees because China is the leading holder of US debt often miss key points. China's currency controls and full employment/export-oriented growth strategy give Beijing few choices other than buying US Treasury bills or harming its own economy. Rather than creating new rules or institutions in international finance, or reorienting the Chinese economy to generate greater long-term consumer demand at home, Chinese leaders are desperately clinging to the status quo (though Beijing deserves credit for short-term efforts to stimulate economic growth). The greater danger with China is not an eclipsing of US leadership, but instead the kind of shift in strategic orientation that happened to Japan after the Great Depression. Japan was arguably not a revisionist power before 1932 and sought instead to converge with the global economy through open trade and adoption of the gold standard. The worldwide depression and protectionism of the 1930s devastated the newly exposed Japanese economy and contributed directly to militaristic and autarkic policies in Asia as the Japanese people reacted against what counted for globalization at the time. China today is similarly converging with the global economy, and many experts believe China needs at least 8% annual growth to sustain social stability. Realistic growth predictions for 2009 are closer to 5%. Veteran China hands were watching closely when millions of migrant workers returned to work after the Lunar New Year holiday last month to find factories closed and jobs gone. There were pockets of protests, but nationwide unrest seems unlikely this year, and Chinese leaders are working around the clock to ensure that it does not happen next year either. However, the economic slowdown has only just begun and nobody is certain how it will impact the social contract in China between the ruling communist party and the 1.3 billion Chinese who have come to see President Hu Jintao's call for "harmonious society" as inextricably linked to his promise of "peaceful development". If the Japanese example is any precedent, a sustained economic slowdown has the potential to open a dangerous path from economic nationalism to strategic revisionism in China too. Dangerous states It is noteworthy that North Korea, Myanmar and Iran have all intensified their defiance in the wake of the financial crisis, which has distracted the world's leading nations, limited their moral authority and sown potential discord. With Beijing worried about the potential impact of North Korean belligerence or instability on Chinese internal stability, and leaders in Japan and South Korea under siege in parliament because of the collapse of their stock markets, leaders in the North Korean capital of Pyongyang have grown increasingly boisterous about their country's claims to great power status as a nuclear weapons state. The junta in Myanmar has chosen this moment to arrest hundreds of political dissidents and thumb its nose at fellow members of the 10-country Association of Southeast Asian Nations. Iran continues its nuclear program while exploiting differences between the US, UK and France (or the P-3 group)

<Continued…>

Impacts- Econ Good- Laundry List
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and China and Russia - differences that could become more pronounced if economic friction with Beijing or Russia crowds out cooperation or if Western European governments grow nervous about sanctions as a tool of policy. It is possible that the economic downturn will make these dangerous states more pliable because of falling fuel prices (Iran) and greater need for foreign aid (North Korea and Myanmar), but that may depend on the extent that authoritarian leaders care about the well-being of their people or face internal political pressures linked to the economy. So far, there is little evidence to suggest either and much evidence to suggest these dangerous states see an opportunity to advance their asymmetrical advantages against the international system.

Impacts- Econ Good- A2: Environment

The Environment is improving- won’t happen

Hayward 3 (Stephan F. Senior Fellow, Pacific Research Institute for Public Policy, 1992-present , 03, “Lomborg Gets the Galileo Treatment”, http://www.aei.org/outlook/15242, CH)

I was provoked," Lomborg explains. "I had never really questioned my belief in an ever deteriorating environment--and here was Simon, telling me to put my beliefs under the statistical microscope." Being a professor of statistics, he made a class project of checking the data and refuting Simon. But a funny thing happened on the way to debunking Simon: "Not everything he said was correct but--contrary to our expectations--it turned out that a surprisingly large amount of his points stood up to scrutiny and conflicted with what we believed ourselves to know." Thus chastened, Lomborg set out in The Skeptical Environmentalist to refute what he calls the litany: We are all familiar with the Litany: the environment is in poor shape here in Earth. Our resources are running out. The population is ever growing, leaving less and less to eat. The air and water are becoming ever more polluted. The planet's species are becoming extinct in vast numbers--we kill off more than 40,000 each year. The forests are disappearing, fish stocks are collapsing and the coral reefs are dying. We are defiling our Earth, the fertile topsoil is disappearing; we are paving over nature, destroying the wilderness, decimating the biosphere, and will end up killing ourselves in the process. The world's ecosystem is breaking down. We are fast approaching the absolute limit of viability, and the limits of growth are becoming apparent.[2] "There is just one problem," Lomborg adds. The litany "does not seem to be backed up by the available evidence." The Skeptical Environmentalist reviews trend data, primarily from UN or other government sources, for hundreds of environmental variables and finds that most aspects of the world's environment are either improving or are not catastrophic as the public imagines. Lomborg quickly adds that he is not saying that the environment is fine, that there is no cause for worry, or that civilization should be content with the current state of things. The point of assessing and comparing various environmental trends is to help policymakers set priorities among different environmental problems. "When things are improving," Lomborg writes, "we know we are on the right track. Although perhaps not at the right speed." Conversely, misleading perceptions lead to misallocation of resources, especially in wealthy countries.[3] As the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency found in an internal study more than a decade ago, funding priorities are often in inverse proportion to the seriousness of environmental problems.

Economic growth prevents environmental destruction.

Ben-Ami 6 (Daniel, Journalist with a Specialty in Economics, Editor of Fund Strategy, “Who’s afraid of economic growth?” May 4, 2006, http://www.spiked-online.com/Articles/0000000CB04D.htm, AD: 7-6-9) BL

The importance of economic growth to providing a better environment should be clear. As a general rule the environment in the developed world is far better for humans than in the poorer countries. For many people in the world, malnutrition, as well as a lack of clean water and modern sanitation, are key killers. In addition, the World Health Organisation (WHO) estimates that 1.6 million people a year - that is one person every 20 seconds - dies as a result of indoor air pollution. As WHO notes: 'More than half of the world's population rely on dung, wood, crop waste or coal to meet their most basic energy needs. Cooking and heating with such solid fuels on open fires or stoves without chimneys leads to indoor air pollution. This indoor smoke contains a range of health-damaging pollutants including small soot or dust particles that are able to penetrate deep into the lungs.' (24) Yet those of us lucky enough to live in the developed world do not need to cope with such problems. Since the overwhelming majority of us are connected to the electricity grid, gas mains or both, the scourge of indoor air pollution is not a killer. Economic development has played a key role in improving the environment for many millions of people, although many more could gain from its benefits in the future.

Impacts- Econ Good- A2: Environment

Zero growth prohibits the discovery of new resources or innovation - its ultimately unsustainable

Florea 8 (Adrian, The Limits of Zero Economic Growth Strategy, University of Oradea, Faculty of Economics, http://imtuoradea.ro/auo.fmte/MIE\_files/FLOREA%20ADRIAN%201.pdf) LE

From the beginning the report entitled „The limits of growth” was the topic of some interesting disputes on the theme of the limited character of resources concluded in valuable studies which are even today serious supports for reflecting on the future. The studies „Catastrophe or a new society? A latino-amercian model of the world?”, Published by the Argentinean Bariloche Fundation having Amilcar Herrera as a coordinator and „Mankind at crossroads” by Mihailo Mesarovit and Eduard Pestel are just on example. These projects of world development vehemently criticized the discrepancy between the rich and the poor, the immorality of waste in the developed countries as compared to the great lack in the third world; underlined the annoying fact that „in the developed regions of world the material consumption reached the proportion of an absurd waste”, with all the consequences that come out. The above mentioned study draws attention on a real fact: the existent resources especially row materials and energy is limited. But from this realistic and necessary finding, to the suggestion of a solution of limiting the growth, the way was too easily chosen, evading intentionally or not the promising chance that the dimension of the known resources will be multiplied, on the basis of the new discoveries sustained by the new achievements of science and technics. And as if this had not been enough they didn’t take into account the possibility that known type of growth that alarmed through waste, to be changed with a rational one, based on another matrix of values, and on another technical way of production and consumption. We have to underline the fact that the project of zero growth was an attempt to suggest that any model of economical growth must be thought on the canons of logics, hidden of ideology. The attempt remained at a level of suggestion because on the whole they didn’t manage to prove that development can be part of social-political pattern. For instance when the society of future is proposed to be an egalitarian one, to allow the participation of all the countries in an equal way, in the advantages that can be obtained on international trade; it is easily observable that this statement contains a big amount of ideology. In spite of all this facts, we consider that the attempt had its role, mainly that of objectification of the analysis on a field of activity which is not negligible. On this open path the efforts of mathematical shaping and formalizing contributed once again to the growth of the scientific and objectivity level of a forming science like the environment economy.

Even with zero growth we would still exhaust all resources

Florea 8 (Adrian, The Limits of Zero Economic Growth Strategy, University of Oradea, Faculty of Economics, http://imtuoradea.ro/auo.fmte/MIE\_files/FLOREA%20ADRIAN%201.pdf) LE

Disasters of a serious gravity made the world realise that the nature is invaded with offals and that the old theories of the value, where only the work and the capital are considered main actors, does not provide a real explaining basis. Thus, the entropic value was born, which tells us, uncomfortably. That we are using resources from a finite deposit and that we do not replace them with others. In the same way the preoccupation for the economy of value imposed itself, moving the centre of the analysis from explaining the causes of the value, finite through its nature, to be reduced, with the maintaining of the quality of the product in which it is incorporated, “the tendency towards quality” and not quantity, to use a phrase preferred by Keynes, becomes an imperative because, as Paul Bran draws the attention, “[T]he law of the entropic value will not forgive us if we do not use the feeding of the Nature with services meant to reduce the pollution and to repair what we broke during the years of the ‘industrial unleash’, of the low entropy theft, theft followed, in many cases, by the ecological crime”. Therefore, the economy of value sends directly towards the reduction of the consumptions specific to raw materials and energy. In the conditions we know that the natural substance of the goods cannot be lowered bellow certain threshold, without questioning the existence of the product itself, it could be said that such a solution can only delay the moment of the resource exhaustion. And if the whole remains the same, we will get to its total consumption only later, engaging and exhausting decreasingly from its content, but we will get there.

Impacts- Econ Good- A2: Environment – A2: Carrying Capacity

Carrying capacity is arbitrary

Green 5 (C. Brooks, U of Central Ark, http://www.brooksgreen.net/capacity.pdf.)

Some scholars have recognized carrying capacity as problematic. Muir (2003) argues, “Logistic growth is very idealized, of course. K [carrying capacity] is not likely to be constant (for example, year-to-year changes in weather effect food production; the richer a life we desire, the lower K for humans is likely to be, etc.). However, the model is useful conceptually.” Muir (2003) concludes by noting, “It is unlikely, however, that we can define a specific K (that is, an actual number) for humans. (People seem to enjoy trying though!).” Hardin (2003) expresses similar concerns. He maintains, “There is no hope of ever making carrying capacity figures as precise as, say, the figures for chemical valence or the value of the gravitational constant.” “As a result,” he writes, “… any particular figure for carrying capacity has a substantial element of the arbitrary in it.”

Carrying capacity is variable – Adaptation solves

Green 5 (C. Brooks, U of Central Ark, http://www.brooksgreen.net/capacity.pdf.)
Second, Cohen (1995) likewise understood that “The future of the human population, like the future of its economies, environment, and cultures, is highly unpredictable” (341). While he noted “… a probabilistic measure of human carrying capacity has been developed for local populations in the Amazon, no probabilistic approach to global human population carrying capacity has been developed” (343). He further maintains, “In basic and applied ecology, the carrying capacity of nonhuman species has been defined in at least nine different ways, none of which is adequate for humans” (343). The problem with calculating human carrying capacity is that “Human carrying capacity depends both on natural constraints, which are not fully understood, and on individual and collective choices concerning the average level and distribution of material well-being, technology, political institutions, economic arrangement, family structure, migration and other demographic arrangements, physical, chemical, and biological environment, variability and risk, the time horizon, and values, tastes, and fashions” (343)

Impacts- Econ Good- Climate Change

Capitalism as sustained by economic growth is key to containing climate change

Intelligence 7 (*Intelligence^2,* global forum reports on debates, oct. 30-7, http://www.intelligencesquared.com/events/capitalism-can-save-the-planet ) ET

The panel debate whether capitalism offers a viable solution for the challenge of reducing carbon dioxide emissions, and whether carbon trading can solve the climate change crisis without damaging economic growth. Arguing in favour of the motion are Tim Harford, John Redwood, and Eric Bettelheim. Tim Harford starts by supporting the motion. He emphasises the necessity to change the decisions made by individuals rather than introducing bureaucratic controls, which he regards as counterproductive. As a solution to effectively reduce carbon dioxide emissions he suggests the implementation of a carbon price set by the government, which will subsequently influence decisions made by individuals through market mechanisms. John Redwood stresses the power of the free enterprise system linked with capitalism. He emphasises the idea that capitalism works in parallel with the grain of human nature, and that capitalistic societies will subsequently produce a green planet as they call for it. Finally, Eric Bettelheim speaks in favour for the motion. He reminds the audience of the failure of the predictions presented by the Club of Rome, which failed as it did not take into account the role of markets in the allocation of resources. Referring to the success of the sulfur dioxide trading program in the US, he speaks in favour of an emission trading scheme for carbon dioxide

Global warming leads to extinction- highest probability

Roach 4 (John, http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2004/01/0107\_040107\_extinction.html , *National Geographic*, July 12.4) ET

As global warming interacts with other factors such as habitat-destruction, invasive species, and the build up of carbon dioxide in the landscape, the risk of extinction increases even further, they say. In agreement with the study authors, Pounds and Puschendorf say taking immediate steps to reduce greenhouse gas emissions is imperative to constrain global warming to the minimum predicted levels and thus prevent many of the extinctions from occurring. "The threat to life on Earth is not just a problem for the future. It is part of the here and now," they write.

Impacts- Econ Good –Overpopulation

Growth results in lower population – Bangladesh study proves

Hasan 6 (Mohammad, Department of Finance and Economics, AN EMPIRICAL INVESTIGATION TO DETERMINE THE LONG-RUN RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN POPULATION GROWTH AND PER CAPITA INCOME IN BANGLADESH, http://www.bdiusa.org/Publications/JBS/Volumes/Volume7/JBS7.2-2-Part-1.pdf, 2/20/06, AD: 7/6/09) JC

This paper empirically examines the nature of the time-series relationship between population growth and per capita income growth using the annual data of Bangladesh within the framework of cointegration methodology. This study finds evidence of a long-run stationary relationship between population and per capita income. Our results also indicate a bi-directional or feedback relationship between population and per capita income. The results of a negative causality flowing from per capita income to population growth appear to indicate that per capita income tends to lower the population growth. Likewise, population growth positively contributes to the growth of per capita income.

Inverse relationship between fertility rates and economic growth

Schultz 5 (T Paul, Yale University - Economic Growth Center; Institute for the Study of Labor, Fertility and Income, http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=838227, October 2005, AD: 7/6/09)

There is an inverse association between income per adult and fertility among countries, and across households this inverse association is also often observed. Many studies find fertility is lower among better educated women and is often higher among women whose families own more land and assets. What do we know about the social consequences of events and policies that change fertility, if they are independent of parent preferences for children or the economic conditions which account for much of the variation in parent lifetime fertility? These effects of exogenous fertility change on the health and welfare of children are assessed from Kenyan household survey data by analysis of the consequences of twins, and the effect of avoiding unanticipated fertility appears to have a larger beneficial effect on the body mass index or health status of children in the family than would be expected due to variation in fertility which is accounted for by parent education and household land.

Impacts- Econ Good –Overpopulation

Economic growth inversely is proportional to population growth

Lustig et al 98 (Nora, Nancy Birdsall and Monica Das Gupta, International Union for the study of population, Extract from a Report from the Exploratory Mission on Population and Poverty, http://www.iussp.org/Activities/scc-pov/pov-outline.php, 12/4/98, AD: 7/6/09)

The prediction from standard growth theory is that population and economic growth should be inversely related during the transition, but changes in population growth should not affect the long-run growth rate of output per worker. What does the empirical evidence show? up until this decade researchers failed to find any significant relationship between population growth and output growth (4). The interpretation was not that population did not have an effect on economic growth, but that the effects were complex and tended to offset one another. Even in the cases where a negative relationship was found, it varied considerably by country and over time, and the impact of population was small by comparison with other factors affecting output growth. Hence, the traditionalist view that population growth was bad for economic growth was not strongly supported by empirical evidence. Recent research, however, arrives at a different conclusion (5). After assessing, replicating and extending a number of studies, Kelley and Schmidt conclude that there appears to be a sizeable inverse relationship between population growth and economic growth over the period 1960-1995 (6). Specifically, declining population growth, fertility and mortality have had a sizeable positive impact on economic growth. Changing age distributions and rising population density and size also had a positive impact, although the contribution of size is small. Of all the demographic variables, improvements in life expectancy constitute the largest single impact on changes in output growth. Furthermore, the authors also find some evidence that the impact of demographic change is not solely transitional but that it also affects long-run economic growth. This result would imply that mechanisms other than those captured by the standard neo-classical growth model are at work in the real world. One such mechanism could be the relationship between population growth and resource degradation. These results are good news for the many countries that are now passing through the demographic transition. If true, they predict a boost to economic growth and an opportunity to accelerate the pace of poverty reduction. However, as emphasised by the authors, these results should be taken as preliminary. The Kelley and Schmidt study is careful in incorporating the dynamics of demographic change in their analysis (7). The impact on economic growth of a new birth varies over a lifetime: usually negative during the child rearing years, then positive during the labour force years, and possibly negative during retirement. Modelling of demography must account for the patterns of birth and death rate changes over time. Some of the early "no correlation" findings can possibly be due to the fact that no care was taken in decomposing population change in its various factors. But, the question still remains whether the results obtained by Kelley and Schmidt (and others) are robust with respect to different statistical specifications and modelling variants. This is an area where further research is welcome.

Impacts- Econ Good- A2: Overpopulation

No Carrying Capacity- Carrying capacity is arbitrary

Green 5 (C. Brooks, U of Central Ark, http://www.brooksgreen.net/capacity.pdf.) ET

Some scholars have recognized carrying capacity as problematic. Muir (2003) argues, “Logistic growth is very idealized, of course. K [carrying capacity] is not likely to be constant (for example, year-to-year changes in weather effect food production; the richer a life we desire, the lower K for humans is likely to be, etc.). However, the model is useful conceptually.” Muir (2003) concludes by noting, “It is unlikely, however, that we can define a specific K (that is, an actual number) for humans. (People seem to enjoy trying though!).” Hardin (2003) expresses similar concerns. He maintains, “There is no hope of ever making carrying capacity figures as precise as, say, the figures for chemical valence or the value of the gravitational constant.” “As a result,” he writes, “… any particular figure for carrying capacity has a substantial element of the arbitrary in it.”

Carrying capacity is variable- adaptation solves

Green 5 (C. Brookes, U of Central Ark, http://www.brooksgreen.net/capacity.pdf) ET

Second, Cohen (1995) likewise understood that “The future of the human population, like the future of its economies, environment, and cultures, is highly unpredictable” (341). While he noted “… a probabilistic measure of human carrying capacity has been developed for local populations in the Amazon, no probabilistic approach to global human population carrying capacity has been developed” (343). He further maintains, “In basic and applied ecology, the carrying capacity of nonhuman species has been defined in at least nine different ways, none of which is adequate for humans” (343). The problem with calculating human carrying capacity is that “Human carrying capacity depends both on natural constraints, which are not fully understood, and on individual and collective choices concerning the average level and distribution of material well-being, technology, political institutions, economic arrangement, family structure, migration and other demographic arrangements, physical, chemical, and biological environment, variability and risk, the time horizon, and values, tastes, and fashions” (343)

Impacts- Econ Good- Racism

Economic decline primarily drives racism

New York Times 90 (*New York Times,* Oct 90) ET

The emancipation of the slaves did not lead directly to segregation, as it should have if American society was primarily and fundamentally racist. Rather, segregation arose in response to a threatening biracial political challenge from black and white farmers in the 1890's to the white elite -- which capitulated to racism after paternalism failed. Segregation collapsed in the face of a civil rights movement sustained by post-World War II prosperity, while racism is now resurgent in an era of economic decline. This oversimplified summary is meant to document the assertion that racism has been and continues to be fostered by competition for limited resources, that is, it is primarily a class issue. It can best be fought by policies for economic and, hence, social justice.

Impacts- Econ Good- Russia Good- Nukes

Russian collapse causes a global nuclear war

David 99 **(**Steven, Professor of Political Science at The Johns Hopkins University, *Foreign Affairs*, Jan/Feb) ET

If internal war does strike Russia, economic deterioration will be a prime cause. From 1989 to the present, the GDP has fallen by 50 percent. In a society where, ten years ago, unemployment scarcely existed, it reached 9.5 percent in 1997 with many economists declaring the true figure to be much higher. Twenty-two percent of Russians live below the official poverty line (earning less than $ 70 a month). Modern Russia can neither collect taxes (it gathers only half the revenue it is due) nor significantly cut spending. Reformers tout privatization as the country's cure-all, but in a land without well-defined property rights or contract law and where subsidies remain a way of life, the prospects for transition to an American-style capitalist economy look remote at best. As the massive devaluation of the ruble and the current political crisis show, Russia's condition is even worse than most analysts feared. If conditions get worse, even the stoic Russian people will soon run out of patience. A future conflict would quickly draw in Russia's military. In the Soviet days civilian rule kept the powerful armed forces in check. But with the Communist Party out of office, what little civilian control remains relies on an exceedingly fragile foundation -- personal friendships between government leaders and military commanders. Meanwhile, the morale of Russian soldiers has fallen to a dangerous low. Drastic cuts in spending mean inadequate pay, housing, and medical care. A new emphasis on domestic missions has created an ideological split between the old and new guard in the military leadership, increasing the risk that disgruntled generals may enter the political fray and feeding the resentment of soldiers who dislike being used as a national police force. Newly enhanced ties between military units and local authorities pose another danger. Soldiers grow ever more dependent on local governments for housing, food, and wages. Draftees serve closer to home, and new laws have increased local control over the armed forces. Were a conflict to emerge between a regional power and Moscow, it is not at all clear which side the military would support. Divining the military's allegiance is crucial, however, since the structure of the Russian Federation makes it virtually certain that regional conflicts will continue to erupt. Russia's 89 republics, krais, and oblasts grow ever more independent in a system that does little to keep them together. As the central government finds itself unable to force its will beyond Moscow (if even that far), power devolves to the periphery. With the economy collapsing, republics feel less and less incentive to pay taxes to Moscow when they receive so little in return. Three-quarters of them already have their own constitutions, nearly all of which make some claim to sovereignty. Strong ethnic bonds promoted by shortsighted Soviet policies may motivate non-Russians to secede from the Federation. Chechnya's successful revolt against Russian control inspired similar movements for autonomy and independence throughout the country. If these rebellions spread and Moscow responds with force, civil war is likely. Should Russia succumb to internal war, the consequences for the United States and Europe will be severe. A major power like Russia -- even though in decline -- does not suffer civil war quietly or alone. An embattled Russian Federation might provoke opportunistic attacks from enemies such as China. Massive flows of refugees would pour into central and western Europe. Armed struggles in Russia could easily spill into its neighbors. Damage from the fighting, particularly attacks on nuclear plants, would poison the environment of much of Europe and Asia. Within Russia, the consequences would be even worse. Just as the sheer brutality of the last Russian civil war laid the basis for the privations of Soviet communism, a second civil war might produce another horrific regime. Most alarming is the real possibility that the violent disintegration of Russia could lead to loss of control over its nuclear arsenal. No nuclear state has ever fallen victim to civil war, but even without a clear precedent the grim consequences can be foreseen. Russia retains some 20,000 nuclear weapons and the raw material for tens of thousands more, in scores of sites scattered throughout the country. So far, the government has managed to prevent the loss of any weapons or much material. If war erupts, however, Moscow's already weak grip on nuclear sites will slacken, making weapons and supplies available to a wide range of anti-American groups and states. Such dispersal of nuclear weapons represents the greatest physical threat America now faces. And it is hard to think of anything that would increase this threat more than the chaos that would

Impacts- Econ Good- Russia Good- Nukes

**Russian economic decline causes nuclear**

Filger 9 (Sheldon, founder of Global Economic Crisis, *The Huffington Post,*, 5.10.9, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/sheldon-filger/russian-economy-faces-dis\_b\_201147.html ) ET

In Russia, historically, economic health and political stability are intertwined to a degree that is rarely encountered in other major industrialized economies. It was the economic stagnation of the former Soviet Union that led to its political downfall. Similarly, Medvedev and Putin, both intimately acquainted with their nation's history, are unquestionably alarmed at the prospect that Russia's economic crisis will endanger the nation's political stability, achieved at great cost after years of chaos following the demise of the Soviet Union. Already, strikes and protests are occurring among rank and file workers facing unemployment or non-payment of their salaries. Recent polling demonstrates that the once supreme popularity ratings of Putin and Medvedev are eroding rapidly. Beyond the political elites are the financial oligarchs, who have been forced to deleverage, even unloading their yachts and executive jets in a desperate attempt to raise cash. Should the Russian economy deteriorate to the point where economic collapse is not out of the question, the impact will go far beyond the obvious accelerant such an outcome would be for the Global Economic Crisis. There is a geopolitical dimension that is even more relevant then the economic context. Despite its economic vulnerabilities and perceived decline from superpower status, Russia remains one of only two nations on earth with a nuclear arsenal of sufficient scope and capability to destroy the world as we know it. For that reason, it is not only President Medvedev and Prime Minister Putin who will be lying awake at nights over the prospect that a national economic crisis can transform itself into a virulent and destabilizing social and political upheaval. It just may be possible that U.S.

Russian economic collapse breeds political instability and global insecurity

Filger 9 (Sheldon, founder of Global Economic Crisis, *The Huffington Post,*, 5.10.9, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/sheldon-filger/russian-economy-faces-dis\_b\_201147.html ) ET

President Barack Obama's national security team has already briefed him about the consequences of a major economic meltdown in Russia for the peace of the world. After all, the most recent national intelligence estimates put out by the U.S. intelligence community have already concluded that the Global Economic Crisis represents the greatest national security threat to the United States, due to its facilitating political instability in the world. During the years Boris Yeltsin ruled Russia, security forces responsible for guarding the nation's nuclear arsenal went without pay for months at a time, leading to fears that desperate personnel would illicitly sell nuclear weapons to terrorist organizations. If the current economic crisis in Russia were to deteriorate much further, how secure would the Russian nuclear arsenal remain? It may be that the financial impact of the Global Economic Crisis is its least

Impacts- Econ Good- Russia Good- War

Russian growth prevents war with the US

Bronwen 9 (Maddox, Chief Foreign Commentator for The Times, The Times, http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/comment/columnists/bronwe n\_maddox/article6 652936.ece ) ET

The most interesting and unexpected ingredient in the Russia-US summit is how well the Russian leaders have managed the financial turmoil. That changes in their favour, slightly, the dynamics of the meeting, which otherwise turn on that peculiar Russian mix of extremes of strength and weakness.On one hand, President Medvedev and Vladimir Putin, the Prime Minister, hold cards that matter hugely to any US president: nuclear missiles; oil; gas; one of the world’s largest armies; friendship with Iran; influence, obsessively deployed, over the Caucasus and Central Asia; a permanent seat — and veto — on the United Nations Security Council. On the other, there is the reality of Russia’s vulnerability on every count of finance, trade, and military strength. There are the big, bald statistics of its shrinking population (although that may be reversing), falling life expectancy (although that is suddenly improving), and stubborn poverty. Most painfully, too, there is the memory of the Soviet era and the incredulity at the sharpness of the reversal. The US team has made clear that in its calculation, the strengths make it worth its while trying to “reset” the relationship. But the weaknesses mean that if the attempt fails, Russia could be relegated behind more pressing problems.The element that might change this calculation is the Russian leaders’ recent skilful management of the economy. It not only points to surefootedness in economic management, which their rhetoric has not often suggested. It offers hope that Russia may find its way out of its current sour resentment, and autocratic rule, and into a more stable future. A World Bank report last month spelt out the unexpected upside to Russia’s otherwise unsurprising suffering during the crisis. Yes, there has been plenty of damage. Real gross domestic product is expected to shrink by about 7.9 per cent this year (compared with a global fall in output of 2.9 per cent). That is a big shock after a decade of high growth, driven by high oil and gas prices. The stock market lost two thirds of its value in the five months to November 2008.Unemployment could now rise to 13 per cent and poverty to 17.4 per cent by the end of the year, the bank warned, noting that the middle class would also shrink by a tenth, or more than six million people, to just over half the population.However, the bank, which called the Government’s response “swift, co-ordinated, and comprehensive”, noted that Russia’s leaders had moved quickly to cut spending as the oil price fell (including pushing through an aggressive rethinking of the military). They had arranged a large stimulus, and had responded to the plunge in foreign reserves (figures yesterday showed a net capital inflow of $7.2 billion in the second quarter of 2009, after $35 billion flowed out in the first quarter). The worst effects of the crisis were perhaps past, the bank suggested. If — a huge if — Russia took the chance to reform old industries, and made them more competitive, then it could come out of the crisis with a more modern, diversified economy.There are a few slight signs that Russia’s leaders might seize that chance, such as the overhaul of the military (arms, and rules for conscription). Alternatively, they will persist with their technique of blaming others for their problems, and focusing on external threats, not obstacles at home.President Obama’s quest of trying to find a new deal to cut stockpiles of nuclear missiles is an honourable one. But its success will depend on whether Russia can be persuaded out of the mindset in which the expansion and success of the European Union and Nato are a threat. The US has had much less success with Russia than with China in persuading it of the value of becoming part of international organisations and laws. Not much in Putin’s or Medvedev’s recent behaviour suggests that they are that way inclined. All the same, the weakness of modern Russia, clutching the few great prizes of its recent past, in the form of missiles and oil wells while the rest lies in tatters, is one point of leverage. So is the Russian leaders’ astute reaction to the crisis, which they dubbed the failure of capitalism. That shows that they can set ideology aside and take quick steps in the country’s interest. That can only be a hopeful sign for Russia’s chances of becoming a less fearful and more modern state.

Impacts- Econ Good- A2: Russia Conflict

Russian growth prevents war with the US – capitalism must look good in order to maintain its ideological prominence and avoid conflict

Bronwen 9 (Maddox, Chief Foreign Commentator for The Times, The Times, http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/comment/columnists/bronwe n\_maddox/article6 652936.ece ) ET

The most interesting and unexpected ingredient in the Russia-US summit is how well the Russian leaders have managed the financial turmoil. That changes in their favour, slightly, the dynamics of the meeting, which otherwise turn on that peculiar Russian mix of extremes of strength and weakness.On one hand, President Medvedev and Vladimir Putin, the Prime Minister, hold cards that matter hugely to any US president: nuclear missiles; oil; gas; one of the world’s largest armies; friendship with Iran; influence, obsessively deployed, over the Caucasus and Central Asia; a permanent seat — and veto — on the United Nations Security Council. On the other, there is the reality of Russia’s vulnerability on every count of finance, trade, and military strength. There are the big, bald statistics of its shrinking population (although that may be reversing), falling life expectancy (although that is suddenly improving), and stubborn poverty. Most painfully, too, there is the memory of the Soviet era and the incredulity at the sharpness of the reversal. The US team has made clear that in its calculation, the strengths make it worth its while trying to “reset” the relationship. But the weaknesses mean that if the attempt fails, Russia could be relegated behind more pressing problems.The element that might change this calculation is the Russian leaders’ recent skilful management of the economy. It not only points to surefootedness in economic management, which their rhetoric has not often suggested. It offers hope that Russia may find its way out of its current sour resentment, and autocratic rule, and into a more stable future. A World Bank report last month spelt out the unexpected upside to Russia’s otherwise unsurprising suffering during the crisis. Yes, there has been plenty of damage. Real gross domestic product is expected to shrink by about 7.9 per cent this year (compared with a global fall in output of 2.9 per cent). That is a big shock after a decade of high growth, driven by high oil and gas prices. The stock market lost two thirds of its value in the five months to November 2008.Unemployment could now rise to 13 per cent and poverty to 17.4 per cent by the end of the year, the bank warned, noting that the middle class would also shrink by a tenth, or more than six million people, to just over half the population.However, the bank, which called the Government’s response “swift, co-ordinated, and comprehensive”, noted that Russia’s leaders had moved quickly to cut spending as the oil price fell (including pushing through an aggressive rethinking of the military). They had arranged a large stimulus, and had responded to the plunge in foreign reserves (figures yesterday showed a net capital inflow of $7.2 billion in the second quarter of 2009, after $35 billion flowed out in the first quarter). The worst effects of the crisis were perhaps past, the bank suggested. If — a huge if — Russia took the chance to reform old industries, and made them more competitive, then it could come out of the crisis with a more modern, diversified economy.There are a few slight signs that Russia’s leaders might seize that chance, such as the overhaul of the military (arms, and rules for conscription). Alternatively, they will persist with their technique of blaming others for their problems, and focusing on external threats, not obstacles at home.President Obama’s quest of trying to find a new deal to cut stockpiles of nuclear missiles is an honourable one. But its success will depend on whether Russia can be persuaded out of the mindset in which the expansion and success of the European Union and Nato are a threat. The US has had much less success with Russia than with China in persuading it of the value of becoming part of international organisations and laws. Not much in Putin’s or Medvedev’s recent behaviour suggests that they are that way inclined. All the same, the weakness of modern Russia, clutching the few great prizes of its recent past, in the form of missiles and oil wells while the rest lies in tatters, is one point of leverage. So is the Russian leaders’ astute reaction to the crisis, which they dubbed the failure of capitalism. That shows that they can set ideology aside and take quick steps in the country’s interest. That can only be a hopeful sign for Russia’s chances of becoming a less fearful and more modern state.

Impacts- Econ Good- A2: Russia Build Up

Concerns about arms sales to Russia are silly- stabilizes the region

Gorenburg 10 (Dmitry, Executive Director, American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, *Russian Military Forum*, 5.12.10, http://russiamil.wordpress.com/2010/05/12/russian-foreign-arms-purchases-are-good-for-regional-stability/ ) ET

A great deal of ink has been spilled recently about how terrible it is that a number of European NATO members are considering selling arms and military equipment to Russia. Many commentators vehemently argue against such arms sales. The reasons for the opposition are rarely stated openly, but when they are they tend to focus on the fear that such deals would tie West European states more closely to Russia, preventing them from standing firm against Russian policies that the commentators oppose. A secondary reason is that these deals would improve Russian military capabilities.Both of these reasons are fundamentally misguided. First of all, countless studies have shown that greater ties between states reduce the likelihood of conflict between them.

Russia buying more arms good- makes them dependent on NATO

Gorenburg 10 (Dmitry, Executive Director, American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, *Russian Military Forum*, 5.12.10, http://russiamil.wordpress.com/2010/05/12/russian-foreign-arms-purchases-are-good-for-regional-stability/ ) ET

If France or Germany sell military equipment to Russia, they not only establish closer ties between their militaries, but they also make the Russian military more dependent on NATO military equipment. Cold warriors seem to think that the dependency argument only runs in one direction — Western states who sell to Russia wouldn’t want to lose sales, so they’ll do whatever Russia wants. But the road of mutual dependence is a two way street. If Russia starts buying certain categories of military equipment from abroad, its domestic defense industry will likely lose whatever capability it still has to produce that category of equipment. Russia will then depend on NATO states for the procurement (and perhaps maintenance) of its military equipment.

Russia arm buying increases Western control over Russia- it’s good

Gorenburg 10 (Dmitry, Executive Director, American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, *Russian Military Forum*, 5.12.10, http://russiamil.wordpress.com/2010/05/12/russian-foreign-arms-purchases-are-good-for-regional-stability/ ) ET

 In that situation, Russian leaders will have to think twice before undertaking any actions towards NATO that are sufficiently hostile as to result in it being cut off from access to such equipment. This form of dependence is much more serious. After all, if Russia gets upset with France and stops buying its military equipment, French arms manufacturers will lose some money and perhaps some French people will lose their jobs. But if France cuts off military sales to Russia in a situation where Russia is dependent on France for certain types of equipment, Russian security will suffer.

Impacts- Econ Good- A2: Russia Build Up

And Russian arm buying doesn’t make conflict worse- Georgia proves

Gorenburg 10 (Dmitry, Executive Director, American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, *Russian Military Forum*, 5.12.10, http://russiamil.wordpress.com/2010/05/12/russian-foreign-arms-purchases-are-good-for-regional-stability/ ) ET

Some analysts fear that Russia could use equipment purchased from NATO, such as the Mistral ships, to attack its neighbors. The 2008 Georgia war showed that even without NATO equipment the Russian military is plenty strong enough to defeat a small and weak army of the kind that just about all of its immediate neighbors possess. Western arms sales are not necessary for Russia to be able to successfully undertake hostile action against a country like Georgia. But again, if NATO arms sales to Russia become ubiquitous, Russia may well become more hesitant to undertake actions that could potentially result in the cut-off of such arms sales. In other words, Western leverage over Russian actions will actually increase.

Russia buying arms improves US security

Gorenburg 10 (Dmitry, Executive Director, American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, *Russian Military Forum*, 5.12.10, http://russiamil.wordpress.com/2010/05/12/russian-foreign-arms-purchases-are-good-for-regional-stability/ ) ET

Second, if Russia starts using NATO equipment, this will improve interoperability between Russian and NATO military forces, making their efforts at military cooperation more effective. Since the two sides are much more likely to work together on potential issues such piracy, smuggling and counter-terrorism than they are to actually fight each other, it seems to me that selling NATO equipment to Russia can only lead to improvements in security for NATO states.

Russian leaders don’t trust their own arms- shows they need international community

Gorenburg 10 (Dmitry, Executive Director, American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, *Russian Military Forum*, 5.12.10, http://russiamil.wordpress.com/2010/05/12/russian-foreign-arms-purchases-are-good-for-regional-stability/ ) ET

Russian leaders have recently contemplated a large number of potential arms purchases from abroad, including both basic equipment, such as uniforms, weaponry, such as sniper rifles, and major platforms, such as amphibious assault ships and armored vehicles. This shows that these leaders no longer trust the capabilities of Russia’s domestic defense industry to rebuild the Russian army, which is equipped almost entirely with aging Soviet-era technology. They have come to understand that foreign ties are only way to rebuild their military capabilities in a reasonable time frame.

Russia Arms sales are in interest of US security paradigm

Gorenburg 10 (Dmitry, Executive Director, American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, *Russian Military Forum*, 5.12.10, http://russiamil.wordpress.com/2010/05/12/russian-foreign-arms-purchases-are-good-for-regional-stability/ ) ET

Western leaders should encourage this trend, because it will only enhance regional and global security. Rather than “eroding the effectiveness of NATO policies toward Russia and in NATO’s own eastern neighborhood,” extensive arms sales by NATO states to Russia will increase Russian dependence on the West, decreasing the likelihood that Russia would take unilateral military action contrary to Western interests, while enhancing regional security by improving the ability of Russian forces to cooperate with NATO forces against threats to their mutual security.