# Advantage Counterplans—ENDI 2013

## \*Latin American Relations

### 1nc—Poverty/Development CP

**Counterplan text: The United States federal government should convene a public/private summit on poverty and inequality. The United States federal government should encourage Latin American countries to institute a more progressive tax system as per our Barshefsky evidence. The United States federal government should increase US aid to assist in restructuring tax systems and building infrastructure.**

**Counterplan solves**

**Barshefsky and Hill, 8**—\*served as United States Trade Representative, the country's top trade negotiator, from 1997 to 2001. She was the Deputy U.S. Trade Representative from 1993 to 1997 \*\*a retired U.S. Army General and former commander of United States Southern Command from 2002 to 2004. Hill also served as the Commanding General, I Corps and Fort Lewis (Charlene and James, “US-Latin American Relations: A New Direction for a New Reality,” Shannon ONeil—a senior fellow for Latin America Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), a nonpartisan foreign-policy think tank and membership organization. Her interests and expertise include politics and economics in Latin America and immigration. She is the director of the U.S.-Mexico Initiative at CFR.[1] O’Neil publishes the blogs Latin America’s Moment and Latintelligence, 2008, <http://www.cfr.org/mexico/us-latin-america-relations/p16279>)

Lessening Poverty and Structural Inequality¶ Reducing poverty and improving access to market opportunities in Latin¶ America are central to U.S. objectives of promoting stable democratic¶ government, enabling economic expansion, and providing alternatives¶ to illegal economic activity. It is in the U.S. interest to support those¶ Latin American governments that are seeking to decrease poverty and¶ structural inequality.¶ Support Local and Regional Solutions¶ The Task Force urges the next administration to convene a public/private summit¶ on poverty and inequality during its first year in office in order to review ‘‘best¶ practices’’ in the region and to demonstrate U.S. commitment to work with¶ LatinAmerican governments and other stakeholders in addressing these problems.¶ This forum would bring together government officials, private businesses,¶ multilateral institutions, and NGOs from Latin American countries,¶ the United States, and other involved nations, including the¶ European Union and China.¶ Increase Public Revenues¶ Latin American governments must establish the institutional infrastructure¶ necessary to boost public revenues if they are to confront social¶ and economic problems successfully. In addition to encouraging¶ increased tax collection through new administrative and enforcement¶ measures, the United States should encourage countries to institute¶ more progressive tax systems, moving away from relying primarily on¶ regressive and cyclical VATs and import duties, to a more progressive¶ mix of property, personal, corporate, capital gains, and other taxes.¶ EU aid practices have begun to reflect such concerns. The Task Force¶ recommends that U.S. officials encourage the International Monetary Fund¶ and other international and multilateral financial institutions to incorporate the¶ redistributive nature of tax systems and revenue collection in their reviews of¶ fiscal policy and their arrangements with borrowing nations. The Task Force¶ also supports increasing U.S. aid and expertise to assist in restructuring tax¶ systems and building the infrastructure and judicial capacity necessary to increase¶ tax collection and limit tax evasion.

### 1nc—Trade Liberalization CP

**Counterplan text: The United States should promote more open trade through the liberalization of textile and agricultural policies, including reducing and eliminating tariffs and subsidies on agricultural commodities. The United States should also approve pending free trade agreements with Colombia and Panama.**

**Solves poverty and trade**

**Barshefsky and Hill, 8**—\*served as United States Trade Representative, the country's top trade negotiator, from 1997 to 2001. She was the Deputy U.S. Trade Representative from 1993 to 1997 \*\*a retired U.S. Army General and former commander of United States Southern Command from 2002 to 2004. Hill also served as the Commanding General, I Corps and Fort Lewis (Charlene and James, “US-Latin American Relations: A New Direction for a New Reality,” Shannon ONeil—a senior fellow for Latin America Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), a nonpartisan foreign-policy think tank and membership organization. Her interests and expertise include politics and economics in Latin America and immigration. She is the director of the U.S.-Mexico Initiative at CFR.[1] O’Neil publishes the blogs Latin America’s Moment and Latintelligence, 2008, <http://www.cfr.org/mexico/us-latin-america-relations/p16279>)

Promote More Open Trade¶ The $600 million in U.S. poverty-oriented aid to Latin America every¶ year pales in comparison with the $555 billion in annual trade. Through¶ trade, accordingly, the United States has an important opportunity to¶ further economic development.While previous trade agreements have¶ provided mutual benefits, the often uncompromising protection and/¶ or subsidization of particular U.S. economic sectors has limited the¶ economic growth and poverty-reducing effects of trade and, in some¶ cases, heightened the dislocations associated with economic opening.¶ The United States should promote more open trade in areas of Latin¶ American comparative advantage as an important step to reduce poverty¶ and inequality in the region, which will further broaden long-term¶ economic opportunities for Latin America and the United States.¶ While recognizing the political challenges and the importance of multilateral¶ solutions, the Task Force recommends that the next administration proactively¶ support the liberalization of textile and agricultural policies, including reducing¶ and eventually eliminating tariffs and subsidies on agricultural commodities,¶ including tariffs on ethanol, and relaxing rules of origin requirements on textiles.¶ Further U.S. opening in these areas would position the United States¶ to seek the further opening of economic sectors in Latin America¶ important to U.S. businesses, such as services. It would also lower¶ overall costs for U.S. consumers.55 To do this the United States should work with Brazil, other LatinAmerican countries, and European nations¶ to push forward the Doha Development Agenda.¶ At the same time, the United States cannot ignore the impetus¶ of globalization. All countries benefit from programs that lessen the¶ dislocations that result from technological change and market opening.¶ The United States should host a hemispheric conference on globalization,¶ trade, technology, and social support in order to explore the best¶ ways to construct social safety nets appropriate for today’s economy.¶ The United States should also approve pending free trade agreements¶ with Colombia and Panama. Free trade remains an important policy¶ tool for expanding economic opportunities in the region and the United¶ States. Rejection of these agreements would severely damage close¶ allies, send a negative signal to other countries in the region, give rise¶ to the view that the United States is an unreliable partner, and strengthen¶ countries in the region that espouse anti-Americanism. The United¶ States should also extend trade preferences to Bolivia and Ecuador as a¶ way to maintain useful relations with these complex countries. Abruptly¶ ending these ties would serve quickly to push these countries further¶ away from the United States diplomatically, and could destabilize already¶ weak institutions in politically fractious countries.

### 1nc—Targeted Assistance CP

**Targeted assistance**

**Barshefsky and Hill, 8**—\*served as United States Trade Representative, the country's top trade negotiator, from 1997 to 2001. She was the Deputy U.S. Trade Representative from 1993 to 1997 \*\*a retired U.S. Army General and former commander of United States Southern Command from 2002 to 2004. Hill also served as the Commanding General, I Corps and Fort Lewis (Charlene and James, “US-Latin American Relations: A New Direction for a New Reality,” Shannon ONeil—a senior fellow for Latin America Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), a nonpartisan foreign-policy think tank and membership organization. Her interests and expertise include politics and economics in Latin America and immigration. She is the director of the U.S.-Mexico Initiative at CFR.[1] O’Neil publishes the blogs Latin America’s Moment and Latintelligence, 2008, <http://www.cfr.org/mexico/us-latin-america-relations/p16279>)

Increase and Refocus Targeted Assistance¶ U.S. funding for targeted assistance and antipoverty programs should¶ reflect the priorities of Latin American governments (as established¶ in the first-year public/private summit on poverty) and also involve¶ restructuring and integrating the programs of various U.S. government¶ bureaucracies to focus on crisis areas in the region.¶ The Task Force recommends that the next U.S. administration and Congress¶ continue and expand their targeted assistance in the following ways:¶ • Fully fund the Millennium Challenge Account.¶ • Complement these programs with new initiatives that reach the¶ poor regions of large middle-income countries—such as Brazil and¶ Mexico—that are currently ineligible for MCA assistance. Within¶ these and the MCA programs, target both poverty alleviation and¶ institution-building.¶ • Change the implementation rules of aid programs in Congress to¶ allow NGOs and contractors from the recipient countries, with¶ appropriate supervision and accountability, to design and implement¶ aid programs, providing more domestic jobs and opportunities.¶ • Direct more counternarcotics aid toward developing alternative economic¶ opportunities to narcotics production.¶ • Use U.S. influence in multilateral institutions, particularly theWorld¶ Bank, the Inter-American Development Bank, and the Overseas¶ Private Investment Corporation, to promote financial inclusion by¶ expanding microenterprise and small-business financing. This should¶ include financial literacy programs, as well as technical assistance¶ regarding the regulatory frameworks and information systems necessary¶ for private banks to enter these markets.

### 1nc—Energy CP

**Counterplan text:**

**The United States federal government should remove disincentives for hemisphere production and trade in biofuels and create incentives for gas distributors to increase the availability of biofuels. The United States federal government should create a formal working group with Brazil, Argentine, and Mexico to discuss the expansion of nuclear energy.**

**Solves energy concerns**

**Barshefsky and Hill, 8**—\*served as United States Trade Representative, the country's top trade negotiator, from 1997 to 2001. She was the Deputy U.S. Trade Representative from 1993 to 1997 \*\*a retired U.S. Army General and former commander of United States Southern Command from 2002 to 2004. Hill also served as the Commanding General, I Corps and Fort Lewis (Charlene and James, “US-Latin American Relations: A New Direction for a New Reality,” Shannon ONeil—a senior fellow for Latin America Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), a nonpartisan foreign-policy think tank and membership organization. Her interests and expertise include politics and economics in Latin America and immigration. She is the director of the U.S.-Mexico Initiative at CFR.[1] O’Neil publishes the blogs Latin America’s Moment and Latintelligence, 2008, <http://www.cfr.org/mexico/us-latin-america-relations/p16279>)

Develop Alternative Energy Markets

The Western Hemisphere produces 80 percent of the world’s biofuels,¶ and a precedent for collaborative leadership has been established by¶ the U.S.-Brazil initiative, which includes cooperation on standards to¶ facilitate trade, technology distribution, andsupport for the development¶ of biofuel production in other countries. The expansion of these industries,¶ aided by U.S. domestic and foreign policy incentives, can benefit¶ the environment, foster economic development through technology¶ transfer and adaptation, and aid in poverty reduction through job¶ creation in the hemisphere. The Task Force recommends building on the¶ U.S.-Brazil Biofuels Pact to encourage the development of alternative energy¶ in the region. The most important policy steps are domestic, including removing disincentives for hemisphere production and trade in biofuels¶ and creating incentives for U.S. gas distributors to increase the availability¶ of biofuels.¶ The Task Force also recommends that the United States encourage the¶ production of alternative fuels and their use by creating a Western Hemisphere¶ umbrella initiative for sustained collaboration and long-term cooperation with¶ regional partners. This would include:¶ • Creating a Hemispheric Alternative Energy Initiative to develop¶ capacity and infrastructure, encourage innovation, and address issues¶ related to biofuels such as food security andenvironmental protection.¶ • Establishing a formal working group with Brazil, Argentina, and¶ Mexico to discuss issues associated with the expansion of nuclear¶ energy, in accordance with the International Atomic Energy Agency¶ rules, and to collaborate on efforts that are both economically and¶ environmentally sustainable.¶ • Promoting the production of alternative energies, such as wind and¶ solar, through new incentives and trade missions sponsored by the¶ secretary of commerce, and World Bank, IDB, and International¶ Finance Corporation financing.

### 1nc—Venezuela CP

**Counterplan text: The United States federal government should work through multilateral institutions to monitor democratic institutions in Venezuela. The United States federal government should increase funding for social justice programs. The United States federal government should create incentives for U.S. private sector investment in energy infrastructure.**

**Solves case**

**Barshefsky and Hill, 8**—\*served as United States Trade Representative, the country's top trade negotiator, from 1997 to 2001. She was the Deputy U.S. Trade Representative from 1993 to 1997 \*\*a retired U.S. Army General and former commander of United States Southern Command from 2002 to 2004. Hill also served as the Commanding General, I Corps and Fort Lewis (Charlene and James, “US-Latin American Relations: A New Direction for a New Reality,” Shannon ONeil—a senior fellow for Latin America Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), a nonpartisan foreign-policy think tank and membership organization. Her interests and expertise include politics and economics in Latin America and immigration. She is the director of the U.S.-Mexico Initiative at CFR.[1] O’Neil publishes the blogs Latin America’s Moment and Latintelligence, 2008, <http://www.cfr.org/mexico/us-latin-america-relations/p16279>)

Address Venezuela through Multilateral Institutions¶ The anti-U.S. policies of President Cha´vez of Venezuela should be¶ taken seriously by U.S. policymakers. It is important that the United¶ States keep a close watch on Venezuela and that Cha´vez’s potentially¶ destabilizing policies within Latin America be carefully monitored. At¶ the same time, a good deal of Venezuela’s international support is¶ limited to the concrete benefits thatVenezuela provides, such as financial¶ support, subsidized oil, and infrastructure investment. Thus, according¶ to the most recent Latinobaro´metro poll of Latin Americans, President¶ Cha´vez’s leadership ranks at the bottom, only slightly above lowestranked¶ Fidel Castro. The 2007 Pew Global Attitudes Project indicates¶ that nearly three-quarters of Brazilians, Peruvians, and Chileans doubt¶ Cha´vez is doing ‘‘the right thing’’ in world affairs. This suggests the¶ United States must temper its vigilance with a careful assessment of¶ Cha´vez’s real influence in the region.¶ U.S. policy is limited in its ability to sway either the domestic or¶ foreign policy of Venezuela. Nevertheless, there are actions the United¶ States can take to protect its interests in Latin America further.¶ These include:¶ • Maintaining official relations with the Venezuelan government, both¶ formal and informal, in order to keep channels open.¶ • Working through multilateral institutions, in particular the United¶ Nations and the Organization of American States, to monitor democratic¶ institutions and criticize antidemocratic behavior in Venezuela¶ (and other countries).¶ • Increasing funding for ‘‘social justice’’ programs and policies in Latin¶ America. Providing a U.S.-backed alternative to Cha´vez’s vision¶ will improve U.S. standing in the region and promote U.S. interests.¶ • Creating incentives for U.S. private sector investment in energy¶ infrastructure in the region and U.S. leadership in the development¶ of alternative fuels. This could both improve diplomatic relations¶ with other countries in the region and help diversify U.S. energy¶ consumption.¶ • Resist the temptation to react unilaterally to the results of Interpol’s¶ investigations in Colombia. Measures initiated by multilateral organizations,¶ such as the United Nations, the European Union, and the OAS, as well as diplomatic efforts by a number of countries in the¶ Western Hemisphere, will be the most effective avenue against any¶ country found to be supporting criminal and insurgent groups¶ actively.¶ An emerging issue for U.S.-Venezuela relations centers on Hugo¶ Cha´vez’s recent announcement that Venezuela will pursue nuclear¶ power. Given the increasingly authoritarian nature of the Venezuelan¶ government and its close ties with Iran, this announcement is particularly¶ troubling. In response to Venezuela, the United States should:¶ • Aggressively pursue already existing efforts such as collaborating with¶ partners at the International Atomic Energy Agency and the Nuclear¶ Suppliers Group to develop universal rules that constrain the spread¶ of enrichment and reprocessing. This will be more effective than¶ narrowly focusing on Venezuela, as the latter approach is unlikely¶ to attract the multilateral support necessary for success.¶ • Focus on the most sensitive parts of Venezuela’s potential nuclear¶ program—uranium enrichment and plutoniumreprocessing—with¶ the aim of ensuring that no Venezuelan nuclear program involves¶ capabilities on either front.

## \*Brazil Engagement CP

### 1nc—Brazil CP

**Counterplan text: The United States federal government should collaborate with Brazil to develop a more consistent partnership to encourage the use of ethanol. The United States federal government should work with Brazil to push forward the Doho Round of global trade negotiations.**

**Solves the case**

**Barshefsky and Hill, 8**—\*served as United States Trade Representative, the country's top trade negotiator, from 1997 to 2001. She was the Deputy U.S. Trade Representative from 1993 to 1997 \*\*a retired U.S. Army General and former commander of United States Southern Command from 2002 to 2004. Hill also served as the Commanding General, I Corps and Fort Lewis (Charlene and James, “US-Latin American Relations: A New Direction for a New Reality,” Shannon ONeil—a senior fellow for Latin America Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), a nonpartisan foreign-policy think tank and membership organization. Her interests and expertise include politics and economics in Latin America and immigration. She is the director of the U.S.-Mexico Initiative at CFR.[1] O’Neil publishes the blogs Latin America’s Moment and Latintelligence, 2008, <http://www.cfr.org/mexico/us-latin-america-relations/p16279>)

Broadening Diplomacy¶ While the United States maintains productive relationships with the¶ vast majority of Latin American nations, there are a few with which¶ the United States has strained relations. The Task Force finds that the¶ United States must officially recognize all countries in the region and should¶ work to identify areas of common interest and cooperation in order to advance¶ U.S. interests, regardless of the countries’ political identity; this includes Cuba¶ and Venezuela.¶ The United States should continue to voice strong support for¶ democracy and to express concern when it perceives that governments¶ are failing to maintain democratic institutions and basic human rights¶ practices. But it should not cut diplomatic ties in such cases. By ignoring¶ and isolating certain nations in our hemisphere, the United States¶ reduces its own influence in these countries and precludes dialogue through which mutual interests can be addressed; at the same time, it¶ inadvertently strengthens the regimes in these countries, as the experience¶ with Cuba amply demonstrates. U.S. relations with Brazil and¶ Mexico should also be strengthened and expanded.¶ Deepen U.S. Relations with Brazil¶ Brazil is the fourth-largest democracy and the ninth-largest economy¶ in the world, and it has become an increasingly important actor not¶ only in Latin America but globally. The Task Force recommends that the¶ United States build on its existing and welcome collaboration with Brazil on¶ ethanol to develop a more consistent, coordinated, and broader partnership that¶ incorporates a wide range of bilateral, regional, and global issues. One crucial area¶ for partnership is regional security. Expanding on current peacekeeping¶ efforts, the United States should broaden and deepen regional security¶ cooperation with Brazil. The narcotics trade threatens Brazil’s security,¶ as it is an important transit country for the European drug market and¶ increasingly a consumer country of cocaine and other drugs. Increasing¶ Brazilian involvement in the fight against narcotics through government-¶ to-government cooperation and joint security initiatives will not¶ only ease the U.S. burden in the war on drugs, but will also make¶ U.S. and Brazilian efforts more effective.¶ The United States should also work closely with Brazil to push¶ forward the Doha Round of global trade negotiations. While this would¶ mean changing domestic agricultural policies, U.S. negotiators could¶ then aggressively pursue more open markets in U.S. areas of concern.¶ Finally, energy and climate change provide ample opportunity for¶ deepening ties and securing mutual economic and environmental¶ advantages. Both the United States and Brazil are increasingly turning¶ to LNG to satisfy future energy demands. The United States should¶ work together with Brazil to develop the LNG hemispheric market,¶ benefiting both countries’ energy matrixes. On biofuels, the United¶ States should pursue a broader joint policy initiative that promotes the¶ development of environmentally sensitive alternative fuels in the region¶ and around the world.

**And, brazil is key to solving relations**

**Sweig et al, 11**—Nelson and David Rockefeller Senior Fellow for Latin America Studies and Director for Latin America Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations (Julia, “Global Brazil and U.S.-Brazil Relations,” July 2011, <http://www.cfr.org/brazil/global-brazil-us-brazil-relations/p25407>)

July 12, 2011—Over the course of a generation, Brazil has emerged as both a driver of growth in South America and as an active force in world politics. A new Council on Foreign Relations (CFR)-sponsored Independent Task Force report asserts "that it is in the interest of the United States to understand Brazil as a complex international actor whose influence on the defining global issues of the day is only likely to increase."¶ Brazil currently ranks as the world's fifth-largest landmass and fifth-largest population, and it expects to soon be ranked the fifth-largest economy. The report, Global Brazil and U.S.-Brazil Relations, recommends that "U.S. policymakers recognize Brazil's standing as a global actor, treat its emergence as an opportunity for the United States, and work with Brazil to develop complementary policies."¶ The Task Force is chaired by former secretary of energy Samuel W. Bodman and former president of the World Bank James D. Wolfensohn and is directed by CFR Senior Fellow and Director for Latin America Studies and Director of the Global Brazil Initiative Julia E. Sweig.¶ Recognizing Brazil's global role, the report recommends that the Obama administration now fully endorse the country's bid for a seat as a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council (UNSC). It argues that "a formal endorsement from the United States for Brazil would go far to overcome lingering suspicion within the Brazilian government that the U.S. commitment to a mature relationship between equals is largely rhetorical."¶ Domestically, Brazil's "inclusive growth has translated into a significant reduction of inequality, an expansion of the middle class, and a vibrant economy, all framed within a democratic context." Consequently, Brazil has been able to use its economic bona fides to leverage a stronger position in the international, commercial, and diplomatic arenas.¶ The report stresses the importance of regular communication between the presidents of both countries. "Cooperation between the United States and Brazil holds too much promise for miscommunication or inevitable disagreements to stand in the way of potential gains." A mature, working relationship means that "the United States and Brazil can help each other advance mutual interests even without wholesale policy agreements between the two," notes the report.¶ The Task Force further recommends that¶ - the U.S. Congress "include an elimination of the ethanol tariff in any bill regarding reform to the ethanol and biofuel tax credit regime."¶ - the United States "take the first step to waive visa requirements for Brazilians by immediately reviewing Brazil's criteria for participation in the Visa Waiver Program."¶ - the U.S. State Department create an Office for Brazilian Affairs and the National Security Council (NSC) centralize its efforts under a NSC director for Brazil in order to better coordinate the current decentralized U.S. policy.

### 2nc—Solves Everything

**Diplomatic negotiation solves trade, energy, and drug trafficking.**

**Sweig et al, 11**—Nelson and David Rockefeller Senior Fellow for Latin America Studies and Director for Latin America Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations (Julia, “Global Brazil and U.S.-Brazil Relations,” July 2011, <http://www.cfr.org/brazil/global-brazil-us-brazil-relations/p25407>)

Expanding Robust Trade¶ The recent flurry of exchanges provide a strong base for refocusing U.S. relations in the region, recognizing the importance of the hemisphere for the country's well-being. This should start with trade. Latin America today represents a good economic news story for the United States. Trade with Latin America has grown faster than virtually any other region in the world, reaching nearly a trillion dollars. U.S. shipments to its southern neighbors now total some $350 billion annually, roughly a quarter of all exports. With somewhat complementary industries and economies, expanding these sales further can benefit all sides.¶ Energy too provides a promising opening, not just for the economies in the region but also for shifting the fraught geopolitical balance for the better. Brazil's huge oil finds, Colombia's rising output, and the possibility of renewed exploration and production in Mexico (if the next president reforms the oil sector to allow foreign direct investment in the same manner as Brazil's Petrobras), would all benefit the United States. The hemisphere is also a renewable energy leader, with wind, solar, hydroelectric, and ethanol. If integrated, these alternative sources could further the quest for a cleaner and more competitive energy matrix worldwide.¶ Finally, drug trafficking and organized crime networks increasingly affect public security across the hemisphere. This may perhaps be the most difficult area for agreement, as more nations now question the policies of the longstanding U.S. war on drugs. But with the threats transnational in origin, so too must be the responses, building and expanding on current regional coordination.¶ The recent high levels of diplomatic engagement between the United States and many Latin American nations are in many ways just governments catching up with the already deep ties on the ground among families, communities, corporations, and supply chains. Sustaining this interest after the Summit of the Americas will serve Washington well, benefiting the U.S. economy, society, and global position as it tackles more recalcitrant problems worldwide.

**Coordination key**

**Meiman and Rothkopf, 9**—\*led the Brazil/Southern Cone and trade practices of McLarty Associates, a strategic advisory firm led by Thomas "Mack" McLarty, former Chief of Staff to President Clinton. She previously worked at the Office of the United States Trade Representative (USTR) as Director for Brazil and the Southern Cone, and at the Department of State as a Foreign Service Officer \*\*President and CEO of Garten Rothkopf, an international advisory firm specializing in transformational global trends, notably those associated with energy, security, and emerging markets (Kellie and David, “The United States and Brazil,” March 2009, <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2009/03/pdf/brazil.pdf>)

The U.S.-Brazil relationship has always been complex—not surprising for two continental¶ powers located in the same hemisphere. It has often been characterized by positive bilateral engagement, counterbalanced by efforts to isolate the other in regional and multilateral forums. This approach is no longer workable, and is in neither country’s best interest.¶ The combination of Brazil’s clear emergence on the world stage and the United States’¶ need to reassert itself as a multilateralist creates potential to forge a partnership born of¶ overlapping interests. This is a moment when both Brazil and the United States need to¶ prove themselves. Brazil needs to show that it is prepared to make hard decisions tied to¶ the role of global stakeholder, as it has done in Haiti by maintaining a critical peacekeep¶ -¶ ing presence in the troubled Caribbean nation. And the United States must show that the¶ era of U.S. unilateralism is over.¶ Today, Brazil is more outward looking from a diplomatic and business perspective than at¶ any point in its history, and would make a beneficial partner for the United States as we¶ confront the next four years. To bear fruit, however, the relationship must be built on a¶ positive, well-coordinated agenda, not as a reaction to difficult regional and global circum¶ -¶ stances. Active maintenance of this initiative must come from the highest levels of both¶ governments, without sacrificing the autonomy of each country’s foreign policy.¶ Even though Brazil will not agree with the United States on every issue, it is in the United¶ States’ interest to forge a cooperative, bilateral relationship. Brazil has much to contribute¶ in regard to integrating emerging powers and technologies into international frameworks,¶ as well as an active interest in growing its global stakeholder role. Brazil should be encouraged to seize this mantle in a meaningful way.¶ To not only take the bilateral relationship to the next level, but to cultivate an important¶ ally at a difficult time in world affairs, the Obama administration needs to establish a progressive, proactive policy agenda focused on reforming multilateral institutions, deepening security cooperation, advancing cooperation on energy and the environment, and taking steps to enhance competitiveness.

### Solves Prolif

**Solves prolif—can change Iran’s posture and sway others**

**Aronson, 10**— served as Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs from 1989-93 (Bernard, “Brazil's Opportunity to Close the Nuclear Proliferation Loophole,” May 7th, 2010, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/bernard-aronson/brazils-opportunity-to-cl_b_568054.html>)

But, like Icarus -- who flew too close to the sun, burned his wings, and fell to earth -- Brazil has risked its international reputation in recent months due to its policies towards Iran. One week after Iran's clerical regime sentenced dozens of dissidents to extended jail sentences and some to death, for protesting its widely disputed presidential election, Brazilian President Luis Ignacio Lula de Silva welcomed Iran's President, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, to Brasilia with a warm, public embrace and condemned sanctions against Iran's nuclear program. Soon after, rebuffing a personal plea from Secretary of State Clinton, Lula warned that tougher sanctions sought by the United States could lead to "war".¶ Brazil will be forced to define its position when the UN Security Council, on which Brazil serves as a rotating member, votes soon on an expanded sanctions regime. Recently, Brazil has echoed Chinese statements which open the diplomatic door a crack to a new Security Council resolution. But no one believes China will agree to a sanctions regime robust enough to deter Iran from developing a nuclear weapons capability. What should Brazil do?¶ Rather than serve as Iran's enabler or seek the lowest common diplomatic denominator, like China, Brazil should vault itself into a position of leadership by helping close the loophole in the Nuclear Proliferation Treaty (NPT) which Iran, North Korea, and other rouge states have exploited to develop nuclear weapons programs.¶ The NPT permits signatories to produce the enriched uranium that fuels peaceful nuclear reactors, store the radioactive fuel the reactors produce, and reprocess the spent fuel so long as the facilities that do so are subject to IAEA inspection. The dilemma is that the same facilities that enrich uranium for nuclear power reactors can be used to enrich it further for nuclear weapons and reprocessed spent fuel yields plutonium that can be fashioned into nuclear bombs. Developing enrichment or reprocessing capabilities, says former IAEA Director, Mohammed ElBaradei, makes nations "latent nuclear weapons states".¶ Exploiting this flaw, North Korea in the 1990's developed a program to process spent nuclear fuel, withdrew from the NPT, and, soon after, tested nuclear devices. Using the same loophole, Iran played cat and mouse with the IAEA for years, obstructing inspections, operating secret parallel facilities, while enriching uranium. Now Iran appears close to nuclear breakout capability. At least 40 of the 60 nations that currently operate or are constructing nuclear power or research reactors possess the industrial and scientific infrastructure to build nuclear weapons by exploiting the same flaw in the Treaty, according to the U.N. Secretary-General's High Level Panel on Threats, Challenges, and Change.¶ Brazil must choose. Is it part of the solution or part of the problem? Historically, it has been both. At U.S. urging, in 1991, Brazil voluntarily placed its nuclear facilities under IAEA supervision and later joined the NPT. But, in 2004, Brazil -- which houses the fifth largest uranium reserves in the world -- affirmed the "inalienable right" of states to enrich uranium for "peaceful purposes", constructed an enrichment facility, and sparred with the IAEA for more than a year before granting access to inspectors.¶ Given that history, and its standing among developing nations, Brazil could fundamentally alter the debate about proliferation -- and about Iran -- by permanently renouncing its right to enrich uranium, closing its enrichment facility, and accepting a long-standing UN proposal: let the IAEA supply NPT signatories which operate verifiably peaceful nuclear programs with the low enriched uranium they need for peaceful purposes and reprocess the spent fuel that they produce. The United States, France, Britain, Germany, and Russia have made Iran a similar offer.¶ Were Brazil to embrace this proposal before the upcoming Security Council vote -- and call on other developing nations to do the same -- it would isolate Iran dramatically. Such a bold move might also convince the 189 Treaty signatories, meeting at the UN this month for the NPT Review Conference held every five years, to back an amendment that would close the enrichment and reprocessing loophole permanently. Lula could solidify his place in history and Brazil would emerge as a leader on the most urgent security challenge facing the international community.

### Solves Warming

**Solve warming—dialogue is a prereq to the plan**

**Meiman and Rothkopf, 9**—\*led the Brazil/Southern Cone and trade practices of McLarty Associates, a strategic advisory firm led by Thomas "Mack" McLarty, former Chief of Staff to President Clinton. She previously worked at the Office of the United States Trade Representative (USTR) as Director for Brazil and the Southern Cone, and at the Department of State as a Foreign Service Officer \*\*President and CEO of Garten Rothkopf, an international advisory firm specializing in transformational global trends, notably those associated with energy, security, and emerging markets (Kellie and David, “The United States and Brazil,” March 2009, <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2009/03/pdf/brazil.pdf>)

Scientific and academic exchanges between the United States and Brazil on alterna¶ -¶ tive energy should be encouraged. Current discussions between the United States and¶ Brazil on biofuels have only scratched the surface without addressing other alternative¶ fuel sources, such as wind and solar. Also, our bilateral ethanol dialogue is narrow, with¶ discussions on bilateral trade non-existent and third-market initiatives covering only four¶ countries. This limited dialogue is not broad enough to help address U.S. energy needs,¶ climate change, or to build a global market for ethanol. ¶ Although it should be pursued only in the context of an overall deepening of our bilateral¶ collaboration and cooperation, reduction or elimination of the U.S. ethanol tariff would¶ unleash the economic forces needed to diminish distortions in biofuel markets and¶ encourage broader use of flex-fuel vehicles in the United States. There are policy solutions¶ circulating in Brasilia and Washington that would allow for an elimination of the tariff, but¶ only for ethanol bound for use in e-85 pumps. Corn ethanol would still have exclusive¶ access to 10 percent ethanol blends. While there are distribution challenges surrounding¶ this solution, we should explore creative ways to approach growing our use of ethanol in¶ the United States and the region.¶ Meanwhile, efforts at hemispheric energy integration pursued in the 1990s have faltered.¶ Despite previous agreements, Argentina has drastically reduced gas supplies to Chile, and¶ Bolivia has yet to truly tap its potential gas reserves. Of course, we have our own energy¶ challenges in the United States. A void remains where once there was a consistent, high-¶ level regional energy dialogue. Regular meetings of hemispheric energy ministers should¶ be re-established jointly under U.S. and Brazilian leadership with a broad ranging agenda¶ designed to promote sustainable energy security and independence in the Americas.¶ Deepening our bilateral energy-environment dialogue is an important first step, and we¶ should take advantage of the current dip in oil prices to initiate this discussion.

### Solv: Dialogue Key

**Dialogue key—essential for genuine partnership**

**Sweig and Spektor, 11**—\* a senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, where she directs the Global Brazil Initiative \*\* directs the Center for International Relations at Fundação Getulio Vargas in Rio de Janeiro (Julia and Matias, “Mr. Obama, Meet the New Brazil,” March 18th, 2011, <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/03/19/opinion/19iht-edsweig19.html?_r=2&>)

To many in Brazil, the Obama administration seems to talk the talk of multilateralism and dialogue, but when push comes to shove it is more comfortable with the more familiar unilateralism and monologue.¶ Obama must demonstrate that he understands that different views of the world need not sour the bilateral relationship; that on the contrary, a major power and a rising one working together can produce innovation on the major challenges of the day. One step that would be highly welcome in Brazil would be for Obama to declare support for Brazil’s quest for a permanent seat on the U.N. Security Council.¶ Presidents Obama and Rousseff have the opportunity this weekend to start building a genuine partnership between their two countries, one that may feel unnatural at first but will be needed more and more.

### Solv: Brazil Key

**Brazil is most important to solve the AFF impacts—they are the eminent power and essential to global integration**

**Sweig and Spektor, 11**—\* a senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, where she directs the Global Brazil Initiative \*\* directs the Center for International Relations at Fundação Getulio Vargas in Rio de Janeiro (Julia and Matias, “Mr. Obama, Meet the New Brazil,” March 18th, 2011, <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/03/19/opinion/19iht-edsweig19.html?_r=2&>)

When Barack Obama lands in Brazil this weekend, he will find a country transformed. In little more than a decade, some 30 million people have been lifted out of poverty and the country has risen to seventh place in the world economy.¶ Change at home has revolutionized policies abroad. Brazil has woken up to the 10 states along its borders, becoming the eminent power and driver of regional integration in South America. It has set out to develop closer ties simultaneously with Israel, Syria and Iran.¶ Brazil has been wooing friends with credit, aid and trade. It has set up shop in most countries in Africa, where it delivers fast-growing aid and development assistance and invests heavily in oil and infrastructure. Brazilian generals command the United Nations operation in Haiti.¶ In the process, Brazil has become a major creditor, supplier and client of the United States. Holding some $160 billion in U.S. bonds, Brazil has a major stake in the recovery of the U.S. economy.¶ With most of the Amazon within its borders, the world’s 10th largest oil stores, and nearly a fifth of the world’s fresh water, Brazil is an environmental power, an energy power, and guarantor of global food security.¶ Once an inward-looking society, Brazil now faces the challenge of projecting its own interests and voice around the world on the major global issues of our time

**Brazil is essential to peace—regional leader**

**Einaudi, 11**—a¶ Distinguished Visiting¶ f¶ ellow in¶ the Center for Strategic¶ r¶ esearch,¶ i¶ nstitute for¶ n¶ ational Strategic¶ Studies, at the¶ n¶ ational Defense¶ University. He is also a Member of¶ the¶ a¶ dvisory Council of the Brazil¶ i¶ nstitute at the Woodrow Wilson¶ i¶ nternational Center for Scholars. (Luigi, “Brazil and the United¶ States: The Need for¶ Strategic Engagement,” March 2011, http://www.ndu.edu/inss/docuploaded/SF%20266%20Einaudi.pdf)

The United States has a basic national security in¶ -¶ terest in Brazil’s continuing democratic and market-¶ oriented success, which improves its will and capacity to¶ help address pressing global problems. We are in a rapidly changing period of international relations, in which¶ a high premium is put on skilled and effective diplomacy¶ in order to provide a measure of management to situa¶ -¶ tions that could spin out of control. We are still haunted by nuclear weapons. In these circumstances, Brazil plays¶ an important role. It is in the U.S. interest to find as¶ many ways as possible not only to cooperate with Brazil,¶ but also to engage with Brasilia as a regional and global¶ partner in the maintenance of peace and prosperity.

**Now key to engage brazil—globalization and power struggles prove**

**Sweig et al, 11**—Nelson and David Rockefeller Senior Fellow for Latin America Studies and Director for Latin America Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations (Julia, “Global Brazil and U.S.-Brazil Relations,” July 2011, <http://www.cfr.org/brazil/global-brazil-us-brazil-relations/p25407>)

Brazil is and will remain an integral force in the evolution of a multipolar world. It ranks as the world’s fifth-largest landmass, fifth-largest¶ population, and eighth-largest economy. Brazil, which may become the¶ world’s fifth-largest economy by 2016, is the B in the BRICs (along with¶ Russia, India, and China\*), a grouping of growth markets that accounted¶ for 23 percent of global gross domestic product (GDP) in 2010 and will¶ collectively reach $25 trillion to overtake the U.S. economy within the¶ next decade. Brazil’s economic prowess places it in a leadership position¶ in Latin America and in the world and boosts the region’s strategic¶ importance globally, especially for the United States.

Given each country’s landmass, economy, population, and resource¶ base, Brazil and the United States necessarily interact in an increasingly globalized and multipolar world. Beyond the geostrategic characteristics¶ that bring Brazil and the United States together, the two countries¶ are also remarkably similar: both are multiethnic, young democracies¶ that uphold common values with respect to free markets, rule of law,¶ individual rights, religious freedom, and diversity and equality.¶ Despite these similarities, the U.S.-Brazil relationship has been prone¶ to misunderstanding, and collaboration between the two countries has¶ been limited. The election of Dilma Rousseff as Brazil’s new president¶ offers an opportunity for a renewed approach. Presidents Barack¶ Obama and Rousseff have underscored a mutual desire to improve and¶ deepen the relationship, and the Task Force urges that efforts be made by¶ both countries to advance that goal. The Task Force believes that now is the time for the United States and Brazil to advance their foreign policy interests by reinvigorating and deepening this critical relationship.

**Brazil holds the most economic sway—key to policy changes**

**Sweig et al, 11**—Nelson and David Rockefeller Senior Fellow for Latin America Studies and Director for Latin America Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations (Julia, “Global Brazil and U.S.-Brazil Relations,” July 2011, <http://www.cfr.org/brazil/global-brazil-us-brazil-relations/p25407>)

Brazil has transcended its status as the largest and most resource-rich¶ country in Latin America to now be counted among the world’s pivotal powers. Brazil is not a conventional military power, it does not rival¶ China or India in population or economic size, and it cannot match the¶ geopolitical history of Russia. Still, how Brazil defines and projects its¶ interests, a still-evolving process, is critical to understanding the character¶ of the new multipolar and unpredictable global order.¶ Over the course of one generation, Brazil’s domestic priority of¶ inclusive growth has translated into a significant reduction of inequality,¶ an expansion of the middle class, and a vibrant economy, all framed¶ within a democratic context. These internal achievements drive Brazil’s¶ agenda on the world stage. Internationally, Brazil has leveraged its¶ domestic assets and achievements to cement its role in areas as diverse¶ as energy and climate change, peace and security, and trade and finance.¶ Understanding and crafting a strategy to help in the success of this new¶ Brazil is in the national interest of the United States.

### Solv: Coordination

**Policy coordination key—only way to create dialogue for future reforms**

**Sweig et al, 11**—Nelson and David Rockefeller Senior Fellow for Latin America Studies and Director for Latin America Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations (Julia, “Global Brazil and U.S.-Brazil Relations,” July 2011, <http://www.cfr.org/brazil/global-brazil-us-brazil-relations/p25407>)

Policy Coo rdination¶ In both Brazil and the United States, interagency coordination of overall¶ policy toward one another is limited. This is especially true in the¶ United States, where initiatives regarding Brazil are undertaken by a¶ variety of agencies with little or no synchronization or guiding strategy.¶ 54 The Task Force believes that existing joint efforts and potential¶ areas for cooperation would benefit from each country developing a¶ more cohesive and coordinated approach toward the other.¶ Brazil’s growing geostrategic importance merits sustained, seniorlevel,¶ and comprehensive coordination of U.S. policy across agencies.¶ The Task Force cautions that incorporating Brazil into high-level U.S.¶ policy discussions—whether over peace and security, global finance, or¶ climate change—are not likely to succeed if left to the regional directorates¶ or bureaus at various executive branch agencies or to the regional¶ subcommittees in the Congress.¶ As Brazil expands its reach across the globe and solidifies its involvement¶ on a wide array of international issues, the Task Force recommends¶ that the National Security Council institutionalize a standing¶ interagency coordination mechanism so that a range of U.S. agencies¶ responsible for functional issues such as finance, trade, energy, environment,¶ agriculture, health, homeland security, defense, and diplomacy¶ better coordinate what remains a highly decentralized U.S. policy¶ toward Brazil. This would require an NSC director for Brazil, rather¶ than a director for Brazil and the Southern Cone.¶ The goal is to give Brazil more and better coordinated attention¶ across the U.S. government and to have agencies and departments¶ beyond those that work on Western Hemisphere issues participate in¶ formulating a more comprehensive policy. Within the State Department,¶ the Task Force recommends creating an Office for Brazilian¶ Affairs separate from the Southern Cone office of the Western Hemisphere¶ Affairs bureau.¶ Seizing the Mo mentum¶ Cooperation between the United States and Brazil holds too much¶ promise for miscommunication or inevitable disagreements to stand¶ in the way of potential gains. A strengthened U.S.-Brazil relationship¶ could be the basis for economic growth in Brazil, the United States, and globally, as well as for lasting peace and democratic stability in the¶ region, nuclear nonproliferation, international progress on combating¶ climate change, development of a global renewable energy market,¶ global food security, and more legitimate and effective international¶ institutions. Presidents Obama and Rousseff have laid the groundwork¶ for progress on many of these fronts. The moment to build on this positive¶ foundation is now.

### Solv: Agriculture Subsidies

**Agriculture is an essential issues to resolve**

**Aramayo and Pereira, 11**—\*Intern at the Brookings Institute, Global Economy and Development, Latin America Initiative \*\*a visiting fellow in the Latin America Initiative from September 2010 to September 2011. His research focused on political economy and public policy in comparative perspective in Latin America. (Carlos and Carlos, “Obama’s Visit to Latin America: Redefining U.S.-Brazil Relations,” March 15th, 2011, <http://www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/2011/03/15-brazil-us-aramayo-pereira>)

One issue which has been a particular source of friction in U.S.-Brazilian relations is trade. Last year, trade tensions grew sharply after Brazil prevailed in its WTO cotton subsidies suit against the United States. Brazil was granted permission to retaliate with trade barriers on several U.S. goods. The United States quickly managed to buy itself a couple of years by subsidizing Brazilian cotton growers. However, this approach is unsustainable. Both countries are food producers and are therefore competitors. The U.S. government should allow for its subsidies to expire so that free market competition can take place. The same is true for ethanol. Brazil has the technical knowhow of producing high-quality ethanol that is cheaper and cleaner than U.S. ethanol. Yet, the American ethanol market is closed for Brazil.

### Solv: UN Security Council Plank

**Security council is essential to reform relations—solves trade tensions**

**Aramayo and Pereira, 11**—\*Intern at the Brookings Institute, Global Economy and Development, Latin America Initiative \*\*a visiting fellow in the Latin America Initiative from September 2010 to September 2011. His research focused on political economy and public policy in comparative perspective in Latin America. (Carlos and Carlos, “Obama’s Visit to Latin America: Redefining U.S.-Brazil Relations,” March 15th, 2011, <http://www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/2011/03/15-brazil-us-aramayo-pereira>)

Regardless of the disagreements, it is not all is gloom and doom. After all, the United States is Brazil’s second biggest trading partner. As tensions grow between Brazil and China over Beijing’s trade practices, there is certainly potential for the United States and Brazil to find a compromise to some of their trade discrepancies. Showing the Chinese that Brazil has options — such as playing along with the United States — could help apply some pressure on the yuan issue and create opportunities for Brazilian companies in the Chinese market.¶ Brazil has increased its weight in multilateral forums, which has been well received in the United States. The Obama administration has supported Brazil’s efforts to gain more voting power at the IMF and World Bank. However, the United States has remained quiet on Brazil’s efforts to become a permanent member of the U.N. Security Council. The fact that Brazil has significantly raised its international profile and is becoming an increasingly important global player should entice Obama and the United States to seek a strategic partnership with this rising power.¶ Therefore, the United States should encourage Brazil’s quest for a permanent Security Council seat. Why? Because while it is true that Brazil has still daunting tasks ahead – such as reducing poverty, corruption, infrastructure, and sustaining growth – Brazil’s rise as a global player appears to be institutionally sustainable. The Obama administration could also use this as an opportunity to ease trade tensions that are likely to increase due to Washington’s unwillingness to back down on ethanol and cotton subsidies. ¶ Brazil’s rise as a major global player has redesigned the lines of power in the southern hemisphere. As a result, both countries need to develop institutionalized and ad hoc lines of communication that will increase understanding.¶ For its part, the United States has shown understanding of the new regional reality and appears to be positioning itself to somewhat pragmatically advance the relationship where both countries can see eye to eye while Brazil works toward achieving certain domestic pre-requisites before becoming a truly sustainable global player. During this transition, disagreements in certain issues and collaboration in others will be the order of the day.

### AT: Squo Solves

**Continuing talks are integral to continued progress over pertinent issues**

**Sweig et al, 11**—Nelson and David Rockefeller Senior Fellow for Latin America Studies and Director for Latin America Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations (Julia, “Global Brazil and U.S.-Brazil Relations,” July 2011, <http://www.cfr.org/brazil/global-brazil-us-brazil-relations/p25407>)

President Obama’s visit to Brazil in March 2011 heralded a new phase¶ of the U.S.-Brazil relationship. With agreements that touched on a¶ wide range of issues—including trade and finance, infrastructure¶ investment, civil aviation, energy, labor, education, and social concerns—¶ presidents Obama and Rousseff signaled to their respective¶ countries that this bilateral relationship is poised to evolve into a¶ robust and mature friendship among equals. Yet most of the concrete¶ deliverables announced during the trip reflected only the low-hanging¶ fruit of cooperation.¶ If the United States and Brazil are invested in a serious and deepening relationship, their conversation must continue. As in U.S. relations¶ with such powers as India, China, Russia, or Germany, frank and highlevel¶ dialogue with Brazil will allow both countries to identify, acknowledge,¶ and manage issues of potential disagreement, which should not¶ destabilize the relationship in its entirety.¶ Along these lines, the Task Force recommends that Obama host an interministerial meeting with Brazil, as President George W. Bush did¶ in 2003. Principals from the U.S. and Brazilian governments need to communicate openly and specifically about the issues that remain as¶ obstacles, including: trade, market access, and subsidies; priorities for and approaches to international security abroad; UN Security Council¶ reform; and exercising human rights values. With frameworks now established for dialogue on many of these issues, the two countries can¶ make genuine progress.

### AFF: Cooperation Not Possible

**Brazil and United States strategic autonomy prevents genuine cooperation**

**Piccone, 12**—a senior fellow and deputy director for foreign policy at the Brookings Institution (Ted, U.S. and Brazil: Together and Apart, April 9th, 2012, http://nationalinterest.org/print/commentary/us-brazil-together-apart-6746)

Emerging Conflicts

This relatively positive bilateral agenda looks gloomier when it comes to regional cooperation. Brazil appears determined to position itself as the Latin American hegemon as it deepens its investment in various schemes of regional political and economic integration that pointedly exclude the United States. The main casualty of this approach is the Organization of American States (OAS), the world’s oldest regional organization, which faces a steady erosion of support from Brazil and others.¶ On recent cases involving Cuba and Honduras, for example, Brazil insisted on pursuing an approach that put the United States at odds with its neighbors. When the human-rights arm of the OAS issued a decision to prevent Brazil from building a power plant without consulting the affected indigenous community, Brasilia, in a fit of pique, withdrew its ambassador and threatened to cut off its dues payments, already embarrassingly low. Its support for Cuba’s participation in the upcoming and future Summits of the Americas, despite its lack of democratic qualifications, is further evidence of a willingness to undermine the core identity of the OAS. Ever since the collapse of the Free Trade Area of the Americas talks, primarily due to Brazil’s unwillingness to sign on to the deal, both countries have pursued their own respective trade interests as well. Signs are strong that Brazil intends to continue down this path of strategic autonomy from the United States, which traditionally has had its way in setting the hemispheric agenda.

## \*Trade

### 1nc—Europe Trilateral Talk

**Counterplan text: The United States federal government should establish a formal Trilateral marketplace forum with the European Union and relevant Latin American countries in the format discussed at the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership negotiations. The United States federal government should establish a trilateral process aimed at removing barriers to trade and investment for the purpose of harmonizing existing free trade agreements.**

**Solves trade and relations**

**Aznar and Dodd, 13—**\*Former Prime Minister of Spain \*\*Chairman and CEO of the Motion Pictures of America (Jose Maria and Christopher, “The Trilateral Bond:¶ REPORT OF THE TRANSATLANTIC TASK FORCE ON LATIN AMERICA¶ ADRIENNE ARSHT¶ LATIN AMERICA CENTER¶ MAPPING A NEW ERA¶ FOR LATIN AMERICA,¶ THE UNITED STATES,¶ AND EUROPE, May 2013, <http://www.acus.org/files/publication_pdfs/403/LatinAmericaTaskForceReport_web2.pdf>)

1. Building a Stronger Trilateral¶ Transatlantic Marketplace

As Latin America continues to grow, diversify its¶ economies, and develop its financial markets, the¶ United States and the European Union stand to benefit¶ from stronger trade and investment ties—as will Latin¶ America. Together, the three regions should work to¶ build a transatlantic economy by reducing barriers,¶ expanding trade, increasing capital investment, and¶ boosting competitiveness.¶ Launch a trilateral dialogue on trade and¶ investment aimed at building an open¶ marketplace between the United States, Europe,¶ and Latin America, as well as Canada, including¶ in agricultural trade¶ . Using the opportunity¶ presented by the Transatlantic Trade and Investment¶ Partnership (TTIP) negotiations, the three should¶ establish a trilateral process aimed at removing¶ barriers to trade and investment. This dialogue could¶ initially find ways to harmonize existing free trade¶ agreements, and then focus on how Latin American¶ countries might connect to the arrangements¶ emerging from the US-EU negotiations. Eventually,¶ this dialogue should focus on reducing US and EU¶ agricultural subsidies that effectively restrict Latin¶ America’s most important export sector from¶ those markets.¶ Expand integration among financial markets in¶ the Americas and Europe but also strengthen¶ regulatory oversight.¶ Regulators and banks in¶ the United States, the European Union, and Latin¶ America must work closely together to ensure the¶ solvency of the system, standardize regulations¶ across jurisdictions, and enforce effective oversight.¶ Latin America should be included in discussions¶ about the ongoing financial services reforms in the¶ United States and European Union.¶ Facilitate the movement of highly skilled¶ individuals and others who will reinforce the¶ integration of this trilateral marketplace.¶ This¶ could include developing trilateral “fast track” visa¶ and border entry schemes for businesspeople as well¶ as more visas for highly skilled individuals.¶ Identify trilateral projects that will promote¶ competitiveness and entrepreneurship.¶ Although¶ each region must address its own competitiveness¶ challenges, there are enormous opportunities to¶ engage in discussions on infrastructure development,¶ including the hemispheric electrical grid and¶ transoceanic corridors. These and other projects¶ should foster entrepreneurship and¶ social development.¶ C¶ reating Human Capital¶ Quality education is key to building competitiveness in¶ a globalized marketplace, the cornerstone of economic¶ growth. The United States, Europe, and Latin America¶ can work together to shape more effective education¶ policy that drives innovation.¶ Compare best practices in targeting poverty¶ reduction and childhood development.¶ Latin¶ America’s innovative Conditional Cash Transfer¶ (CCT) programs hold lessons for the United States¶ and European Union about the efficacy of targeted¶ antipoverty approaches. The United States and Latin¶ America should follow the example of some European¶ countries that invest heavily in early childhood¶ development—investments that yield significant¶ returns into the future.¶ Work collaboratively to strengthen education and¶ research linkages as a way to spur innovation.¶ Governments should reduce legal and institutional¶ barriers to crossover between universities and¶ the private sector. They should also encourage¶ international collaboration between researchers and¶ expand existing educational exchange programs.¶ This will require facilitating educational exchange¶ visas for both researchers and students.¶ Compare best practices in technical and¶ vocational education, and in online and non-¶ traditional learning.¶ Europe is ahead in providing¶ high-value vocational educational tracks to their¶ students; the US and Latin American governments¶ can learn much that will help their schools incorporate¶ such technical learning options. The Americas and¶ Europe can also learn from each other about effective¶ ways of using information and communications¶ technologies, especially in programs that will facilitate¶ greater international collaboration

### 2nc—Solvency

**Trilateral coordination is a pre-requisite to solvency—all other progress depends on discussions**

**Sanchez Zinny, 13** (Gabriel, “Mapping a New Era for Latin America, the United States and Europe,” May 21st, 2013, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/gabriel-sanchez-zinny/mapping-a-new-era-for-lat_b_3294840.html>)

President Obama's trip to Mexico and Costa Rica has put Latin America back at the center of Washington's foreign policy debate, for a few days at least. The visit comes at a time when Secretary of State John Kerry has not yet visited the region nor given any important speech on Latin American affairs. It remains unclear whether the Administration will offer any new vision for US relations with Latin America, after four years of relative absence.¶ But it is somewhat of an open question whether Latin America even wants more attention from Washington. The private sectors of Latin America and the United States -- as well as Canada and the EU -- are charging ahead with trade and investment of an unprecedented intensity. What does this portend for the future of our political relationships?¶ This is the central question that the Atlantic Council's new Adrienne Arsht Latin America Center seeks to answer in its founding report, The Trilateral Bond: Mapping a New Era for Latin America, the United States, and Europe. Written by a Transatlantic Task Force on Latin America composed of business leaders, academic experts, and policymakers and co-chaired by former Spanish Prime Minister Jose Maria Aznar and Senator Chris Dodd, our report tackles the common issues facing the US, Europe, and Latin America based on a new transatlantic partnership.¶ We argue in the report that "together, the United States, Europe, and Latin America should build a stronger, more equal trilateral partnership based on a community of interests and values -- this is in the economic, security and political interests of all three. Despite Latin America's expanding markets, rich energy and natural resources, and newfound confidence on the geopolitical stage, it has not been visible within the transatlantic relationship." Engaging Latin America as a peer in this relationship is the premise upon which progress in all other spheres -- economic, diplomatic, security, human rights and energy -- must be based.¶ Over the past decade, the region has grown faster than either the U.S. or the EU, which has returned to recession. Economic instability in the U.S. used to seriously disrupt its neighbors to the south, but Latin America weathered the 2008 crisis well, shrinking less and returning to growth faster.¶ It has also continued its deep economic ties with the U.S. and Europe: "The European Union is the largest single foreign investor in Latin America, accounting for 39 percent of total FDI in the region in 2011. The EU is also the leading recipient of Brazilian exports and its first trading partner, importing primarily agricultural goods and accounting for 21.7 percent of Brazil's total trade. The United States is the largest single national investor in the region and supplied 18 percent of total FDI there in 2011," according to our report. But at the same time, Latin America is diversifying and coming into its own as a player in international trade. The rise of multilatinas (Latin American multinationals) that are investing in places like Africa and China mean that the region's outward foreign direct investment has more than quadrupled since 2000.¶ Countries like Brazil, Colombia, Mexico, Chile and Peru have all been transforming into mature markets. This means the freedom to pursue new trade opportunities, and the independence to chart its own course, without it threatening the foundations of our partnerships. Relations must continue to become more rational, more pragmatic, and more equal, as Latin America becomes more integrated with the rest of the world.

plan

**Sanchez Zinny, 13** (Gabriel, “Mapping a New Era for Latin America, the United States and Europe,” May 21st, 2013, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/gabriel-sanchez-zinny/mapping-a-new-era-for-lat_b_3294840.html>)

Nonetheless, with Latin America on the rise, there are many areas for cooperation, and many problems that demand closer ties. In a community of nations that shares a common set of historical references, philosophical roots, and cultural touchstones, a more active political and economic alliance must be the aspiration for policymakers, business, and thought leaders alike. In practice, our report touches on many of these specific areas, providing concrete recommendations for action. Some of these include:¶ Building a stronger trilateral transatlantic marketplace. "The three regions should work to build a transatlantic economy by reducing barriers, expanding trade, increasing capital investment, and boosting competitiveness. Using the opportunity presented by the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) negotiations, the three should establish a trilateral process aimed at removing barriers to trade and investment. Eventually, this dialogue should address the controversial topic of reducing US and EU agricultural subsidies that effectively restrict Latin America's most important export sector from those markets."¶ Launching a comprehensive trilateral energy dialogue to address the shifting global energy landscape and to share best practices across the broad sector of energy policy. "Latin America is already a major producer of energy, including oil and gas, hydro-electric and thermal energy, and biofuels. A stronger resource partnership would provide a strategic boost for a new transatlantic community as it seeks to remain competitive in an evolving global economy."¶ Addressing transnational crime and boosting public security. "The drug trade has for too long been identified with Latin America alone. In reality, it is a transatlantic -- even global-phenomenon that affects both day-to-day citizen security and the consolidation of democratic institutions. The United States and the European Union should expand efforts to prevent, treat, and reduce the harm associated with drug use and take steps to limit the cross-border flow of deadly assault weapons. These weapons spawn violence on America's streets and find their way wholesale to Latin America."¶ Education and human capital deserve their own chapter, given that the success of almost all other initiatives will be based on them. While the US, the EU and Latin America all represent different levels of educational quality, they face similar challenges to preparing their students for a high-skill work force. Quality education is key to building competitiveness in a globalized marketplace, and as such is the cornerstone of economic growth. As Assistant Secretary of State Roberta Jacobson argued at the report's launch, the middle class cannot continue to grow without advances in education. The United States, Europe, and Latin America can work together to shape more effective education policy that drives innovation.¶ Human capital also touches on a timely debate in the U.S. -- immigration policy. Facilitating the movement of those with the ability to contribute to growth and innovation will reinforce the integration of the trilateral marketplace. As we argue, "this should include developing trilateral 'fast track' visa and border entry schemes for businesspeople as well as more visas for highly skilled individuals." In addition, "Governments should reduce legal and institutional barriers to crossover between universities and the private sector."¶ Finally, we argue that to pursue these goals, we must strengthen the trilateral institution frameworks that can ensure routine consultation and promote collaboration. Some existing institutions, such as the Organization of American States (OAS) and the EU-Latin American summit process can carry some of this weight. But there should be more trilateral integration, as well as more recognition of Latin America's growing importance within global multinational institutions such as the UN Security Council and the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD).¶ After decades of economic and political turmoil, Latin America is taking its place as a transatlantic peer, closely related to the U.S. and Europe by a common history and shared aspirations. It is time for the three regions to recognize this reality, and reshape their relationship to reflect it.

**Trilateral partnership key to create dialogue with Latin American countries**

**Aznar and Dodd, 13—**\*Former Prime Minister of Spain \*\*Chairman and CEO of the Motion Pictures of America (Jose Maria and Christopher, “The Trilateral Bond:¶ REPORT OF THE TRANSATLANTIC TASK FORCE ON LATIN AMERICA¶ ADRIENNE ARSHT¶ LATIN AMERICA CENTER¶ MAPPING A NEW ERA¶ FOR LATIN AMERICA,¶ THE UNITED STATES,¶ AND EUROPE, May 2013, <http://www.acus.org/files/publication_pdfs/403/LatinAmericaTaskForceReport_web2.pdf>)

I¶ t is time to redefine the transatlantic partnership. Europe¶ continues to struggle with serious economic and political¶ challenges, while the US economy stagnates and¶ decision-makers in both the public and private sectors face¶ a highly partisan political system. If the United States and¶ Europe are to remain competitive—economically, politically,¶ and strategically—in this increasingly multipolar world, they¶ must reach out to partners who share their values and can¶ contribute to a stronger transatlantic economy. That partner¶ is Latin America.¶ Together, the United States, Europe, and Latin America¶ should build a stronger, more equal trilateral partnership¶ based on a community of interests and values—this is¶ in the economic, security, and political interests of all¶ three¶ . Despite Latin America’s expanding markets, rich¶ energy and natural resources, and newfound confidence¶ on the geopolitical stage, it has not been visible within the¶ transatlantic relationship. Neither the United States nor most¶ European governments have made the region a priority in¶ their recent foreign policies.¶ Establishing a new era of deeper, more enhanced dialogue¶ and engagement among Latin America, Europe, and the¶ United States, along with Canada, will bring significant¶ dividends for each, both economically and strategically.¶ A renewed relationship must, however, be based on¶ partnership. With the growing international clout that comes¶ with political stability and economic growth, Latin America¶ has diversified its relationships, becoming more integrated¶ with the rest of the world.¶ Building such a trilateral partnership will not be easy. Latin¶ America brings incredible diversity, both among countries¶ and within them. The region is divided politically, and not all¶ regional leaders may initially see the value of working with¶ others. But only together can North and South America and¶ Europe address many regional and global issues effectively. ¶ Underlying the political and economic motives for a¶ strengthened trilateral partnership is a common ideological¶ tradition rooted in democracy and human rights. Latin¶ America shares a similar historical commitment to these¶ principles as Europe and North America and has made¶ enormous strides in recent years toward living up to them.¶ The continued success of all three partners depends on¶ defending and deepening this community of values, because¶ from this democratic tradition springs the opportunity for¶ innovation, entrepreneurship, and consequently, more¶ prosperous economies. ¶ While Latin America still has work to do in strengthening¶ democratic institutions, the region has demonstrated a¶ remarkable dedication to developing political stability and,¶ in many cases, open economies. As other world powers¶ emerge that may not share these same values, it is all the¶ more crucial that North America, Europe, and Latin America¶ use this common ground to build reinvigorated cooperation¶ that advances democratic principles and boosts economic¶ and political competitiveness in a changing world economy.¶ To that end, this report identifies five policy areas in which¶ deepening the trilateral relationship contributes to the¶ transatlantic partners’ mutual interests, and from these areas¶ flow specific policy recommendations.

### AFF—Trilateral Talks Fail

**Latin American diversity dooms solvency**

**Aznar and Dodd, 13—**\*Former Prime Minister of Spain \*\*Chairman and CEO of the Motion Pictures of America (Jose Maria and Christopher, “The Trilateral Bond:¶ REPORT OF THE TRANSATLANTIC TASK FORCE ON LATIN AMERICA¶ ADRIENNE ARSHT¶ LATIN AMERICA CENTER¶ MAPPING A NEW ERA¶ FOR LATIN AMERICA,¶ THE UNITED STATES,¶ AND EUROPE, May 2013, <http://www.acus.org/files/publication_pdfs/403/LatinAmericaTaskForceReport_web2.pdf>)

A major challenge in building such a trilateral framework¶ is the diversity of Latin America. In terms of economic¶ conditions, Mexico, Brazil, and Colombia have achieved¶ a high level of industrialization and diversification, while¶ Bolivia, Venezuela, and Argentina still depend almost entirely¶ on their primary goods commodities to power growth.¶ Diversity also exists within some countries, with extreme¶ poverty and remoteness existing alongside high economic¶ growth rates and increasing international investment. Given¶ this diversity, for many in the United States and Europe, it¶ has been easier to focus policy on bilateral relationships.¶ It is obviously necessary to deal with individual countries,¶ especially the regional powerhouses of Mexico and Brazil,¶ but there is also much to be gained by adopting a more¶ strategic approach to the entire region.¶ In addition to uneven levels of economic development,¶ different parts of the region are headed in different directions¶ when it comes to geopolitical clout and healthy democratic¶ institutions. Brazil, for instance, is a newly assertive regional¶ power with a wide array of international economic and¶ political relationships—its¶ multilatinas¶ (multinational Latin¶ American firms) make major investments in the United¶ States, Europe, the Middle East, and Africa, and it receives¶ billions in Chinese investment. Brazil can either be a leading¶ figure in a renewed trilateral partnership or, in the absence¶ of proactive leadership, a weathervane that points Latin¶ America away from the West.

**Coordination fails—Eurozone**

**Sanchez Zinny, 13** (Gabriel, “Mapping a New Era for Latin America, the United States and Europe,” May 21st, 2013, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/gabriel-sanchez-zinny/mapping-a-new-era-for-lat_b_3294840.html>)

There are also challenges to a renewed transatlantic partnership, as we detail in the report. An important swathe of Latin America seems to have no desire for a better relationship, led by Venezuela, Bolivia, and Nicaragua -- instead, their northern neighbors are more useful as targets for domestic political populism. And the ongoing crisis of the Eurozone makes it more difficult for the EU to focus on its common foreign policy.

## \*Sustainability

### 1nc—AT: Barry

**Counterplan text: The United States federal government should create a global program to protect and restore natural ecosystems funded by a carbon tax as per our Barry evidence.**

**Solves sustainability**

**Barry 13** – Political ecologist with expert proficiencies in old forest protection, climate change, and environmental sustainability policy [Dr. Glen Barry (Ph.D. in "Land Resources" and Masters of Science in "Conservation Biology and Sustainable Development” from the University of Wisconsin-Madison), “ECOLOGY SCIENCE: Terrestrial Ecosystem Loss and Biosphere Collapse,” Forests.org, February 4, 2013, pg. <http://forests.org/blog/2013/02/ecology-science-terrestrial-ec.asp>

One possible revolutionary solution to the critical issues of terrestrial ecosystem loss and abrupt climate change is a massive and global program to protect and restore natural ecosystems – funded by a carbon tax, furthering the essential reduction of fossil fuel emissions. This program would establish and protect large and connected core ecological areas, buffers, and agro-ecological transition zones throughout all of Earth's bioregions.¶ Global ecological sustainability depends critically upon maintaining connectivity of ecosystem processes and patterns. We simply must learn to live in a manner that does not destroy our habitat and to consider the land around us and the life and processes it sustains as a measure of societal and biosphere well-being. Political ecology has the potential to provide the needed framework to integrate human needs for just, equitable advancement with the needs of the biosphere, avoiding ecosystem collapse, and to formulate the policies and political structures required to do so.

## \*Economy

### 1nc—Tax Reform CP

**Counterplan Text: The United States federal government should establish a top marginal rate for the personal income tax of 39.6, convert tax deductions that tend to favor those in top tax brackets into uniform credits, establish a top marginal tax rate of 28 percent on capital gains, close tax loopholes, and simplify tax filings.**

**Solves the economy**

**Center for American Progress, 12** (A Synopsis of CAP’s Comprehensive Tax Reform and Deficit Reduction Plan, December 4th, 2012, <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/tax-reform/news/2012/12/04/46837/a-tax-reform-and-deficit-reduction-plan/>)

The plan addresses some of the most serious flaws in the federal tax code while raising additional revenue to be used for deficit reduction, and at the same time offering changes to government spending. Chief among our tax system’s problems is the fundamental failure to raise revenues adequate to fund the necessary operations, services, public investments, and protections of government. In addition to this most basic of shortcomings, the current tax code is also weighed down with far too many special provisions, loopholes, targeted tax subsidies, and sheltering opportunities. These aspects serve to not only complicate the code and the process of tax filing, but some of them introduce economic distortions and undermine the confidence of the American public that their tax system is treating everyone fairly.¶ Amending our tax system to raise more revenue progressively, simply, and efficiently, coupled with targeted spending reductions, are the keys to addressing our long-term fiscal challenges. These are challenges we must address or face a future in which critical public investments such as education and infrastructure will go underfunded; key national priorities such as strengthening the middle class, reducing poverty, and building a world-class infrastructure will remain unaddressed; income inequality will continue to rise; and confidence in America’s ability to govern its fiscal affairs will continue to fall. The report being released today outlines a plan that reduces the federal budget deficit by $4.1 trillion over the next 10 years while offering measures to boost the economy in the short run as we recover from the recession.¶ Our plan accomplishes its deficit reduction primarily through a wide-ranging reform of the personal income tax system that raises adequate revenues progressively while making the tax system more efficient, simple, fair, and comprehensible. The key features of our plan are:¶ A top marginal rate for the personal income tax of 39.6 percent as it was under President Bill Clinton¶ Converting tax deductions that tend to favor those in top tax brackets into uniform credits that bestow equal benefits on taxpayers in all brackets¶ A top marginal rate of 28 percent on capital gains as it was under President Ronald Reagan and throughout much of the 1990s¶ Closing tax loopholes¶ Simplifying tax filing¶ In addition our plan includes targeted spending cuts, most significantly $385 billion in federal health care savings.¶ The Center for American Progress plan will set the federal budget on a sustainable course, beginning with a comprehensive reform of the tax code. First and foremost, this plan will raise approximately $1.8 trillion more than we would under current tax policies. By the end of the decade, our tax system would match the revenue proposed by the bipartisan chairs of the president’s 2010 fiscal commission, Alan Simpson and Erskine Bowles. Furthermore, our reforms ensure that the additional revenue is raised in a progressive way. The vast majority of the new revenue will come from households making more than $500,000 a year, and households earning less than $100,000 a year will, on average, pay a little less.¶ Second, our tax plan will simplify the filing process and streamline the code so that everyone can trust that each taxpayer is being treated fairly. Our plan would tax different sources of income much more equally than the current code does. It would remove the alternative minimum tax, repeal other provisions that add complexity, reduce the number of people who have to itemize, and eliminate unjustified tax loopholes. It would also turn certain deductions that currently favor those in higher tax brackets into credits that will bestow equal benefits. A large “standard credit” protects middle-income filers and relieves even more taxpayers of the need to itemize expenses than under the current tax code.¶ Our plan restores the top rate to the same rate that existed during the 1990s’ economic expansion: 39.6 percent for those in the top bracket (people earning more than $400,000). Most taxpayers would be in the 15 percent tax bracket under our plan. The plan also treats investment income and wage income more equally. It restores the capital gains rate to 28 percent—where it was after President Reagan signed the 1986 tax reform act and where it was for most of the 1990s. And it treats dividends as ordinary income—as they were for decades until 2003. The vast preponderance of the economic evidence shows that tax rates at these levels are no obstacle to economic growth. In fact, the cuts in top tax rates has only led to deficits and increased after-tax inequality.¶ This tax reform, combined with reasonable spending reforms, will place our federal budget onto far stronger foundations. We identify hundreds of billions of dollars in new spending savings that come on top of the $1.5 trillion in spending cuts already enacted into law. These include nearly $385 billion in mostly Medicare savings, $100 billion in further defense savings, and $100 billion from other programs. And by putting these measures into place, which will reduce budget deficits over the next decade, we make room for critical investments in job creation today.¶ All together, our combined plan will reduce the projected federal budget deficits by approximately $4.1 trillion over 10 years. Enactment of our plan would reduce the publicly held debt from currently projected levels of near 90 percent in 2022, to below 72 percent and falling.

### Solv: Tax Reform

**Repealing the corporate income tax immediately boosts the economy and US competitiveness.**

Karen **Campbell**, 3/13/**2009**. PhD Economics Temple, policy Analyst in Macroeconomics in the Center for Data Analysis at The Heritage Foundation. “Time for a Real Change: Repeal the Corporate Income Tax,” <http://www.heritage.org/Research/Taxes/bg2248.cfm>.

Entrepreneurs are among America's greatest resources. These individuals try to change the status quo because they expect to use resources to create higher value than those resources are currently pro­ducing. This takes investments, and investments are risky. The return to these investments is the economic growth that they create, which is profit. Yet the gov­ernment often taxes these profits twice, once at the business level and then again when the profits are distributed to individuals. This double taxation not only dampens the incen­tive to invest, but also obscures who actually bears the burden of these taxes. Corporations are often per­sonified and demonized, but a corporation is a legal entity, not an actual person. Because a corporation is made up of a group of individuals but is not actually an individual, corporate taxes are really taxes on the stakeholders in the corporation. In a U.S. Treasury report, William Gentry points out that empirical studies show that employees and consumers really bear the cost of corporate and investment taxes.[[1]](http://www.heritage.org/Research/Taxes/bg2248.cfm#_ftn1) Simulation results show that repealing the corpo­rate income tax alone, which would cost approxi­mately $300 billion in annual tax revenue,[[2]](http://www.heritage.org/Research/Taxes/bg2248.cfm#_ftn2) would produce by 2012:¶ 2 million more jobs than the baseline scenario;¶ $280 billion more in real (inflation-adjusted) gross domestic product (GDP);¶ $4,000 more in real disposable income for a family of four; and¶ $707 billion more in household net wealth—the base of economic strength and stability.¶ Losing Our Competitive Edge In a global economy, investments will flow to the areas where they can earn the highest returns. Many factors—such as labor supply, resource availability, and legal structure—influence the return on investments. In particular, taxing returns on investment discourages investment, holding all else constant. According to a recent Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) working paper, of the three taxes (income, corporate, and consumption), corporate taxes are most harmful to economic growth.[[3]](http://www.heritage.org/Research/Taxes/bg2248.cfm#_ftn3) Other countries are aware of this and have steadily reduced their corporate tax rates. The U.S. has been the exception. Chart 1 shows how most other countries in the global econ­omy have undercut U.S. competitiveness in corpo­rate tax rates.[[4]](http://www.heritage.org/Research/Taxes/bg2248.cfm#_ftn4) If Congress repealed the corporate income tax, investments would flow into the country. Multi­national and international companies would be encouraged to operate in the United States, bringing jobs and new technology to meet today's economic challenges. Owners of corporations—those who earn the profits—would have more resources to invest in things that create value for others. Eliminating the corporate tax would also encour­age owners to hire and train people and to invest in their workforces because a more competitive tax structure would give corporations a greater incen­tive to domicile in the U.S. Further, higher levels of investment would require new skills of employees. As these investments paid off, economic growth would occur.[[5]](http://www.heritage.org/Research/Taxes/bg2248.cfm#_ftn5)

**Federal tax systems are too costly – CP saves money**

**Edwards 9** – the director of tax policy studies at the Cato Institute and a top expert on federal and state tax and budget issues. Before joining Cato in 2001, Edwards was senior economist on the congressional Joint Economic Committee examining tax, budget, and entrepreneurship issues. (Chris, *Cato Handbook for Policymakers, 7th Edition, pg. 418)*

At the beginning of the 20th century, federal taxes accounted for 3 percent of the nation’s gross domestic product, and federal tax rules filled just a few hundred pages. **Today, federal** taxes account for about 18 percent of GDP, and federal tax laws and regulations span 67,506 pages, according to CCH Inc.¶ The federal government extracts about $2.8 trillion in federal taxes from families and businesses each year, which imposes a huge economic cost. The most visible cost is people being left with less money to buy food, clothing, and other needed items, while **businesses are left with fewer funds for investment.**¶ **The federal tax system imposes other costs**. The complexity of federal taxation creates compliance and administrative costs, and it makes financial planning more difficult for individuals and businesses. Furthermore, the hidden nature of many federal taxes imposes a cost in transparency. In particular, it is difficult for citizens to figure out the overall burden of taxes they are paying under the current system.¶ A final cost of the current tax system is that high rates and **the unequal treatment of economic activities create distortions that reduce growth.** Given all these problems of the current tax system, **tax reforms should aim at three goals: simplification, transparency, and increased economic growth.**

## \*US-EU Relations

### 1nc—FTA CP

**Counterplan text: The United States federal government should negotiate a free trade agreement with the European Union.**

**Solves relations and boost growth**

Daniel S. **Hamilton and** Joseph P. **Quinlan 13** [Director and Senior Fellow at the Center for Transatlantic Relations at Johns Hopkins University, "U.S.-EU Free Trade Agreement: Global Game-Changer?," 2-23, http://pjmedia.com/blog/u-s-eu-free-trade-agreement-global-game-changer/?singlepage=true]

Momentum is building for a new and comprehensive free-trade and investment agreement between the United States and the European Union, with President Obama pledging his support for the plan in his State of the Union address. Such a deal would not only boost growth on both sides of the Atlantic, it would also strengthen the U.S.-EU economic axis relative to developing nations and key emerging powers like China. While a high degree of market integration already exists between the U.S. and Europe thanks to existing agreements, much more can be done to fuse the world’s two largest economies together. A transatlantic trade and investment pact would not only be about reducing tariffs, it would also be about reducing non-tariff barriers and harmonizing the web of regulatory standards that inhibit transatlantic trade and investment flows, and which add to the cost of doing business on both sides of the ocean. The issues are more micro than macro. An ambitious agreement would include the harmonization of food safety standards, e-commerce protocols, and data privacy issues. It would also encompass the standardization of a myriad of service-related activities in such sectors as aviation, retail trade, architecture, engineering, finance, maritime, procurement rules and regulations, and telecommunications. The move towards a more barrier-free transatlantic market would also include product standardization: for example, a car tested for safety in Bonn would be sellable in the U.S. without further tests in Boston. Or a drug approved by the Federal Drug Administration would be deemed safe and market-ready in Brussels. Labeling and packaging requirements on both sides of the pond would be standardized, saving companies millions of dollars over the long run. Technical regulations and safety standards are hardly headline-grabbing topics, but when these hurdles to doing business are stripped away, the end results are lower costs for companies, reduced prices for consumers, and more aggregate demand of goods and services. That in turn spells more transatlantic trade and investment, with total trade between the U.S. and EU amounting to over $500 billion last year. Cross-border foreign direct investment (FDI) between the two parties topped $300 billion last year, making U.S.-EU investment ties among the largest and thickest in the world. As for tariffs, average transatlantic tariffs are relatively low — in the 5-7% range — although tariffs remain quite high in such categories as agriculture, textiles and apparel, and footwear, so there is room for barriers to fall in a number of industries. More importantly, in that a large percentage of transatlantic trade is intra-firm, or trade in parts and components within the firm, even a small decline in tariffs — which are in effect a tax on production — can lower the cost of producing goods and result in lower prices for consumers on both sides of the pond. The more intense the intra-industry trade component of trade between two parties, like the one that characterizes U.S.-EU trade, the greater the effects and benefits of lower tariffs. In addition to trade in goods, there are services: the transatlantic service economy is the sleeping giant of the partnership. Unleashing service activities requires that existing regulatory rules and regulations be eliminated or reduced, which means doing away with “behind-the-border” barriers that include complex domestic regulations, cumbersome licensing and qualification requirements, and duplication of professional credentials, to name just a few barriers. At a broad and macro level, a study by the EU Commission found that eliminating or harmonizing half of all remaining tariffs and non-tariff barriers on bilateral trade could add up to 1.5 percentage points to growth over the medium term on both sides of the ocean. The European Center for International Political Economy, meanwhile, estimates that a deal could boost U.S. exports to the EU by 17% and EU exports to the U.S. by 18% over time. The figures are not overly large, but given how large the U.S.-EU economies are today — combined, the U.S. and EU account for over half of world GDP — even a small percentage increase in trade or investment translates into a large increase in aggregate output. In addition, given that both parties are hobbled by massive debt obligations and chronic deficits, any growth strategy should have a net positive effect on the transatlantic economy. A free-trade and investment deal would help create jobs and income on both sides of the pond, and spur more cross-border trade and investment in goods and services. The more far-reaching the agreement, the greater the impact on key sectors of the transatlantic economy, notably in services where there is plenty of scope for further integration. A U.S.-EU free-trade agreement [FTA] would do more than trigger economic activity. It would help reinvigorate a critical bilateral relationship that has been badly frayed and fractured over the past decade. Indeed, the last ten years have been among the rockiest in decades for the transatlantic partnership. Transatlantic solidarity and cohesion have been undermined by the increasing frequency of economic recessions on both sides of the ocean. The U.S. dotcom bust and ensuing transatlantic recession in 2001, the U.S.-led financial crisis-cum-recession in 2008, and Europe’s sovereign debt crisis of 2010: all of these economic shocks have taken a toll on U.S.-EU economic relations and have eroded bilateral trust and cooperation. Add in Europe’s sovereign debt crisis juxtaposed against robust economic growth emanating from China, India, and the developing nations, and there is little wonder that many in Washington now believe Europe is increasingly irrelevant on the global stage. The rapidly aging, heavily indebted, and increasingly fragmented continent is viewed as more of a withering partner of the United States than as an engaging, forward-looking, and dynamic ally. Hence the strategic “pivot” towards Asia. But enter the prospects for a free-trade and investment agreement. Such a deal — if comprehensive and far-reaching — could be just the spark that regalvanizes a bilateral partnership responsible for constructing and maintaining the global economic order of the post-war era. A free-trade agreement [FTA] could halt the divergence of interests between the U.S. and Europe, and instead spawn a new dawn of cooperation and convergence between the world’s two largest economies. Under this scenario, the transatlantic economy, the largest commercial artery in the world, would be revived. The global clout and credibility of the United States and Europe would be restored. By coming together as opposed to drifting apart, the U.S. and Europe would remain the standard bearers of the global economic architecture. Whatever the common standards of a free trade and investment agreement, and whatever the harmonization and standardization of industry/sector regulations, a transatlantic deal could become the template by which the United States and Europe negotiate with various emerging market economies — China included. In this sense, a transatlantic free trade and investment agreement would serve notice to the developing nations that the world’s two largest economies can still work together, and when they do, they still have a great deal of global economic leverage over most, if not all, developing nations. In the end, a sweeping free trade and investment agreement between the United States and the European Union would be a global game-changer. The deal would reverberate around the world. And in time, Washington and Brussels would come to realize that the best way to promote growth and rise to the challenge of emerging powers like China is by working together, not apart.

### AFF—FTA Fails

**Helps the economy by less than 1%**

**Knigge 13** [Michael, German editor of DW, RIAS Media Fellow at Duke University , Master's degree in American Studies, "TRANSATLANTIC RELATIONS: EU and US plan world’s biggest trade bloc," 2-26, http://stratrisks.com/geostrat/10716]

Economically, a broad free-trade agreement would fundamentally redraw the map of worldwide trade. Goods and services traded between the EU and US constitute the largest bilateral economic partnership in the world. Daily, they amount to more than 1.8 billion euros ($2.4 million). The combined GDPs of the US and EU account for approximately half of worldwide economic output and one-third of the global flow of goods. According to EU estimates, a comprehensive free-trade agreement between the EU and US would raise the EU’s GDP by one-half percent, or 66 billion euros per year. A similar increase is expected for the US.

**Not a game changer**

**Sapir 13** [Andre, Senior Fellow at Bruegel, professor of Economics at Université Libre de Bruxelles (ULB) and a former economic adviser to the president of the European Commission, "The Transatlantic Trade and Investment Initiative: Hope or Hype?," 3-5, http://www.bruegel.org/nc/blog/detail/article/1034-the-transatlantic-trade-and-investment-initiative-hope-or-hype/#.UUCd9xzrzws]

The language of the Cold War seems to be again present in the mouth of some European leaders to justify the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Initiative. “This is about the weight of the western, free world in world economic and political affairs,” declared EU Trade Commissioner De Gucht at a recent conference. The enemy this time is not the Soviet Union but appears to be the BRICs (and in particular China), which already today have a combined GDP equivalent to that of the EU or the US and far greater when the comparison is made in purchasing power parity (PPP) instead of using exchange rates. At current exchange rates, China alone will be the world’s largest economy before 2030, a position it will probably reach already before 2020 when measuring GDP at PPP. President Obama linked explicitly in his State of the Union address the TTIP to the Trans-Pacific Partnership Initiative, which has been under way for a while and which China regards as economically and politically unfriendly. The TTIP clearly aims to better prepare the EU and the US for the economic battle with the BRICs and other emerging powers. To do so, it will seek not only to remove the remaining trade barriers – that outside agriculture, a sector which will be mostly excluded de facto from the negotiation, are almost non existent – but will mainly focus on making EU and US rules and regulations “compatible” as Commissioner De Gucht stated. Harmonizing or even mutual recognition of rules and regulations is clearly not an option. If it were the EU and the US would be able to create a Transatlantic Single Market that would be truly historical. But it would also mean that the EU and the US, which are democratic systems with different regulatory preferences and complex procedures that reflect their multi-level governance, would be ready to set aside their differences in the name of competitiveness and the threat of emerging countries. If harmonization and mutual recognition are largely unattainable, then what making rules and regulations “compatible” mean? Not much beyond exchange of information and dialogue but does not add up to an economic “game-changer”. In fact the figure of “tens of thousands of new jobs” being created in Europe thanks to the TTIP, which must be compared to the nearly 25 million unemployed here, seems to confirm that the architects of the EU-US initiative are seeking political rather than economic objectives. The main goal is probably to reassure Europeans, who are the main demandeurs and who are undergoing some difficult times that America still views the transatlantic relationship as crucial.

## \*China

### 1nc—Dialogue CP

**Counterplan text: The President of the United States should establish a formal process for cooperation and dialogue with the President of China by committing to a regular summit. The United States federal government should upgrade their military-to-military dialogues to the level of principles.**

**Solves US-China relations**

**Rudd, 13** (Kevin, February 26th, 2013, Beyond the Pivot: A New Road Map for U.S.-Chinese Relations, Beyond the Pivot: A New Road Map for U.S.-Chinese Relations, <http://www.chinausfocus.com/foreign-policy/beyond-the-pivot-a-new-road-map-for-u-s-chinese-relations/>)

OBAMA'S TURN TO TAKE THE INITIATIVE

More than just a military statement, the Obama administration's rebalancing is part of a broader regional diplomatic and economic strategy that also includes the decision to become a member of the East Asia Summit and plans to develop the Trans-Pacific Partnership, deepen the United States' strategic partnership with India, and open the door to Myanmar (also called Burma). Some have criticized Washington's renewed vigor as the cause of recent increased tensions across East Asia. But this does not stand up to scrutiny, given that the proliferation of significant regional security incidents began more than half a decade ago. ¶ China, a nation of foreign and security policy realists where Clausewitz, Carr, and Morgenthau are mandatory reading in military academies, respects strategic strength and is contemptuous of vacillation and weakness. Beijing could not have been expected to welcome the pivot. But its opposition does not mean that the new U.S. policy is misguided. The rebalancing has been welcomed across the other capitals of Asia -- not because China is perceived as a threat but because governments in Asia are uncertain what a China-dominated region would mean. So now that the rebalance is being implemented, the question for U.S. policymakers is where to take the China relationship next.¶ One possibility would be for the United States to accelerate the level of strategic competition with China, demonstrating that Beijing has no chance of outspending or outmaneuvering Washington and its allies. But this would be financially unsustainable and thus not credible. A second possibility would be to maintain the status quo as the rebalancing takes effect, accepting that no fundamental improvement in bilateral relations is possible and perpetually concentrating on issue and crisis management. But this would be too passive and would run the risk of being overwhelmed by the number and complexity of the regional crises to be managed; strategic drift could result, settling on an increasingly negative trajectory. A third possibility would be to change gears in the relationship altogether by introducing a new framework for cooperation with China that recognizes the reality of the two countries' strategic competition, defines key areas of shared interests to work and act on, and thereby begins to narrow the yawning trust gap between the two countries. Executed properly, such a strategy would do no harm, run few risks, and deliver real results. It could reduce the regional temperature by several degrees, focus both countries' national security establishments on common agendas sanctioned at the highest levels, and help reduce the risk of negative strategic drift.¶ A crucial element of such a policy would have to be the commitment to regular summitry. There are currently more informal initiatives under way between the United States and China than there are ships on the South China Sea. But none of these can have a major impact on the relationship, since in dealing with China, there is no substitute for direct leader-to-leader engagement. In Beijing, as in Washington, the president is the critical decision-maker. Absent Xi's personal engagement, the natural dynamic in the Chinese system is toward gradualism at best and stasis at worst. The United States therefore has a profound interest in engaging Xi personally, with a summit in each capital each year, together with other working meetings of reasonable duration, held in conjunction with meetings of the G-20, the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation, and the East Asia Summit.¶ Both governments also need authoritative point people working on behalf of the national leaders, managing the agenda between summits and handling issues as the need arises. In other words, the United States needs someone to play the role that Henry Kissinger did in the early 1970s, and so does China.¶ Globally, the two governments need to identify one or more issues currently bogged down in the international system and work together to bring them to successful conclusions. This could include the Doha Round of international trade talks (which remains stalled despite approaching a final settlement in 2008), climate-change negotiations (on which China has come a considerable way since the 2009 UN Conference on Climate Change in Copenhagen), nuclear nonproliferation (the next review conference for the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty is coming up), or specific outstanding items on the G-20 agenda. Progress on any of these fronts would demonstrate that with sufficient political will all around, the existing global order can be made to work to everyone's advantage, including China's. Ensuring that China becomes an active stakeholder in the future of that order is crucial, and even modest successes would help.¶ Regionally, the two countries need to use the East Asia Summit and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations' Defense Ministers' Meeting-Plus forum to develop a series of confidence- and security-building measures among the region's 18 militaries. At present, these venues run the risk of becoming permanently polarized over territorial disputes in the East China and South China seas, so the first item to be negotiated should be a protocol for handling incidents at sea, with other agreements following rapidly to reduce the risk of conflict through miscalculation.¶ At the bilateral level, Washington and Beijing should upgrade their regular military-to-military dialogues to the level of principals such as, on the U.S. side, the secretary of defense and the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This should be insulated from the ebbs and flows of the relationship, with meetings focusing on regional security challenges, such as Afghanistan, Pakistan, and North Korea, or major new challenges, such as cybersecurity. And on the economic front, finally, Washington should consider extending the Trans-Pacific Partnership to include both China and Japan, and eventually India as well.

**Dialogue possible—can deal with complex issues**

**Wall Street Journal, 13** (Chinese, U.S. Military Chiefs Break the Ice , June 2nd, 2013, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887324063304578521160445646042.html>)

U.S. officials say they have seen a marked change, at least in tone, in the new Chinese leadership's approach to the U.S.—a change that was on display in private talks between U.S. and Chinese defense officials who met on the sidelines of the conference.¶ For veterans of Shangri-La, the Chinese delegation at the conference this year appeared to be more engaged and outgoing than in years past. Their delegates not only spoke fluent English but went out of their way to be cordial and courteous in their public and private comments, while still being strident about China's concerns over stepped-up U.S. military deployments in Asia, which visiting Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel told the conference would continue.¶ The change in China's approach, at least so far, has renewed U.S. hope that Beijing will at least be willing to engage in more detailed discussions than they have in the past on thorny issues, including setting standards for cyberspace, tamping down tensions over territorial disputes in the South China Sea and finding ways to restrain North Korea, the officials said.¶ "There is a lot more hope," a senior Obama administration official said. "The previous government was more 20th century. The new team seems to be more 21st century."¶ But the U.S. official said it was unclear, based on the limited exchanges that have taken place between top U.S. officials and China's new leadership, whether these "style differences" will translate into "a difference in action."¶ Renewed U.S. hopes stem, at least so far, from the fact that Beijing has indicated to Washington that it "is willing to talk about the issues," including sensitive ones such as cyberespionage, the official said.

### Solv: Military Dialogues

**Military-to-military dialogue can resolves problems**

**Xinhua News, 13** (Interview: U.S., China seek to advance military-to-military ties in strategic talks, July 8th, 2013, http://english.peopledaily.com.cn/90786/8315381.html)

.

Military-to-military relationship between the United States and China has seen great strides in recent years. During their summit last month in California, Chinese President Xi Jinping and his U.S. counterpart Barack Obama agreed to find a new way to manage their differences and actively foster a new type of military relations commensurate with the new type of major-country relationship.¶ Pollack said President Xi's "personal identification with this issue" bodes well for the talks ahead. He said disagreements between the two sides persist, but only "to the degree both sides recognize the strategic stakes, recognize that you cannot have a stable, long-term U.S.-China relationship if the military to military relationship is somehow outside that process."¶ There's likely "an increased effort to try to... find more rules of the road" and define an overall pattern that "issues with the moment" do not disrupt or interfere with overall military to military relationship, said Pollack.

**Talks solve—now key**

**Miller, 13** (Zeke, Time Magazine, At U.S.-China Summit, Leaders Talk of Avoiding Another Cold War, June 10th, 2013, <http://swampland.time.com/2013/06/10/at-u-s-china-summit-leaders-talk-of-avoiding-another-cold-war/>)

China’s President Xi Jinping announced that he was looking for the establishment of a “new model of major country relationship” with the United States, as he expressed urgency in taking steps to prevent another Cold War at a carefully orchestrated meeting this weekend with President Obama on isolated 200-acre Sunnylands estate.¶ “China and the United States must find a new path—one that is different from the inevitable confrontation and conflict between the major countries of the past,” Xi told reporters Friday after his first session with Obama.¶ In public statements, President Obama welcomed the effort. “We shared our respective visions for our countries’ futures and agreed that we’re more likely to achieve our objectives of prosperity and security of our people if we are working together cooperatively, rather than engaged in conflict,” Obama said.

**Solves north korea and territorial disputes**

**Miller, 13** (Zeke, Time Magazine, At U.S.-China Summit, Leaders Talk of Avoiding Another Cold War, June 10th, 2013, <http://swampland.time.com/2013/06/10/at-u-s-china-summit-leaders-talk-of-avoiding-another-cold-war/>)

“The discussions were positive and constructive, wide-ranging and quite successful in achieving the goals that we set forth for this meeting,” Donilon said Saturday after Xi had departed the estate.¶ A highlight of the meeting, according to U.S. officials, was China’s embrace of the U.S. position with respect to North Korea, with Donilon saying the presidents agreed it was a “key area for U.S.-China enhanced cooperation.” They agreed that North Korea must be denuclearized, and agreed on a path forward to apply pressure on the government in Pyongyang, which U.S. officials view as one of China’s first forays stepping in to promote regional calm.¶ “I think what you have essentially underway here is a shared threat analysis and a shared analysis as to what the implications and impact would be of North Korea pursuing a nuclear weapons program,” Donilon said, adding there was a discussion about further talks with North Korea being “authentic and credible. “We really haven’t seen from the North Koreans at this point that kind of commitment on the substance of potential talks, I think, at this point to move forward,” he said.¶ Obama also encouraged Xi to deescalate tensions with Japan over the disputed Senkaku Islands in the East China Sea, which are believed to sit upon oil and gas reserves and are claimed by both countries.¶ Obama said “that the parties should seek to de-escalate, not escalate; and the parties should seek to have conversations about this through diplomatic channels and not through actions out of the East China Sea,” Donilon told reporters.¶ Both leaders discussed the importance of strengthening military-to-military ties, which lag diplomatic and economic relations by more than a decade. Gen. Martin Dempsey, the chairman of the joint chiefs of staff, visited China earlier this year, and both leaders pledged to increase the frequency and depth of those interactions to promote stability between the two powers.

### AFF—Talks Fail

**Talks fail—unknown agendas, differing ideas, and mistrust**

**Keatley, 13**—a former editor of The Asian Wall Street Journal and the South China Morning Post, both of Hong Kong (Robert, “New Hope in U.S.-Chinese Talks,” July 10th, 2013, http://nationalinterest.org/print/commentary/new-hope-us-chinese-talks-8709)

There has been a predictable pattern to past U.S.-China summit meetings: the two leaders endorse lofty pledges of closer friendship and shared objectives, complete with upbeat photo-ops to impress their respective publics. Then they go home again and not a whole lot changes.¶ Whether last month’s California talks between Presidents Barack Obama and Xi Jinping will prove any different remains unknown. But two events—one current and the other in October—will do much to determine if in fact there will a significant upgrade to crucial connections between the world’s two largest economies, which annually record $500 billion worth of trade with each other. As usual regarding China, firm predictions would be unwise but there are signs that important economic changes that both Washington wants and Beijing needs are indeed possible.¶ Yet if the economic outlook shows tentative promise, the security side is a bit murky. In particular, U.S. hopes of restraining one aspect of China’s enthusiastic cyber espionage, deemed “really at the center of the relationship” by the White House, have been sabotaged by the revelations of Edward Snowden, the whistleblower stranded in a Moscow airport. Chinese officials may use his disclosures as an excuse to avoid restrictions on their own cyber spying despite previously agreeing to hold serious talks about the problem.¶ However, there are indications of flexibility on the foreign-policy front. Beijing has hinted it may temper nationalistic rhetoric and ease territorial disputes with Asian neighbors, and also cooperate more effectively to curtail North Korea’s nuclear-arms program—two Washington goals. But at the same time it is tightening internal political controls to ensure that the first priority of Xi and his colleagues is not threatened—keeping the Communist Party in firm command. Thus human-rights differences will continue.¶ The first significant event is underway in Washington this week. It’s the fifth round of recurring high-level discussions called the U.S.-China Strategic and Economic Dialogue (SED), this time headed by Secretary of State John Kerry and Treasury Secretary Jacob Lew for the United States and State Councilor Yang Jiechi and Vice Premier Wang Yang for China, with a supporting cast of hundreds from a multitude of agencies. The purpose is to resolve, or at least minimize, differences over a wide range of economic, diplomatic and security issues that have eluded solution in lower-level talks. If successful, the two sides will draft guidelines that could let specific problems be settled amicably in follow-up bureaucratic negotiations, placing overall relations on a smooth and productive path.¶ This is easier said than done. Beneath the soothing words there is great and persistent distrust between Washington and Beijing politicians, attitudes shared by significant portions of their populations. For example, a former governor of Virginia now concerned with security affairs believes the United States must be prepared to counter strenuous Chinese efforts to deny it naval access to the western Pacific, where the United States has important allies. And many Chinese, including some officials, believe Washington is plotting to “contain” a rising China and deny it its “rightful” place in world affairs. American protests that containment is neither possible nor desirable, that it wants China to become a full and responsible member of global governance, are often disbelieved.

**Talks fail—past summit proves**

**Economy, 13—**C.V. Starr Senior Fellow and Director, Asia Studies, Council on Foreign Relations (Elizabeth, “Can Obama, Xi Break summit stalemate?,” June 4th, 2013, CNN Special, <http://globalpublicsquare.blogs.cnn.com/2013/06/04/can-obama-xi-break-summit-stalemate/>)

Presidential summits between the United States and China have become disappointingly predictable. Before every summit there is a sense of anticipation. What issues will be at the top of the agenda? What new agreements might be reached? How will the two presidents get along? During the summit, news is scant. There are hints of common purpose, but mostly there are admissions of significant differences. And then, inevitably, there is the post-summit letdown. The issues were the same as always. The leaders didn’t really get along (although no one quite says that). And new agreements were never in the cards.

**Talks fail—bilateralism stinks**

**Economy, 12**—C.V. Starr Senior Fellow and Director, Asia Studies, Council on Foreign Relations (Elizabeth, “Sino-US: One Step Back, Two Steps Forward,” November 28th, 2012, <http://www.boaoreview.com/comparison/2012/1128/106.html>)

The U.S.-China relationship is commonly understood as needing more: more dialogues, more trade, more understanding, and more opportunities to cooperate. Yet the reality is just the opposite. In order to succeed, the relationship, ironically, needs less: less hype, less pressure, less competition, and less bilateralism. ¶ As Chinese Vice Foreign Minister Cui Tiankai noted just prior to the visit of Vice President Xi Jinping to the United States in February 2012, the two countries suffer a trust deficit. Certainly, recent polls in both countries bear out his assessment. In a 2012 China Daily USA-Gallup poll of more than 2,000 Americans, only slightly more than 30 percent believed that China’s growing influence in the world was a good thing. And in a 2012 Committee of 100 poll of more than 4,000 Chinese citizens, only 56 percent considered the United States trustworthy.¶ But there is good news as well. In those same two polls, more than 80 percent of Americans believed that having a close relationship with China was a good thing, and over 60 percent of Chinese thought that the U.S.-China relationship was either important, very important, or China’s most important relationship.¶ So how can the United States and China build on the desire of people in both countries to get the relationship right? Vice Minister Cui suggests that “nurturing and deepening mutual trust” is “a major issue that both sides must give full attention to and seriously address.” How to build that trust, however, is the critical question. ¶ As a first step, the two countries need to move away from the mind-set that more is better. Rather than incorporating even more issues into the bilateral relationship, the objective should be to establish a manageable policy environment in which trust can develop. Specifically, it means taking steps to minimize competition, set aside intractable issues, and keep global and regional issues where they belong—in a multilateral framework.¶ By taking these steps, the two countries may create a constructive framework that will allow for greater cooperation.

**Multilateralism is essential to combat problems**

**Economy, 12**—C.V. Starr Senior Fellow and Director, Asia Studies, Council on Foreign Relations (Elizabeth, “Sino-US: One Step Back, Two Steps Forward,” November 28th, 2012, <http://www.boaoreview.com/comparison/2012/1128/106.html>)

What's next?

Pundits and policymakers in the United States are prone to say that no problem of global significance can be addressed without the cooperation of China and the United States. However, this raises expectations for a level of partnership that at this point in time cannot be met. As long as China and the United States bring different values, priorities, and policy approaches to the table, it will be challenging to find common ground. Overall, the nature of the current U.S.-China relationship suggests the need to lower rather than raise expectations.¶ And, of course, merely developing a more manageable agenda and dismantling the framework of competition will not be enough to build the trust that Vice Minister Cui and others seek. That requires more time and more effort. The development of real trust between the United States and China necessitates a number of more profound changes in the way in which the two countries approach each other. It demands clarity of intention, predictability of action, shared sensibilities, a willingness to give before one takes, and mutual respect.¶ Nonetheless, if the United States and China can begin the process by taking a step back to establish a new narrative for the relationship that minimizes competition, sets aside intractable issues, and keeps global and regional issues where they belong—in a multilateral framework—there will be the potential for the two countries, like the frog in the well, to take two steps forward for every one step back.

## \*Prolif

### 1nc—Grab Bag CP

**Counterplan text: The United States federal government should provide sufficient funding to the IAEA for the purpose of improving nuclear security in order to prevent nuclear and radiological materials from falling into the hands of terrorists. The United States federal government should increase national efforts to bring the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty into force. The United States federal government should negotiate nuclear arms control treaties similar to START.**

**Policy solutions**

**Solves prolif**

**Council on Foreign Relations, 13** (“The Global Nuclear Nonproliferation Regime,” June 25th, 2013, <http://www.cfr.org/arms-control-disarmament-and-nonproliferation/global-nuclear-nonproliferation-regime/p18984#p5>)

Introduction

Recent trends have brought the nuclear nonproliferation regime to a moment of grave crisis. The regime is under siege from both rogue states and nonstate actors, and its core bargain between the nuclear haves and have-nots continues to erode. Bolstering international restraints on the world's deadliest weapons will require the United States and its international partners to adopt realistic, concrete steps to strengthen and close gaps in existing treaty regimes, institutions, and partnerships.¶ These recommendations reflect the views of Stewart M. Patrick, director of the program on international institutions and global governance.¶ In the near term, the United States and its international partners should consider the following steps:¶ Increasing the IAEA budget and reforming the safeguards, security, and personnel systems¶ The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) is the globe's technical agency in charge of ensuring that countries maintain safeguards on their peaceful nuclear programs. Safeguards help deter a country from diverting nuclear technology and materials from peaceful to military programs. The major concern is that safeguards capabilities have not kept up with the increased use of nuclear power and the projected expansion of nuclear power to many counties. In the words of the Bush administration's head of the National Nuclear Security Administration, "safeguards equipment is outdated and personnel preparedness declining as the agency failed to replace retiring experts with new hires."¶ The IAEA provides services on improving nuclear security in order to prevent nuclear and radiological materials from falling into the hands of terrorists. In 2008, the Eminent Persons Commission advised the IAEA director general that the agency needs to substantially increase its budget for safeguards and security work. Unfortunately, this financial support has not been forthcoming. The IAEA, however, needs member states to commit to place the agency on a sustainable funding path. It also needs to reform its personnel rules to allow experts to stay in one type of job for longer than seven years and for highly qualified senior personnel to stay employed beyond the mandatory retirement age of sixty-two. The recent release of an IAEA report discussing Iran's alleged covert nuclear weapons activity presents more evidence regarding the need to ensure the funding needs of the IAEA are satisfied.¶ Increasing national and international efforts to bring the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty into force¶ Increasing national and international efforts to bring the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) into force and boost funding to the CTBT Preparatory Commission to continue to improve the international monitoring system. The Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) is specifically linked to the overall nonproliferation regime, and entry into force would strengthen the norm against proliferation of nuclear weapons and make it more difficult for states to have confidence that nuclear weapons would work without testing. For the CTBT to enter into force, forty-four nuclear-capable states must ratify it. If the United States ratifies, it can then apply more leverage to the remaining holdout states to do the same.¶ Nonratifying states include China, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran, Israel, North Korea, Pakistan, and the United States. In a February 2010 speech, Vice President Biden reaffirmed U.S. commitment to ratify the treaty. The United States will need allied states to reach out and apply diplomatic pressure to holdout states to help secure entry into force. To ensure the requisite technical support for the treaty, the United States and its allies need to provide enough funding and other technical resources to the CTBT Organization (CTBTO) and Preparatory Commission. Such support will improve the global monitoring system that is designed to detect relatively low yield nuclear tests throughout the world.¶ Negotiating new, emboldened nuclear arms control treaties¶ The United States and Russia replaced the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) with the New START Treaty. Successful negotiation and ratification of this agreement improved the overall condition of U.S.-Russia relations, possibly making it easier to work together on other multilateral efforts (such as ensuring the peaceful use of nuclear energy, preventing further proliferation to additional states, and implementing global best security practices on nuclear weapons and weapons-usable nuclear materials). The New START agreement preserves many of the best elements of its predecessor, such as information exchange, predictability, and permanence in reductions, verification, and transparency. But the United States and Russia must also look ahead to deeper nuclear reductions and focus on broader issues of contention, including missile defense and advanced conventional weapons.¶ In the longer term, the United States and its international partners should consider the following steps:¶ Reforming and strengthening the NPT by creating automatic or binding UNSC mechanisms.¶ Rights in the NPT come with responsibilities. Nuclear weapon states have the responsibility to ensure access to peaceful nuclear technologies, and the recipient states need to show that they can manage nuclear power safely and securely. Although Iran has cited its inalienable right under the NPT to access peaceful nuclear technologies, including dual-use enrichment technologies, it has not met its responsibility to ensure adequate safeguards on its peaceful nuclear program. It has also not provided enough transparency into suspected nuclear weapons development activities to assure the world that it is meeting its responsibility to not acquire nuclear weapons. North Korea left the NPT under the Article X supreme national interest clause, but it did so while under suspicion of developing nuclear weapons. Moreover, it never placed its nuclear program under safeguards.¶ Although amending the NPT is admittedly a difficult task, states should commit to strengthening the interpretation and application of the treaty's rules. In particular, the UN Security Council should require that any state in violation of its safeguards agreement should suspend the suspect activity until the violation is resolved. The Security Council should also require any state in violation of its safeguards agreement that wants to leave the NPT to return nuclear technologies and materials obtained while a member to countries of origin. In addition, the Security Council should call for a special inspection in any country that has violated its safeguards commitment and is under suspicion of having a nuclear weapons program. Nuclear weapon states have a special responsibility to reaffirm their commitment to pursue nuclear disarmament. They need to demonstrate what concrete actions they have taken and intend to take on the disarmament front. The 2010 NPT Review Conference provided an opportunity for treaty signatories to recommit themselves to a world free of nuclear weapons; however, U.S. efforts to include language on stronger verification measures in the final document failed.¶ Determining whether to institutionalize PSI.¶ In his April 2009 Prague Speech, President Obama advocated that the world should "come together to turn efforts such as the Proliferation Security Initiative...into a durable institution." The purported benefits of creating a formal institution out of PSI are still being debated. For example, turning the PSI from an informal cooperation agreement into an organization with a secretariat and a budget has the potential to increase its resource endowment and expand its reach. Institutionalizing the initiative may also help clarify commitments and increase operational transparency, making it easier to evaluate performance and measure progress. Bringing the PSI under UN aegis, some analysts have argued, could boost its international legitimacy and appeal to China, India, and Middle Eastern states, whose cooperation in policing the nuclear trade market remains important. One way to put PSI on a firmer institutional footing without folding into an explicitly formalized institution would be to strengthen its legal foundation. This would place interdiction on grounds consistent with international law.¶ Creating a global alliance against nuclear terrorism.¶ The terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, while non-nuclear, renewed fears of catastrophic nuclear terrorism. In response, the United States and partner countries have revived or initiated international efforts to counter this threat. In particular, the Group of Eight (G8) countries in 2002 launched the Global Partnership against the Spread of Weapons and Materials of Mass Destruction, in which the United States committed to spend at least $10 billion over ten years, and other partners pledged to match that sum. In 2004, the United States formed the Global Threat Reduction Initiative, which was an umbrella program including several programs to secure and reduce fissile materials as well as radioactive materials. Russia is a major partner in this initiative. In 2006, Russia and the United States joined forces again when then President Bush and then Russian President Putin began the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism, which as of early 2010 had eighty-two countries voluntarily taking part in sharing intelligence on nuclear terrorist threats as well as pledging to work toward better security practices over nuclear and other radioactive materials.¶ These programs and initiatives have achieved significant results, but more committed and coordinated global efforts are needed. The challenge for the new U.S. administration is to urge countries to meet their financial and resource commitments pledged under these programs and to increase funding and personnel to ensure that President Obama's goal of securing all vulnerable nuclear material can be achieved by 2014. The institutionalization of biennial global nuclear security summits—with the next summit planned for 2014 in the Netherlands—is a solid step in this direction.¶ Developing a system of layered nuclear fuel assurance.¶ The spread of nuclear fuel making facilities under a single state's control can increases the risk of diversion of peaceful nuclear technologies into weapons programs. Issuing an edict to prohibit this activity runs into the barriers of state sovereignty and the "inalienable right" to pursue peaceful nuclear programs. States have built fuel making facilities for reasons of satisfying national pride, developing a latent weapons capability, and trying to make a profit. To take away or at least to reduce the economic rationale for these facilities, several fuel assurance programs have been proposed. Many of these proposals were studied decades ago. Concerns about proliferation in response to Iran's nuclear program have prompted a dusting off of these proposals or a dressing up with more incentives. The important point is that the nuclear fuel market has worked effectively and there is no reason to expect it to fail in the foreseeable future especially with the expansion plans of the established nuclear fuel producers.¶ To further strengthen nonproliferation, it makes sense to offer a layered system of fuel assurances that would be available to any country that is in compliance with its safeguards commitments. The first layer would be the existing market in which a handful of major producers have been meeting customers' needs. The second layer would consist of political commitments and insurance policies that would form in effect a virtual fuel bank to back up the existing market. The final layer would consist of an actual fuel bank containing sufficient fuel or low enriched uranium that can be readily converted to fuel. Such a bank should contain at least enough fuel or enriched uranium to supply the needs of a few large power reactors over a two to three year period. Even with this layered approach, certain countries may still decide to pursue new fuel making endeavors, but a robust layered fuel system will at least expose that these countries are doing such activities for other than economic reasons.

### 2nc—Solvency

**The NPT must be updated to resolve prolif—reinforcement key**

**Council on Foreign Relations, 13** (“The Global Nuclear Nonproliferation Regime,” June 25th, 2013, <http://www.cfr.org/arms-control-disarmament-and-nonproliferation/global-nuclear-nonproliferation-regime/p18984#p5>)

The problem of nuclear proliferation is global, and any effective response must also be multilateral. Nine states (China, France, India, Israel, North Korea, Pakistan, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United States) are known or believed to have nuclear weapons, and more than thirty others (including Japan, Germany, and South Korea) have the technological ability to quickly acquire them. Amid volatile energy costs, the accompanying push to expand nuclear energy, growing concerns about the environmental impact of fossil fuels, and the continued diffusion of scientific and technical knowledge, access to dual-use technologies seems destined to grow.¶ In the background, a nascent global consensus regarding the need for substantial nuclear arms reductions, if not complete nuclear disarmament, has increasingly taken shape. In April 2009, for instance, U.S. president Barack Obama reignited global nonproliferation efforts through a landmark speech in Prague. Subsequently, in September of the same year, the UN Security Council (UNSC) unanimously passed Resolution 1887, which called for accelerated efforts toward total nuclear disarmament. In February 2012, the number of states who have ratified the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty increased to 157, heightening appeals to countries such as the United States, Israel, and Iran to follow suit.¶ Overall, the existing global nonproliferation regime is a highly developed example of international law. Yet, despite some notable successes, existing multilateral institutions have failed to prevent states such as India, Pakistan, and North Korea from "going nuclear," and seem equally ill-equipped to check Iran as well as potential threats from nonstate terrorist groups. The current framework must be updated and reinforced if it is to effectively address today's proliferation threats, let alone pave the way for "the peace and security of a world without nuclear weapons."

### 1nc—Sole Purpose CP

**Counterplan: The United States federal government should adopt a policy that declares that the United States solely maintains nuclear weapons to deter and, if necessary, respond to nuclear attacks against ourselves, our forces, or our friends and allies.**

**The counterplan solve prolif—a “sole purpose” declaration is key.**

Blair et al. 8—Former professor of security studies @ Yale and Princeton University. Expert on U.S. and Russian security policies, nuclear forces and command-and-control systems [Bruce G. Blair (President of the World Security Institute), Thomas B. Cochran (Chair for nuclear policy @ Natural Resources Defense Council and senior scientist and director of its Nuclear Program), Jonathan Dean (Advisor on global security issues @ Union of Concerned Scientists), Steve Fetter (Dean of the School of Public Affairs @ University of Maryland), Richard L. Garwin (IBM fellow emeritus at the Thomas J. Watson Research Center w/ Ph.D. in physics from the University of Chicago), Kurt Gottfried (Emeritus professor of physics @ Cornell University), Lisbeth Gronlund (Senior scientist and codirector of the Global Security Program @ Union of Concerned Scientists and a research affiliate in the MIT Program in Science, Technology, and Society), Henry Kelly (President of the Federation of American Scientists and served as assistant director for technology in the White House Office of Science and Technology from 1993 to 2000), Hans M. Kristensen (Director of the Nuclear Information Project @ Federation of American Scientists), Robert Nelson (senior scientist in the Global Security Program at the Union of Concerned Scientists), Robert S. Norris (senior research associate @ Natural Resources Defense Council), Ivan Oelrich (Vice president for strategic security programs @ Federation of American Scientists and professor in the Security Studies @ Georgetown University), Christopher Paine (Director of the Nuclear Program at the Natural Resources Defense Council), Frank N. von Hippel (nuclear physicist and professor of public and international affairs @ Princeton University), David Wright (co-director and senior scientist of the Global Security Program @ Union of Concerned Scientists and a research affiliate of the MIT Program in Science, Technology, and Society, and Stephen Young (Washington representative and senior analyst in the Global Security Program @ Union of Concerned Scientists), Toward True Security: Ten Steps the Next President Should Take to Transform U.S. Nuclear Weapons Policy, February 2008]

1. The United States should declare that the sole purpose of U.S. nuclear weapons is to deter and, if necessary, respond to the use of nuclear weapons by another country.

Current U.S. policy is to retain the option of using nuclear weapons for military purposes other than deterring nuclear attack, including:

• Deterring, responding to, and even preempting conventional, chemical, or biological attacks

• Destroying chemical or biological agents

• Deterring or responding to other unspecified threats to U.S. vital interests

However, giving nuclear weapons roles beyond deterring nuclear attack is both unnecessary and counterproductive. Those roles add little or nothing to the deterrence of non-nuclear attacks provided by U.S. conventional forces or to the U.S. ability to counter or respond to such attacks. Moreover, **maintaining and strengthening the firebreak against the use and proliferation of nuclear weapons is paramount to U.S. security**. If U.S. policy treats nuclear weapons as a multipurpose arsenal, then other states will be more inclined to seek nuclear weapons. If the United States, with its unquestioned conventional superiority, acts as if it must rely on nuclear weapons to protect and defend its vital interests, then weaker states—particularly those not covered by U.S. security guarantees—will perceive a far greater need for such weapons. Indeed, implicit or explicit U.S. threats to use nuclear weapons may motivate nations to acquire nuclear weapons to deter the United States.33 These added roles for U.S. nuclear weapons also negate the nonproliferation benefits of U.S. “negative security assurances” that the United States will not use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear signatories of the NPT.

Some believe that the consequences of attack from chemical and especially biological weapons could be so great that it is unwise to forgo the “sharp deterrence” provided by explicit threats to use nuclear weapons in response. Rather than promising never to use nuclear weapons first, these proponents advocate that the United States pledge not to initiate the use of “weapons of mass destruction,” by which they mean chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons.

However, chemical weapons do not belong in this category—their destructive capacity pales compared with that of nuclear weapons. Thus, it would be irresponsible for the United States to use nuclear weapons in response to an attack by chemical weapons. Biological weapons, in contrast, could, over time, kill as many people as nuclear weapons—if they are contagious and delivered effectively. However, the threat of a U.S. conventional response is likely to be as effective in deterring such attacks as an explicit U.S. nuclear threat. In any event, any marginal gain in deterrence against a biological attack would be offset by the incentive such a policy would provide hostile nations to acquire nuclear weapons.

Advocates of an explicit U.S. nuclear threat often claim that such a threat deterred Iraq’s use of chemical and biological weapons during the first Gulf War. However, President George H.W. Bush’s threat of “the strongest possible response” if Iraq used its chemical or biological weapons applied equally to the destruction of Kuwait’s oil fields, which Iraq did with impunity.34

U.S. officials threatened privately to escalate the war in ways that did not involve nuclear weapons if Iraq used chemical or biological weapons. Secretary of State James Baker warned the Iraqi foreign minister that the use of such weapons would lead the United States to seek to topple the Hussein regime.35 These threats were almost certainly an equally, if not more, potent deterrent compared with the nuclear threat. There is also evidence that U.S. air attacks impaired Iraq’s ability to deploy and use chemical and biological weapons. We do not know why Iraq did not use chemical or biological weapons in that war. However, the balance of evidence does not support the conclusion that veiled U.S. threats to use nuclear weapons were the determining factor.

Nuclear threats are also unnecessary to deter non-nuclear attacks because U.S. conventional military strength far exceeds that of all potential adversaries, and will do so for the foreseeable future. The United States and its allies can rely on their combined conventional military strength to counter any non-nuclear threat to their security. Finally, practical political reasons preclude the use of nuclear weapons **in response to non-nuclear attacks**. Although **one can imagine cases where domestic pressure for nuclear revenge might be strong**, or where the use of nuclear weapons might reduce U.S. casualties and end a war more quickly, wise leaders would weigh these considerations against the grave damage that nuclear first use would do to U.S. security. In the short term, nuclear attacks could turn world opinion against the United States and render a collective response against an offender difficult or impossible. The long-term effects would be even more profound. Nuclear strikes would deal a **fatal blow to U.S. leadership and alliances, wreck the nonproliferation regime, and spur other states to acquire nuclear weapons**. While the United States has considered using nuclear weapons numerous times since the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, it has not done so, in part because of just such considerations.

Threatening to use nuclear weapons in response to non-nuclear attacks could also increase the **pressure on the U**nited States to follow through, even if that would be counter to U.S. interests, for two reasons. First, if the United States retains its first-use option, the **military** will maintain detailed contingency plans and standard operating procedures for such use, which could dominate thinking about how to respond in a crisis. Second, once **policy makers** threaten a nuclear response, they might worry about undermining U.S. credibility and resolve if they did not follow through, even if they believed that doing so would be unnecessary or imprudent.

The bottom line is that the marginal value of explicit threats to use nuclear weapons to respond to non-nuclear attacks is small, the wisdom of carrying out such threats is dubious, and the potential long-term security costs of making such threats is great. The United States should make clear that the sole purpose of its nuclear weapons is to deter and, if necessary, respond to nuclear attacks.

**No-First-Use declaration strengthens anti-proliferation norms and gets modeled**

**Civiak 9**—Consultant in Nuclear Weapons Policy w/ Ph.D. in physics from the University of Pittsburgh [Robert L. Civiak (Former Specialist in Energy Technology in the Science Policy Division of the Congressional Research Service (10 years) & Former Program and Budget Examiner with the Office of Management and Budget, primary responsible for oversight of the Department of Energy’s stewardship of the nuclear weapons stockpile (11 years)), Transforming the U.S. Strategic Posture and Weapons Complex: for Transition to a Nuclear Weapons-Free World, Prepared by the Nuclear Weapons Complex Consolidation (NWCC) Policy Network, April 2009]

In the near term, it is unlikely that we can eliminate the risk that more nations will acquire nuclear weapons. However, the assertive use of nuclear threats—as was the policy of the Bush Administration—is the wrong way to go about preventing the emergence of new nuclear weapons states. The existence of a huge U.S. nuclear arsenal has not deterred any potentially hostile nation from acquiring nuclear weapons. Threats of preemptive or preventive nuclear strikes on smaller opponents stoke fears of political coercion and conventional military attack under the cover of a nuclear umbrella. These fears feed, rather than quench, the desire for national nuclear deterrents. A world free of nuclear weapons offers the greatest hope of reducing nuclear insecurity and achieving the coordinated international action that is necessary to prevent other nations from acquiring nuclear weapons. Until that can be achieved, it is in the interest of the United States to reduce the rhetoric and change the doctrine regarding potential first use of nuclear weapons.

The nuclear security politics of the Cold War consisted of attempting to “reassure” friends and foes alike that the U.S. would resort to the use of nuclear weapons to defend its allies from all forms of aggression. Now, to halt the global spread of nuclear weapons, the U.S. and other nuclear weapons states must do the opposite. They must work together to convince all nations, regardless of their ideological hue, that they will never become targets of nuclear attack if they adhere faithfully to the requirements of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and refrain from acquiring nuclear weapons or assisting others to do so.

**The U**nited **S**tates **should eliminate nuclear threats** completely from its global military posture and forego integrating the potential use of nuclear weapons with strategies for use of conventional force. The United States must live up to its democratic ideals, defending its interests primarily by engaging other nations through negotiation and reciprocal accommodation, without invoking a nuclear “ace-in-the-hole.”

The United States must pursue a nuclear weapons policy directed at preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons and weapons-usable material. **We must lead** **in creating a global norm** in which no new nation feels a need for its own nuclear deterrent and nations already possessing nuclear weapons join us in radical stockpile reductions and deemphasizing the strategic importance of nuclear weapons. Furthermore, the U.S. must respect the principles of the UN Charter and its constraints on the permissible uses of unilateral military force. This policy must reject any notion of an “exceptional” U.S. privilege, beyond the inherent right to self-defense enshrined in the Charter, to engage in the unilateral use of military force to further its interests or extinguish perceived threats anywhere on the globe.

Other than the use of nuclear weapons by others, the United States is not confronted by any credible threat to its security, or to that of its allies, which might require a threat of nuclear escalation to counter it. Therefore, the President and the Congress should declare, **without qualification**, that the United States will not be the first nation to use nuclear weapons in any future conflict. This “no first use” policy should be reflected in our nuclear force structure and readiness posture. U.S. nuclear forces should neither be structured nor postured for preemptive attacks against another nation’s nuclear forces. It should be the declared policy of the United States that its nuclear forces are only for the purpose of deterring a nuclear attack. Since many fewer nuclear weapons are needed for such a “minimum deterrence” strategy, President Obama should begin to implement large reductions in U.S. nuclear forces. Furthermore, the U.S. by its actions, as well as its words, must seek to devalue nuclear weapons as instruments of national security, while fostering the establishment of global and regional security arrangements to facilitate their complete elimination. The nuclear weapons posture of the United States **exerts a significant influence on nuclear weapons programs in other countries**. For example, we know from the history of nuclear weapons espionage and proliferation that **foreign nuclear establishments closely follow technical and policy developments regarding U.S. nuclear weapons** and the U.S. nuclear weapons complex. This is yet another reason for adopting the new paradigm for sustaining the U.S. nuclear deterrent outlined in this report, which limits changes to nuclear weapons.

Proliferation is also driven by regional anxieties and conflicts that are not directly linked to U.S. nuclear or conventional military capabilities. Regional tensions are a significant driver of nuclear weapons development in **South Asia**, the **Middle East**, and on the **Korea**n Peninsula. Resolving tension in those regions must be seen as an important aspect of the strategic posture and nuclear weapons strategy of our nation. This requires **adherence to** a set of **principles that will detach nuclear** forces and threats of **preemption from the process of resolving political and territorial disputes**. Only then can negotiations reach beyond issues of national survival and attempt to reconcile the specific conflicting objectives that are causing tension. Regional military imbalances should be dealt with through cooperative security negotiations and arrangements to reduce such threats, or if necessary by adjustments in our own and allied conventional forces, not by the threatened use of nuclear forces or strategies for preemptive or preventive nuclear attacks.

In an ideal world, the question, “what are nuclear weapons for?” would be moot. There would be no nuclear weapons. As we move toward that vision, the United States should view its nuclear weapons for one purpose and one purpose only—to deter the use of nuclear weapons by others. The Department of Defense and the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) should structure U.S. nuclear forces and the weapons complex accordingly. Pg. 24-25

### 2nc—Solvency

**An NFU would solve demand-side and supply-side incentives for proliferation.**

**Korb and Rothman 12**—\*Lawrence J. Korb is a senior fellow at the Center for American Progress, and served as assistant secretary of defense during the Reagan administration from 1981-1985. In that position, he administered 70 percent of the country’s defense budget; his service earned him the DoD’s medal for Distinguished Public Service. He has written 20 books on national security issues. He is currently a member of the Bulletin’s Science and Security Board. \*\*Alexander H. Rothman is a special assistant with the national security and international policy team at the Center for American Progress [“No first use: The way to contain nuclear war in South Asia,” *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, 68(2) 34–42, EBSCO]

A US decision to declare a no-first-use policy would have benefits that extend far beyond South Asia. Such a policy would dramatically strengthen America’s arms control credentials, giving the US government the moral authority to push for stronger controls on weapons-usable nuclear technology and material. Also, efforts to negotiate a multilateral agreement banning the first use of nuclear weapons would inject life into the global nonproliferation regime.

The NPT is based on a compact between the nuclear and non-nuclear states. The non-nuclear states pledged to refrain from developing a nuclear weapons capacity, and in return, the states that already possessed nuclear weapons in 1968—the United States, the United Kingdom, France, China, and Russia—agreed to work toward “general and complete disarmament.”4

But the United States still owns the largest and most advanced arsenal in the world. To effectively pressure the non-nuclear states to live up to their NPT commitments, it is important that the United States clearly demonstrate its efforts to fulfill its own. Declaring a policy of no-first-use would go far in that direction. Moreover, reassuring other countries that they are safe from a US nuclear attack would reduce pressure for them to acquire a nuclear deterrent.

Perhaps more significant, a no-firstuse agreement that included the world’s major nuclear powers would create an opportunity to bring other nuclear weapons states (India, Pakistan, and Israel) into the global nonproliferation regime. There is no guarantee that any of these three states—each of which refused to sign the NPT and developed nuclear weapons in defiance of the international community—will adopt a no-first-use policy. But there are reasons to believe India, at least, would be interested.

Shortly after testing its first nuclear weapon in the late 1990s, India declared it “will not be the first to initiate a nuclear strike, but will respond with punitive retaliation should deterrence fail” (National Security Advisory Board on Indian Nuclear Doctrine, 1999). By the early 2000s, however, India had begun moving away from this unconditional policy, stating that it would consider a nuclear response to chemical or biological attacks (Kapur, 2011). US-led efforts to create an international no-first-use norm might help to persuade India to return to its original policy and thereby improve stability between the South Asian nuclear weapons states.

**Unilateral NFU will be modeled**

**Feiveson & Hogendoorn 3**—Co-director & Research Asst. in the Program on Science and Global Security @ Princeton University [Harold A. Feiveson (Senior research scientist @ Woodrow Wilson School, Princeton University) & Ernst Jan Hogendoorn, “No First Use of Nuclear Weapons,” The Nonproliferation Review, Summer 2003]

But for declaratory policies more generally (considering first the United States alone), in our view, the simplest, most direct, and most powerful approach is an unambiguous U.S. commitment not to use nuclear weapons first under any circumstances. The present formulation focusing on pledges to non-nuclear-weapon states may have seemed prudent when we were devising ways to persuade non-nuclear countries to agree to an indefinite extension of the NPT, or when we were concerned with Soviet aggression in Europe or elsewhere. But, such an approach is no longer necessary. To hold open the option for nuclear use against another nuclear weapon state is unnecessary and awkward, at a time when the United States is drawing closer to Russia and China, and U.S. relationships with India, Pakistan, or Israel are not conflictual. Even if not legally binding, strong, unhedged no-first-use commitments by the United States and other nuclear weapon states would strengthen the nonproliferation regime, and possibly also help set the stage for later, more binding, commitments.

It would be valuable for strong no-first-use commitments to be made by all the nuclear-weapon states, and one would hope that such commitments would follow a U.S. lead. But there is no reason for the United States to insist upon an international agreement before acting. The United States has undertaken unilateral initiatives in the past with the hope, later proven, that other states would follow suit—the most recent example being the 1991 decision by President George H.W. Bush to withdraw most U.S. tactical nuclear weapons from active deployment. In the case of a no-first-use pledge, a unilateral declaration by the United States would greatly increase pressure on other nuclear weapons states also to commit to no first use of nuclear weapons.

**US action changes the decision calculus of potential proliferants**

**Drell & Goodby 8**—Professor of physics @ Stanford University & Research fellow @ Hoover Institution [Sidney Drell (Senior fellow at Stanford’s Hoover Institution). & James Goodby (senior fellow at the Brookings Institution), “The Reality: A Goal of a World without Nuclear Weapons Is Essential,” The Washington Quarterly, Volume 31, Number 3, Summer 2008 pg. ProjectMuse]

Being caught in the nuclear deterrence trap at present levels of nuclear weapons is not a safe place in a world when 20 to 30 nations acquire nuclear arsenals. It was bad enough when just a few nations had them. Think of the Cuban missile crisis with the added uncertainty of many more decision centers and with terrorists ready to exploit the crisis. The February 2008 confrontation in the Persian Gulf between U.S. warships and Iranian speedboats may have been a case of false signals being injected into a crisis situation. In any event, **false signals in a deep crisis could trigger a nuclear exchange.**

It is imperative that responsible governments form a coalition of the willing to block the spread of nuclear weapons capabilities and, as Brown says, to roll back existing capabilities. The February 2008 Oslo conference showed very clearly that the idea of a global partnership enjoys strong support as a means of dealing with today’s nuclear threats.12 The conference also demonstrated that the efforts of governments will succeed or fail to the extent that their people are wholeheartedly behind the idea and to the extent that their goal is not to perpetuate indefinitely a regime based on discrimination but to remove discrimination between the nuclear haves and have-nots. A world without nuclear weapons is the only goal that will meet these conditions.

This assertion is counter to a frequently stated claim that expectations about the role of nuclear weapons in future international relations have no part in national decisionmaking and will not affect the decisions of other countries that currently are weighing the importance of nuclear weapons for their security. If decisionmakers think that some nations will still possess nuclear weapons or that more nations will acquire them and that possessing nuclear arsenals is going to be seen as normal and legitimate, they will logically lean toward keeping open the option to build a nuclear arsenal themselves and will exercise that option when conditions seem to require it. **Expectations about the actions of others** have **always play**ed **a large part in policymaking**, and it is no different in the nuclear arena.

Expectations are particularly important in this area of national defense because decisions are usually incremental and frequently the subject of some debate. Decisions about major issues, such as building a nuclear arsenal, and the daily decisions about carrying out a national policy are not the prerogative of a single leader. That was true even in Iraq. Debates about costs and benefits present opportunities for diverse opinions to have their effect. When those debates [End Page 30] occur, **it is imperative that at least some people expect that nuclear weapons will** not always be the indispensable trump card. Of course, the exercise of U.S. power and influence by itself cannot stop a cascade of decisions to build a nuclear bomb, but it can help to create a climate of international opinion in which rolling back nuclear weapons programs seems as reasonable an option as developing new ones. Thus, we envision a global bargain that must be nearly universal and not dominated by nuclear-armed superpowers, as it was during the Cold War.

### AFF—No Solvency

**Security Assurances are political footballs. Unilateral concessions are worthless**

**Johnson 9**—Acronym Institute Executive Director [Rebecca Johnson. (PhD from the London School of Economics & MA from the University of London School of Oriental and African Studies),, “Security Assurances for Everyone: A New Approach to Deterring the Use of Nuclear Weapons,” Disarmament Diplomacy, Issue No. 90, Spring 2009, pg. http://www.acronym.org.uk/dd/dd90/90sa.htm]

Since then, the issue of security assurances has been a political football at successive NPT meetings, with barely any substantive progress. Many states, especially from the non-aligned bloc, continue to assert that these resolutions are inadequate and call for multilaterally negotiated legally binding security assurances. Some want these to be negotiated in the Conference on Disarmament (CD), while others demand that negotiations take place under NPT auspices.[1]

**No verification. The pledge is not credible**

**Larson 99**—Professor of political science & social psychology @ University of California, Los Angeles [Deborah Welch Larson, “Words and Deeds: The Role of Declarations in US–Soviet Relations,” Declaratory Diplomacy: Rhetorical Initiatives and Confidence Building, Edited By: Michael Krepon, Jenny S. Drezin, and Michael Newbill, May 1999]

Under certain conditions, declarations may reassure the other side of a state’s peaceful intentions. The ability of declarations to bring the United States and Soviet Union closer together depended on the statement’s credibility, specificity, and verifiability. Some symbolic declarations were inherently credible, and changed adversarial relations by improving the political climate. For example, statements recognizing the other as a legitimate partner, admitting fault, or identifying shared interests in avoiding war had a positive impact, without need for further implementation. Recognition of the other state’s legitimacy is a prerequisite for more substantive cooperative measures.

Other types of statements in the US–Soviet context, however, needed additional measures to make them credible. Statements announcing specific cooperative actions were more believable than declarations of general intent, as long as the target state could verify whether the action was carried out. Bilateral declarations in which the superpowers committed themselves to specific actions—such as establishing a hotline or not orbiting nuclear weapons in space—helped create greater mutual confidence. Each state could see whether the other side was keeping the agreement. As George F. Kennan stated, in dealing with the Soviets it was better “to stick to strictly specific agreements which left aside all questions of motive and purported only to specify what each of us would do, when we would do it, and under what conditions it would be done.”1 pg. 1-2

**No support for their solvency claim. It is pure conjecture**

**Krepon & Drezin 99**—President of the Henry L. Stimson Center & Research Associate in the Confidence-Building Measures

Project @ Henry L. Stimson Center [Michael Krepon and Jenny S. Drezin (Finishing a Masters of International Affairs at the School of International and Public Affairs, Columbia University.), “Declaratory Diplomacy and Confidence Building,” Declaratory Diplomacy: Rhetorical Initiatives and Confidence Building, Edited By: Michael Krepon, Jenny S. Drezin, and Michael Newbill, May 1999]

There is no literature of “declaratory” confidence building to draw upon. As in any first attempt to clarify principles of successful practice, we are keenly aware of the difficulties of extrapolating from limited data. Since key data on declaratory confidence-building measures (CBMs) will remain elusive, given the secrecy surrounding decisions by national leaders to make important public declarations, we must start with the limited information available. Our case study authors have done an admirable job of ground breaking. We gratefully draw upon their work to suggest keys to successful practice, as well as practices to avoid if national leaders truly seek to use public declarations as part of a broader effort to alleviate tension and promote reconciliation. Insights can also be drawn from the abundant literature on strategies of deterrence, negotiation, and communication. We delve into this literature in order to understand ways by which declarations can be employed tactically in a more comprehensive strategy to build trust, lessen tension, and facilitate successful negotiation. The extent to which declaratory diplomacy succeeds depends on re-enforcing actions taken by political leaders before, concurrent with, or following the declarations.1 pg. 153

## \*Cred/Heg

### 1nc—Compensation

**Counterplan text: The Department of Defense must reduce its civilian payroll expenses using furloughs, reform its compensation system by using the preference-based benefits optimization approach, and reexamine the size and structure of the DoD civilian workforce.**

**Solves hegemony**

**Adams et al, 13**—Professor in the US Foreign Policy Program at the School of International Service, American University. He is also a Distinguished Fellow at the Stimson Center. He was a Fellow at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars (Gordon Adams, Stimson Center¶ David Barno, Lieutenant General USA (Ret.), Center for a New American Security¶ Nora Bensahel, Center for a New American Security¶ David Berteau, Center for Strategic and International Studies¶ Barry Blechman, Stimson Center¶ Shawn Brimley, Center for a New American Security¶ Thomas Donnelly, American Enterprise Institute¶ Mackenzie Eaglen, American Enterprise Institute¶ Paul Eaton, Major General USA (Ret.), National Security Network¶ Eric Edelman, Foreign Policy Initiative¶ Nathan Freier, Center for Strategic and International Studies¶ Mark Gunzinger, Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments¶ Christopher Griffin, Foreign Policy Initiative¶ Todd Harrison, Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments¶ Lawrence Korb, Center for American Progress¶ Andrew Krepinevich, Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments¶ Maren Leed, Center for Strategic and International Studies¶ Clark Murdock, Center for Strategic and International Studies¶ Michael O'Hanlon, Brookings Institution¶ Christopher Preble, Cato Institute¶ Russell Rumbaugh, Stimson Center¶ Jim Thomas, Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments¶ Kim Wincup, Center for Strategic and International Studies¶ Robert Work, Center for a New American Security¶ Dov Zakheim, Center for Strategic and International Studies (Consensus on defense reforms, June 3rd, 2013, http://www.aei.org/article/foreign-and-defense-policy/defense/consensus-on-defense-reforms/)

A striking bipartisan consensus exists today across the think tank community on the need for Pentagon and Congressional leaders to address the growing imbalances within the defense budget that threaten the health and long-term viability of America's volunteer military.¶ It is our shared belief that the Department of Defense urgently needs to close excess bases and facilities, reexamine the size and structure of the DoD civilian workforce, and reform military compensation. While we do not all agree on the best approach to reform in each case, we agree that if these issues are not addressed, they will gradually consume the defense budget from within. This will leave a smaller share of the budget to pay for the manning, training and equipping of our armed forces that make the U.S. military second to none.¶ There is no shortage of useful ideas on how to begin addressing these pressing matters. The challenge has been getting Congress and the administration to admit change is required and take action. For example, many in Congress are understandably fearful of repeating the mistakes of the most recent round of base closures in 2005. This round of closures was an anomaly in many respects because it occurred during a period of growth in defense spending and emphasized moving and consolidating facilities instead of outright closures. Consequently, DoD's inventory of buildings only fell from 2.4 billion square feet to 2.3 billion — roughly 85 percent of which is within the United States. This did not yield the kind of historical savings previous rounds of base closures have brought the taxpayer. Yet by DoD's own estimates, it currently pays to maintain some 20 percent excess capacity in its infrastructure—resources that could be better used to sustain our military muscle. To its credit, the administration has asked Congress to initiate another round of closures to reduce this excess capacity. Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle should partner with the Pentagon to identify the true scale of excess capacity and then work expeditiously to better match the Department's vast network of facilities to its shrinking force.¶ The size and structure of the civilian workforce is another area in need of careful examination and restructuring that Pentagon leadership has been reluctant to address. From 2001 to 2012, the active duty military grew by just 3.4 percent. Yet over the same timeframe the number of civilian defense employees grew by 17 percent, an increase five times greater than the armed forces. While this large workforce supports essential missions of the Department and warfighter, its growth over the past decade has, by and large, been unchecked and imbalanced. In the last four years alone, DoD civilians have grown by ten percent, but it is unclear if that growth was appropriately matched to the changing needs of a downsizing military and shifting strategy. This is a critical unanswered question for policymakers since DoD civilians are directly employed by the government, consuming $74 billion of the annual defense budget. Under sequestration, DoD must reduce its civilian payroll expenses in 2013 using furloughs, but furloughs are merely a temporary means of reducing costs. When the new fiscal year begins on October 1, DoD will still have more civilian employees than it can afford and quite possibly more than it needs. It is past time for the Pentagon to rightsize this workforce and make permanent reductions in a thoughtful and targeted manner.¶ Finally, we all agree on the need for a comprehensive evaluation and modernization of the military compensation system. This system has remained essentially unchanged for forty years, yet America's highly-mobile youth expect and value various forms of compensation differently today. Better meeting the needs of a 21st century workforce should be the driving force behind reform. But cost should be a consideration, as should the outdated forms of payment for the 80 percent of service members who serve less than a full 20-year career. From FY 2001 to FY 2012, the compensation cost per active duty service member grew 56 percent, adjusting for inflation, or a rate of 4.1 percent annually. DoD has proposed many incremental changes to the compensation system over the past five years to reduce this rate of growth, but each time Congress has largely rejected DoD's proposals. Yet if Congress fails to curb the growth in military compensation costs, they will continue to grow as the defense budget shrinks, crowding out funds needed for training, readiness and for the replacement of worn out equipment. Congress took a modest step forward on this issue in 2012 by establishing a bipartisan commission to examine the military compensation system but stopped short of requiring itself to act on the commission's recommendations. To make meaningful progress on this issue, leaders of both parties should, at a minimum, commit to bringing the recommendations of this commission to a vote in both chambers.¶ None of these reforms will be easy, painless, or popular. But they are absolutely essential to maintaining a strong national defense over the long term. These smart and responsible initiatives should be undertaken by Pentagon and Congressional leaders regardless of the level of defense spending. While these reforms are necessary, they are not of themselves sufficient to meet the fiscal and strategic challenges the military currently faces. Those of us who have joined together in support of these efforts find ourselves with differing views on many other issues, including the proper level of defense spending and how that money can best be allocated. But we are all in strong agreement on the need to pursue these key reforms for a transforming military. To paraphrase President Eisenhower, every unnecessary base that remains open, every excess civilian employee that remains on the payroll, and every mis-targeted dollar of military compensation signifies, in the final sense, a theft from both the training and equipping of our young men and women in uniform and, ultimately, the security of our citizens. It is time for Congress and the Obama administration to act.

### Solv: Compensation

**Reform key—need new funds**

**Center for American Progress, 12** (Reforming Military Compensation, May 7th, 2012, <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/security/report/2012/05/07/11573/reforming-military-compensation/>)

Military personnel costs have nearly doubled since fiscal year 2001 and now consume one-third of the Pentagon’s base budget—about $180 billion per year. If these costs are allowed to continue rising at their current rate, they will eat through the entire defense budget by FY 2039 unless the overall budget is increased to accommodate them.¶ The Pentagon’s personnel budget is composed of three major items: pay, health care, and retirement. The rapid cost growth in each of these programs presents a serious obstacle to the Obama administration’s efforts to bring defense spending under control after the massive increases that occurred over the past decade. If left unreformed, increasing expenses for each of these three programs will eat up a growing share of the defense budget, diverting funds from other critical national security initiatives such as training and modernization.¶ The threat that mounting personnel costs pose to military readiness has not gone unnoticed by the nation’s political and military leaders. In the Pentagon’s FY 2013 budget request, Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta and the Joint Chiefs of Staff highlight the need for significant changes to the Defense Department’s existing pay, health care, and retirement systems. In light of the pressing need to reform the military’s compensation systems, this report identifies opportunities for responsible savings in each of these three areas that do not break faith with the men and women who are serving or have served. Nor will these recommendations in any way affect those who have suffered physical or mental wounds in service of the country.

**Key to long term military missions—without changes now, US strength will wane inevitably**

**Harrison, 12**—the Senior Fellow for Defense Budget Studies at¶ the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments. Mr. Harrison¶ joined CSBA in 2009 from Booz Allen Hamilton, where he supported¶ clients across the Department of Defense assessing challenges¶ to modernization initiatives and evaluating the performance of acquisition¶ programs. He previously worked in the aerospace industry¶ developing advanced space systems and technologies and served as¶ a Captain in the U.S. Air Force Reserves (Todd, “REBALANCING MILITARY COMPENSATION: AN EVIDENCE-BASED APPROACH,” 2012)

Final Thoughts

The military compensation system has failed to adapt since the transition to an¶ all-volunteer force some four decades ago. As this study demonstrates, the preferences¶ of junior personnel—the short-term, non-career volunteers that make¶ an all-volunteer force possible—are significantly different from those of the career¶ personnel the compensation system was designed for before the transition¶ to an all-volunteer force. Keeping an all-volunteer force viable without fundamentally¶ reforming the compensation system has proven costly and it is almost¶ certainly unsustainable.¶ The fiscal crisis DoD and the nation now face provides a unique opportunity to¶ address the long-term structural problems in the military compensation system.¶ Military personnel costs are on an unsustainable trajectory, and if these structural¶ problems are not addressed the military will be left with essentially one choice¶ to control personnel costs—reduce the number of personnel. This would limit the¶ range of strategic choices available to future presidents and, if left unchecked,¶ would eventually result in a military too small for even the most basic missions.¶ To address the structural problems underlying the compensation system, DoD¶ should use the preference-based benefits optimization approach presented in this¶ study. This approach is grounded in empirical evidence and focused on the needs¶ and desires of those who serve. DoD should make decisions regarding compensation¶ policy with its eyes open, fully aware of the consequences of both its actions¶ and inactions. The goal should not simply be to reduce costs, although that is a¶ necessary component of reform to ensure the sustainability of the all-volunteer¶ force. Rather, the focus should be on improving the value of the compensation¶ system by shifting resources from undervalued forms of compensation to more¶ highly valued forms of compensation.

**Solves military readiness**

**Korb et al, 12**—a Senior Fellow at the Center for American Progress. He is also¶ a senior advisor to the Center for Defense Information and an adjunct professor at¶ Georgetown University (Lawrence, “Reforming Military Compensation,” May 2012, http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2012/05/pdf/military\_compensation.pdf)

Undoubtedly, any attempt to alter military pay and benefits will most likely meet¶ resistance from the military and veterans lobbies, who will label it as unfair to¶ those who have fought or are fighting the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. But as we¶ have pointed out repeatedly, most of those bearing the burden of those conflicts¶ will not get retirement benefits from the military. Therefore they will not be¶ affected by any changes to health care benefits for military retirees, and, in fact,¶ they will actually be helped by our recommended retirement reforms.¶ There is no doubt that this nation has deployed too many people who have volun¶ -¶ teered to defend the country on too many occasions. Yet this is not a situation that¶ can be rectified when we, as a nation, are providing unsustainable pay and benefits¶ to a few select retirees.¶ What is required is that our military and political leaders recognize—just as the Joint¶ Chiefs of Staff did in 1981 when they tried to convince then-President Ronald Reagan¶ not to fulfill his campaign promise to end draft registration—that an all-volunteer¶ military is a peacetime force. Wars, they said, require selective service mobilization.¶ Our political and military leaders who failed to carry out the selective service mobi¶ -¶ lization have committed a moral outrage and have attempted to make up for this¶ dereliction of duty by throwing money at the problem. This lack of moral courage¶ and failure to do the right thing has created problems for our military volunteers and¶ for the country. Moreover, as we noted throughout this report, the current health¶ care and pension systems for military retirees do nothing to support the majority of¶ those who have borne the brunt of the fighting over the past 10 years.¶ The deployment of men and women without sufficient time at home has resulted¶ in higher incidence of mental problems, domestic violence, alcoholism, and sui¶ -¶ cide. Further, by raising pay and benefits to unsustainable levels, they have jeopar¶ -¶ dized the nation’s ability to modernize and train the force for future missions. This¶ paper has dealt with the second problem, but the American people must demand¶ that our elected and appointed leaders never allow the first situation to arise again.

### AFF—Reforms Fail

**Cant implement changes and links to politics**

**Gingrich, 12** (Carl, “DoD Reforms Don't Go Far Enough,” May 2012, <http://www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/2012/05/21-military-reforms-gingrich>)

Closing Thoughts

Faced with budget reductions over the next decade and the potential for even greater reductions under the terms of the 2011 Budget Control Act, the Defense Department made some difficult decisions in the 2013 budget, including the proposal of modest reforms to military compensation. The purpose of these reforms is to address the fastest-growing costs in the defense budget, which are effectively crowding out other programs, and to generate internal savings to help mitigate austerity measures. Yet even if the need for reform is compelling, congressional support is far from certain. The irony is that the department faces a considerable challenge to implement reforms, even though they do not adequately achieve these purposes.¶ DoD’s proposed reforms will save money, but their limited scope and modest nature will not adequately control future cost growth. Moreover, they miss an important opportunity to update key elements of compensation. This article advocates a more robust approach, including immediate cash compensation reform, minor adjustments to the proposed health care reforms, and the elimination of many installation-based services. Together, these measures could save an additional $40 billion over the next decade while beginning the process of updating the compensation system. In sum, these reforms would slow cash compensation growth and reduce the value of noncash and deferred benefits by transferring greater costs to service members and retirees. But most importantly, these reforms would continue to compensate service members and retirees at levels commensurate with their sacrifice and commitment to the nation.

### AFF—AT: Increase Military $$

**Increasing military spending fails—need efficiency**

**Friedman, 9**—a research fellow in defense and homeland security studies. His areas of expertise include counter-terrorism, homeland security and defense politics. He is the author of dozens of op-eds and journal articles and co-editor of two books, including Terrorizing Ourselves: Why U.S. Counterterrorism Policy Is Failing and How to Fix It, published in 2010. He is a graduate of Dartmouth College and a Ph.D. candidate in Political Science and an affiliate of the Security Studies Program at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (Benjamin, “The US Should Cut Military Spending in Half,” April 27th, 2009, http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/us-should-cut-military-spending-half)

To really keep us safe, we should slash defense spending. Americans should prepare for fewer wars, not different ones. Far from providing our defense, our military posture endangers us. It drags us into others’ conflicts, provokes animosity, and wastes resources. We need a defense budget worthy of the name. We need military restraint. And that would allow us to cut defense spending roughly in half.

### 1nc—Cred Defense

**Credibility is already destroyed—middle east policies**

**Singh, 13**— managing director of The Washington Institute and a former senior director for Middle East affairs at the National Security Council(Michael, June 12th, 2013, U.S. Credibility on Iran at Stake in Syria <http://www.washingtoninstitute.org/policy-analysis/view/u.s.-credibility-on-iran-at-stake-in-syria>)

Western officials' inattention to this broader picture has real strategic consequences for U.S. interests. No matter how much American policymakers stress that the "military option" is on the table with respect to Iran's nuclear program, Washington's failure to push back on Iranian aggression in Syria, and the European Union's reluctance to penalize Hezbollah for its actions, undercut the credibility of Western warnings. Whatever the view of the West, for Tehran these issues, as well as the West's responses to them, are inextricably connected.¶ And not just for Tehran -- America's allies in the region also see U.S. actions in different theaters as linked, and they view with alarm Washington's passivity in the region. Consequently, American influence is everywhere diminished as friends and foes alike increasingly factor Washington out of policy decisions, and the force of America's allies collectively is reduced as each pursues policies independently not just of the United States but, to a great extent, of one another.¶ Once lost, influence is costly to regain, which gives rise to a vicious cycle. Re-establishing U.S. influence and credibility requires actions that, as crises deepen and multiply, become costlier as time passes, which reinforces the argument against taking them. Nowhere is this more evident than in Syria.¶ Costly interventions in Iraq and Afghanistan have soured U.S. officials on further entanglement in the Middle East. But disengaging from the region will only add to the costs of those wars, not compensate for them.

## \*Warming

### 1nc—CCS

**Counterplan text: The United States federal government should provide a tax credit for carbon capture and storage projects.**

**Nothing else can solve – CCS is the only short-term solution to warming**

**Der 10** - Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy @ U.S. Department of Energy [Dr. Victor K. Der (Former Director of the Office of Clean Energy Systems where he directed large-scale demonstration programs, including the Clean Coal Technology Demonstration program, the Power Plant Improvement Initiative, the Clean Coal Power Initiative, and FutureGen, a program for near-zero coal emissions. PhD in Mechanical Engineering from University of Maryland), “ARTICLE: CARBON CAPTURE AND STORAGE: AN OPTION FOR HELPING TO MEET GROWING GLOBAL ENERGY DEMAND WHILE COUNTERING CLIMATE CHANGE,” University of Richmond Law Review, March 2010, 44 U. Rich. L. Rev. 937

Top coal producing nations, including the United States, China, and India, hold domestic coal reserves so abundant that exploration for the resource appears neglected. n12 These nations are also [\*939] vested in an often extensive, dependent infrastructure. n13 Included in this infrastructure are coal-based generating plants with useful lives measured in **decades**, for which large investments have been made in response to long-term market signals. n14 A combination of considerations, including the length of **plant service**, investment requirements, **significant lead-times** needed to build energy infrastructure and gain cost improvements, and **coal's** relative **abundance** as an energy resource, make it unlikely that any country currently depending on this default fuel option n15 will completely replace its reliance in the short and intermediate term. n16 Even nations earnestly striving to move to more efficient or greener technologies in response to long-range market trends will need time to do so. Additionally, an estimated 1.5 billion people or more currently live without electricity. n17 If those nations create and utilize a fossil-fuel-powered grid n18 without the prospect of a scalable means for capturing CO(2), the global atmospheric buildup of this GHG would be direly exacerbated.

For the past several decades, the international research community, of which the U.S. Department of Energy's ("DOE") Office of Fossil Energy is an important part, has traveled a road of growing discovery regarding global climate change. During this period, policy and scientific debates about the role played by anthropogenic (i.e., human-induced) GHG emissions in warming the Earth's climate have continued. n19 Meanwhile, researchers [\*940] have progressively built a body of knowledge based on experiments, observations, modeling, theory testing, the study of ancient ice cores, and examination of historical and current weather data. n20 The **consensus among the scientific community** emanating from this gradual accumulation of evidence and analysis is that rising fossil fuel CO(2) emissions are contributing significantly to more extreme temperature swings and could permanently and adversely impact the Earth's climate. n21

Complicating matters, the formidable challenge of reducing GHG emissions is coming at a time when significantly more energy will be needed to meet expected future demand, much of which will come from developing countries. n22 While alternative sources of energy exist, **short-and intermediate-term forecasts** demonstrate there are barriers to global substitution, including expense, intermittency, adjustability, geographic concentration, and long development lead-times. n23 The practical challenge facing the United States and other developed nations is how to continue to depend on coal as a primary electricity source while assuring this reliance is both economically and environmentally sustainable. Of equal importance in resolving this issue, however, is an associated philosophical challenge: in an increasingly carbon-constrained world, what workable solution can we provide for coal-producing and consuming nations, whose participation in the effort to resolve atmospheric CO(2) buildup is critical to success?

Underlying all of these issues is the fact that climate change is a complex and challenging problem with many variables and no all-encompassing answer. As a result, many think developing a portfolio or range of options is the most suitable, potentially effective, and sustainable response. n24 While energy efficiency improvements, increased use of renewables, and greater utilization [\*941] of nuclear power are important components of this portfolio, among the most promising potential solutions for countries reliant on large fossil fuel reserves is CO(2) capture and storage ("CCS"), also known as sequestration. n25 This procedure can reduce CO(2) output from present stationary emitting sources and help avoid future atmospheric emissions. n26

For a number of years, DOE has been at the forefront of domestic and international research and development ("R&D") efforts to actively pursue the capture and storage of CO(2) emissions from fossil fuel power and industrial plants. n27 For example, over thirty years ago, DOE improved enhanced oil recovery ("EOR") with low temperature CO(2) flooding, as disclosed in the Comberiati patent application from 1979. n28 Because of CCS research and other worldwide R&D initiatives, n29 if there is a sufficient price placed on emitting CO(2) within the decade, CCS could transition from experimental and demonstration levels to **global commercial deployment**. While substantial progress has been made, CCS is at a critical stage of development: there are still several significant technical and non-technical hurdles n30 that must be overcome before this transition can occur and the technology is firmly established as an effective option for reducing CO(2) emissions. Many of these challenges are being addressed directly and indirectly through both the DOE R&D program and international partnerships. Although significant and complex, none of these hurdles [\*942] appear insurmountable, n31 yet failure to deal with them in a timely and effective fashion could delay - or even prevent - expedited and comprehensive CCS deployment.

The atmosphere of international urgency for dealing with the climate change issue is further driving an accelerated deployment of CCS. Some experts suggest cost-competitive **CCS must be deployed** in a majority of countries and situations by 2020. n32 Many also believe this action is **necessary** to reduce energy-related CO(2) emissions enough to begin the process of stabilizing atmospheric GHG concentrations to help avoid possibly **catastrophic warming** later in the century. n33 The crux of the matter is this: the manner in which these issues are resolved will likely impact not only the effectiveness of CCS as part of a portfolio solution, but also global energy supply, use, and cost, as well as the growth of economies primarily dependent on coal for electricity. Cumulatively, these issues add up to a daunting challenge that the international community recognizes it must address with alacrity. //1ac

### Solv: Warming

**CCS is a bridge to new energy supplies and consumption technologies**

**Marston & Moore 08** – Energy Regulatory Attorney & Oil and Gas Attorney [Philip M. Marston & Patricia A. Moore, “FROM EOR TO CCS: THE EVOLVING LEGAL AND REGULATORY FRAMEWORK FOR CARBON CAPTURE AND STORAGE,” Energy Law Journal, Vol. 29:421, 2008

In oversimplified terms, the CCS process will consist in capturing the carbon content of coal (whether before, during, or immediately following combustion), removing impurities such as water, nitrogen, hydrogen sulfide, and mercury (among others) and then combining the carbon with oxygen to create CO2 for removal from the premises by pipeline. While carbon dioxide has been captured on a commercial scale for several decades by separating CO2 from natural gas production or during certain industrial processes, the current focus has shifted to the possibility of capturing carbon dioxide from coal-fired electricity generating facilities. This change of focus is due of course to the large role played by coal-fired power plants in overall CO2 emissions. Coal is recognized as the single largest contributing fuel source to global CO2 emissions, accounting for roughly forty percent of all such emissions, perhaps seventy percent of which are attributable to coal-fired electricity generation.31

Proponents of CCS believe that it will be an enabling technology that may eventually be employed on a vast scale to allow the United States and other coal-based economies to make significant reductions in CO2 emissions even while continuing to burn large quantities of coal. In this view, CCS would serve as a transitional, or “bridge” technology, between coal-based power generation to newer energy supply and consumption technologies (including building and urban designs) that reduce CO2 emissions or avoid the need for fossil fuel combustion in the first place.32 Because capturing CO2 from power plants is expected to be costly, however, it is expected that some incentive or subsidy will be required, at least in the initial phases of implementation (which may last a decade or more). This view is embodied in a number of governmental initiatives in various stages of review or adoption around the world.33 These include actions by the European Union (EU),34 the Clean Development Mechanism under the rubric of the Kyoto-based Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC),35 and various legislative proposals or action by United States state legislatures36 and by the United States Congress.37 Pg. 431-433

**CSS leads to biomass and negative emissions – That solves**

**Luckow et al. 10** – Scientist @ [Pacific Northwest National Laboratory](http://www.linkedin.com/company/4714?trk=pro_other_cmpy) [P Luckow, JJ Dooley, Marshall Wise (Scientist in the Integrated Modeling & Energy @ PNNL) & SH Kim, “Son Kim (Engineer @ PNNL) “Biomass Energy for Transport and Electricity: Large Scale Utilization Under Low CO2 Concentration Scenarios,” Pacific Northwest National Laboratory PNNL-19124, January 2010

5.0 Conclusion

From the modeling results in this study, the availability of CCS is the key determinant for how biomass will be used in the energy system under a climate policy. In the electric sector, when the carbon prices are sufficiently high, biomass will be paired with CCS when it is available. When CCS is available, using biomass to make electricity while venting CO2 emissions becomes an economically uncompetitive technology in the same way that coal without CCS does. In the refining sector, biomass is also paired with CCS when available, though at the end use the emissions from combustion of the final refined liquid are always vented to the atmosphere. Despite not capturing all the carbon in the biomass, in the absence of very low cost electric cars, the use of biomass replaces oil, resulting in a significant mitigation of emissions. With CCS, this study had shown that biomass will play a major role in providing energy for both electricity and liquid fuels.

The result is much different when CCS is not available. Without CCS, much of the biomass is utilized in transportation, where it is a competitive low carbon option. Without CCS, biomass in the electric sector is no longer a source of negative CO2 emissions but instead just one of several low or zero carbon sources. In this case, the electric sector increases nuclear and renewables under a climate policy and leaves the biomass for the transportation sector.

The percentage of biomass energy that uses CCS will increase with higher carbon prices. Figure 16 plots the CCS utilization percentages for biomass as a function of carbon price, for each of the scenarios studied that included CCS. The percentage of biomass with CCS rises rapidly from 10% at $100/tC to 90% at $500/tC. Beyond a carbon price of $1000/tC, essentially 100% of biomass is used with CCS. Both policies appear to follow the same path, which is expected given that CCS technology assumptions remain consistent across the policy choices.

Although not varied in the scenarios in this paper, assumptions about other technologies such as nuclear, renewable, hydrogen, and energy end-use technologies will also have important implications on the use and value of biomass and biomass with CCS. For example, without new nuclear reactors and other low carbon alternatives, more biomass will be utilized in the electricity sector, in combination with an increased use of coal and gas with CCS. The availability of a high supply of low carbon electricity that nuclear and renewables provide is an important factor in allowing for biomass to be used in the transportation sector.

Given a climate policy in which the carbon in land is valued equally with carbon in the energy system, biomass energy used in conjunction with CCS has the potential to be a major component of achieving low concentration targets. Despite the higher technology costs of CCS, the resulting negative emissions when used in conjunction with biomass are an important step to meeting strict carbon caps, and help to offset venting of CO2 from sectors of the energy system that may be more expensive to mitigate, such as oil use in transportation.

The bottom line is that, either in the electricity or technology sector, biomass will be used with CCS when available. At the point of use, biomass is simply another fuel, differing very little from coal. In the presence of a strict emissions constraint, the high value place on CO2 means that the emissions from biomass are very valuable, and should be captured when feasible. While biomass alone is an attractive source of net-zero emission energy, when coupled with CCS, net negative emissions are far superior economically in a climate policy context. Pg. 23-24

### AFF—Doesn’t solve warming

**Decades away**

**Ming & Melzer 10** – President of Research Partnership to Secure Energy for America & Board President of the Texas Carbon Capture and Storage Association C. Michael Ming (BS w/ distinction in Petroleum Engineering and an MS in Engineering Management from Stanford University), & L. Stephen Melzer (President of Melzer Consulting. Provides background materials and advising clients of business strategies related to CO2 EOR and CCS), “CO2 EOR: A Model For Significant Carbon Reductions,” Conference Paper Presented at the Symposium on the Role of EOR in Accelerating the Deployment of CCS, July 23, 2010, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, pg. <https://rfflibrary.wordpress.com/2011/05/25/role-of-enhanced-oil-recovery-in-accelerating-the-deployment-of-carbon-capture-and-sequestration>

One of the multiple future technology options required to mitigate carbon emissions from traditional fossil fuel power generation and other industrial processes is to capture and sequester (CCS) those emissions. Yet, at present, CCS at any meaningful scale relative to the extraordinary volumes of CO2 emissions being produced is still years and possibly decades away. Capture costs appear to be unacceptably high, the “energy penalty” for capture on conventional existing coal fired power is far too high, the distribution network to move the CO2 to repositories is mostly not in place, and the determination of safe and acceptable permanent repositories is not ready for accepting CO2 for a multitude of reasons. Yet at the same time there is actually high demand and higher potential for CO2 in existing oilfield tertiary enhanced oil recovery (EOR) operations where there exists both amenable pore volume and established CO2 related infrastructure and expertise. Pg.1

**CCS for coal plants is a decade away**

**Marston & Moore 08** – Energy Regulatory Attorney & Oil and Gas Attorney [Philip M. Marston & Patricia A. Moore, “FROM EOR TO CCS: THE EVOLVING LEGAL AND REGULATORY FRAMEWORK FOR CARBON CAPTURE AND STORAGE,” Energy Law Journal, Vol. 29:421, 2008

As discussed above, the current literature and, indeed, current domestic and international events indicate that actual implementation of any new statutory scheme governing permanent storage of CO2 outside of oil and gas-bearing reservoirs is likely some years away. Even if legislation were passed, implementation by the relevant agencies would take considerable time. Moreover, actual implementation of CCS for coal-fired power plants will require new engineering and construction of commercial-sized pilot projects to prove the capture technology on a commercial scale. Only after these initial pilot commercial-scale projects have proven economically successful would deployment of the technology in new coal-fired power plants begin on a commercial scale. What this means is that – regardless of the current, very high level of interest in CCS projects – there will not be actual capture and storage of any considerable quantity of CO2 from coal-fired generating plants for years, and very possibly a decade or more.221 While CO2 capture from power plants may be years away, new anthropogenic sources of CO2 from industrial processes such as ammonia plants and CTL facilities are expected to come on line in the relatively near future.222 For this reason this article focuses here on a path forward for CCS that may be immediately available to a perspicacious oil and gas operator for creating a transitional path, from the incidental storage of CO2 that occurs naturally during EOR operations, to a future opportunity post-EOR operations for the incremental storage for CCS purposes.

### 1nc—Carbon Tax

**The United States Federal Government should implement a 15-year tax of $15 per ton on carbon dioxide emissions in the United States.**

**Counterplan spurs renewable development – solves the case**

**OEP 12** (Our Energy Policy, “Can We Get It Right on Gas?,” 8-5-12,

http://www.ourenergypolicy.org/can-we-get-it-right-on-gas/)

“A sustained [natural] gas glut could **undermine new investments** in wind, solar, nuclear and energy efficiency systems – which have zero emissions – and thus keep us addicted to fossil fuels for decades,” Friedman writes. He suggests that such a scenario would reduce natural gas’ societal value because the economic and energy security benefits of domestic natural gas come with significant environmental trade-offs, such as climate impact and hydraulic fracturing. To maximize natural gas’ value to society, Friedman argues for “nationally accepted standards for controlling methane leakage, for controlling water used in fracking — where you get it, how you treat the polluted water that comes out from the fracking process and how you protect aquifers — and for ensuring that communities have the right to say no to drilling.” He goes on to say that a carbon tax, which would **raise the price** of natural gas, could raise enough revenue to help pay down the national debt, lower income and corporate taxes, and help make renewables cost-competitive with natural gas.

**Counterplan solves the economy, warming and avoids politics**

**Millikin 12** (Mike, Editor of Green Car Congress, “MIT study suggests carbon tax could help reduce US deficit, lower other taxes, reduce emissions,” 8-27-12, <http://www.greencarcongress.com/2012/08/reilly-20120827.html>)

A new report from MIT’s Joint Program on the Science and Policy of Global Change suggests that a tax on carbon emissions could help raise the money needed to reduce the US deficit, while improving the economy, lowering other taxes and reducing emissions. In the report—Carbon Tax Revenue and the Budget Deficit: A Win-Win-Win Solution?—John Reilly, co-director of the Joint Program and co-author Sebastian Rausch, now at ETH Zurich University, calculated the impact a carbon tax starting at $20 per ton would have using a national economic model that details energy, taxes and household incomes. They found that the tax would raise $1.5 trillion in revenue, which could then be used to reduce personal or corporate income taxes, extend the payroll tax cut that expires this year, maintain spending on social programs—or some combination of these options—while reducing the deficit. Bush-era tax cuts are scheduled to expire at the end of 2012, leading to interest in raising revenue through a carbon tax. This revenue could be used to either cut other taxes or to avoid cuts in Federal programs. There is a body of economic research suggesting that such an arrangement could be a win- win-win situation. The first win—Congress could reduce personal or corporate income tax rates, extend the payroll tax cut, maintain spending on social programs, or some combination of these options. The second win—these cuts in income taxes would spur the economy, encouraging more private spending and hence more employment and investment. The third win—carbon dioxide (CO2) pollution and oil imports would be reduced. —Rausch and Reilly (2012) The analysis used the MIT US Regional Energy Policy (USREP) model to evaluate the effect of a carbon tax as part of a Federal budget deal. Reilly and Rausch compared a baseline scenario—in which temporary payroll cuts and the Bush tax cuts are allowed to expire—to several scenarios that include a carbon tax starting at $20 per ton in 2013 and rising at 4%. They found that whether revenue is used to cut taxes or to maintain spending for social programs, the economy is better off with the carbon tax than if taxes remain high to maintain Federal revenue. They also found that, in addition to economic benefits, a carbon tax reduces carbon dioxide emissions to 14% below 2006 levels by 2020, and 20% below by 2050. Oil imports remain at about today’s level, and compared to the case with no carbon tax, are 10 million barrels per day less in 2050. The carbon tax would shift the market toward renewables and other low carbon options, and make the purchase of more fuel-efficient vehicles more economically desirable. In shifting the market through a tax on emissions rather than through tax credits for renewable sources, the nation would be raising revenue rather than spending it. This contributes to the win-win-win result we expected for the nation’s economy and environment.

### 2nc—Solves

**Carbon Tax Saves Environment and Economy- Increases Revenue and destroys Warming**

**Gale 13** 3/13 (co-director of the Tax Policy Center, Arjay and Frances Miller Chair in Federal Economic Policy at the Brookings Institution, ormer assistant professor of economics at UCLA and senior economist at the Council of Economic Advisers, coeditor of Economic Effects of Fundamental Tax Reform, Rethinking the Estate and Gift Tax, and Private Pensions and Public Policies, director of the Retirement Security Project at the Brookings Institution) (William, “A Carbon Tax is a Win-Win for the Economy and the Environment,” 3/12/13)

<http://taxvox.taxpolicycenter.org/2013/03/12/a-carbon-tax-is-a-win-win-for-the-economy-and-the-environment/>

Looking for a way to improve the operation of the economy, lower our dependence on foreign oil, reduce pollution, slow global warming, cut government spending, and decrease the long-term budget deficit is? Then you should support a carbon tax, which could help the nation address all these issues simultaneously. A new paper I’ve written with Samuel Brown and Fernando Saltiel, [Carbon Taxes as Part of the Fiscal Solution](http://www.taxpolicycenter.org/publications/url.cfm?ID=1001666), argues the tax would even be a good idea if we didn’t have a budget problem.Although a carbon tax would be new for the U.S. government, it already has been implemented in several European countries (though not always in the manner advocated by economists), Australia, and three Canadian provinces. California recently initiated a cap-and-trade system, which auctions carbon permits to companies and functions much like a tax.A carbon tax makes good economic sense: Unlike most taxes, it can correct a market failure and make the economy more efficient. Although there are substantial benefits from energy consumption, there are also big societal costs that people don’t pay for when they produce and consume energy – including there air and water pollution, road congestion, and climate change. Since buyers of fossil fuels don’t directly bear many of these costs, they ignore them when they decide how much and what kind of energy to buy. And that results in too much consumption and production of these fuels. Economists have long recommended a tax on fossil fuel energy sources as an efficient way to address this problem.A carbon tax could significantly reduce emissions. Tufts University economist [Gilbert Metcalf estimated](http://www.nber.org/papers/w14375.pdf?new_window=1) that a $15 per ton tax on CO2 emissions that rises over time would reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 14 percent. [Another study](http://www.nrel.gov/docs/fy10osti/47312.pdf) estimated that the European countries’ carbon taxes have reduced emissions significantly.Estimates suggest that a well-designed tax in the United States could raise as much as 1 percent of Gross Domestic Product in new, revenue—money that could be used to reform other taxes, [as discussed by Donald Marron and Eric Toder](http://www.taxpolicycenter.org/publications/url.cfm?ID=412744). Alternatively, those new revenues could help reduce the country’s substantial and unsustainable budget deficits.A carbon tax would also reduce America’s dependence on foreign sources of energy and create better market incentives for conservation, the use of renewable energy sources, and the production of energy-efficient goods. The permanent change in price signals from enacting a carbon tax would stimulate new private sector research and innovation in developing energy-saving technologies and in harnessing renewable energy. The implementation of a carbon tax also offers opportunities to reduce and reform federal spending on other energy-related programs.One downside: A carbon tax is regressive since low-income households use relatively more of their income to buy energy than those with higher incomes. However, this problem could be addressed by rebating some of the carbon tax revenues as refundable income tax credits or payroll tax credits.Critics also fear that a unilateral U.S. carbon tax would hurt the domestic economy while doing little to reduce world-wide carbon emissions or levels. This view, however, understates the value of a permanent price signal for research and development and the social and environmental value of emissions reductions that would come from U.S. action. It also discounts the experience of other countries that have unilaterally created carbon taxes. There is no evidence that they paid a significant price, or any price at all, in terms of economic growth. Moreover, if there is ever going to be multilateral action to limit carbon emissions, the US – as the largest per-capita emitter of carbon dioxide – needs to take a leading role.A carbon tax isn’t perfect. But relative to the alternatives, it has an enormous amount to offer.

### Solv: Warming

**Solves warming—emissions**

**Fox 9** (Carolyn Fischer and Alan K. Fox, Resources for the Future, “Combining Rebates with Carbon Taxes,” May 2009, <http://www.rff.org/rff/documents/rff-dp-09-12.pdf>)

The numerical results illustrate these points. Rebates are higher for the trade-sensitive, energy-intensive manufacturing sectors, such as iron and steel. Refined oil products are highly complementary with emissions of uncovered sectors, so they should be taxed in addition to the carbon tax when the transportation sector is not covered. **Electricity generation** is the **largest emitter** and has important countervailing effects. On the one hand, it is complementary with downstream emitting sectors, but that includes already-covered sectors and many sectors that are trade sensitive and subject to foreign leakage. Thus, a modest rebate can help redistribute emissions reductions among these sectors in a more cost-effective way—at least for the implementing country—but at a cost of forgoing significant reductions.

**Creates electricity generation – comprises a significant amount of emission**

**Renewable Energy Focus ‘9** (“Renewable energy is critical to climate change mitigation, says IEA”, 12-7, <http://www.renewableenergyfocus.com/view/5745/renewable-energy-is-critical-to-climate-change-mitigation-says-iea/>)

The International Energy Agency (IEA) will present “key findings” on renewable energy during the climate conference in Copenhagen. To highlight the important role that renewable energy “must play” in achieving the objectives of climate change mitigation, IEA will present data from its scenario analysis and energy technology roadmaps at three separate side events during the UN climate conference (COP15). It has scheduled ‘IEA Sustainable Energy Policy & Technology Day’ for 16 December; a ‘World Energy Outlook 2009' briefing on 17 December; and a joint event on 15 December with the newly-created International Renewable Energy Agency (IRENA), Renewable Energy Policy Network for the 21st Century (REN21), IEA’s Renewable Energy Technology Deployment Implementing Agreement, the European Renewable Energy Council and Greenpeace. IEA’s latest World Energy Outlook says renewable energy will be the second largest contributor (after energy efficiency) to the reduction of energy-related CO2 emissions by 2030. A range of renewable energy technologies will offset the annual emission of 3100 megatonne (Mt), or 23% of the total CO2 reductions necessary to stabilise CO2 concentration at levels to hold global long-term temperature increase to 2ºC. The increasing role of renewable energy will be particularly significant in the power sector, and IEA will use their sessions at COP15 to explain in detail what steps will be needed to achieve the full potential of renewable energy around the world. IEA will also use COP15 as a venue to present results from recent studies on implementing energy efficiency as a key to a sustainable energy future. The agency will provide details on the steps needed to capture the “huge potential” of efficiency to reduce dependence on fossil fuels and to reduce GHG emissions. IEA suggests that 57% of cost-effective GHG abatement potential should come from energy efficiency, and IEA member countries have committed to ensure “a co-ordinated, efficient approach to promoting energy efficiency.” It recently suggested a set of 25 energy efficiency policy recommendations which, if implemented globally, could save 8200 Mt of CO2 emissions a year by 2030. The climate change negotiations have focused on creation, expansion and improvement of the global carbon market through mechanisms such as cap-and-trade and sectoral approaches. To achieve these goals, a number of key low-carbon technologies such as renewable energy need to be rapidly developed, demonstrated and commercialised. These technologies include offshore wind energy, advanced solar energy, sustainable biofuels, electric vehicles, carbon capture & storage, and fully-integrated energy efficiency, and the IEA is developing a series of Energy Technology Roadmaps to provide strategic guidance for advancing these technologies. Each roadmap will contain technology-specific analysis of investment needs, policy frameworks, technology development and public engagement milestones and actions that are needed to deliver renewable energy and low-carbon potential by 2050. “Electricity is the largest, fastest-growing emitter of energy-related CO2,” the IEA explains. “Urgent action is needed to curb the growth in power-related CO2 emissions in the developing world” and the agency will explain in Copenhagen how new climate policy options can address this problem.

**Solves warming—leads to CCS**

**Jia 7** (Anne, science-writing intern at Stanford News Service, “Researchers examine carbon capture and storage to combat global warming,” Stanford Report, 6-13-12, <http://news.stanford.edu/news/2007/june13/carbon-061307.html>)

Engineers have more than three decades of experience putting carbon dioxide into oil reservoirs, where it increases oil production by making the oil expand and "thin out" such that it flows more easily, Benson said. "That experience gives us confidence that we know how to drill the wells, push the [carbon dioxide] in and say something about what will happen when it gets down there," said Orr. Currently, three industrial-scale projects are pumping millions of tons of carbon dioxide into the ground every year. Two of them represent the first efforts at storage in deep saline aquifers. A Stanford team also has begun researching storage of **carbon dioxide** in deep coal beds. In coal, chemical bonds form between the carbon dioxide and the coal, making the method potentially more secure than others, the researchers said. Even better, the process can free natural gas that sits on the coal's surface. Natural gas is a relatively clean fossil fuel, which can then be burned in place of coal, said Mark Zoback, professor of geophysics and a researcher on the project on storage in coal. The project, which is funded by GCEP and GEOSEQ—a partnership involving the Department of Energy, several national labs, government groups and industry partners—is still in its early stages, the researchers said. Of all the projects, only one is turning a **profit** without recovering oil. Sleipner, an industrial-scale project run by Norwegian oil company Statoil, injects carbon dioxide into a deep saline aquifer beneath the North Sea floor. Its economic success, scientists say, is due to the presence of Norway's high **carbon taxes**, which give green technologies an advantage by discouraging carbon emissions. Carbon taxes are charged to a company for every ton of carbon dioxide it emits, so that it becomes increasingly costly to be dirty. Thus the taxes **encourage companies** to be green. When a clean technology is expensive—incorporating carbon capture and storage into a power plant costs $30 to $70 per ton of carbon dioxide—taxes on emissions level the playing field and help make it viable. A policy framework, therefore, is essential for making carbon capture and storage **economical**, the Stanford researchers said.

### AFF—Fails

**Carbon Tax is Useless- Will do Nothing to help environment**

**Michaels 13** 7/13 (Forbes writer for interface of public policy and public science) (Patrick, The Carbon Tax: Washington's Latest Bad Idea, Oddly Shepherded By Republicans, 7/5/13,) http://www.forbes.com/sites/patrickmichaels/2013/07/05/the-carbon-tax-washingtons-latest-bad-idea-oddly-shepherded-by-republicans/

Every year, as temperatures approach their July peak, our “greener” friends trot out global warming horrors and even more horrible policies—witness President Obama’s recently proposed diktats. But this year it’s different, as some conservatives are pushing a oxymoronic “revenue neutral” carbon tax. You’d think people in D.C. might learn from others. Just last month, precisely such a tax took down Australia’s Prime Minister, Julia Gillard. She had succeeded Kevin Rudd, who was bounced out of office for his support of a cap-and-trade scheme. Rudd is now temporarily back, likely to be replaced when his Labour party pays the ultimate price for Gillard’s tax in September’s general election.Washington’s version of political suicide is the brainchild of former Congressman Bob Inglis (R-SC), who lost his primary by a 70-29 margin when he got global warming religion. He now heads the “Energy and Enterprise Initiative” at R Street Partners, a relatively new Washington think tank which split off from Chicago’s libertarian/conservative Heartland Institute over their aggressive stance on climate change.Inglis’ theory—you can’t make this kind of stuff up—is that his tax is going to be magically adopted by Congress in some type of grand deal during President Obama’s last year. Ask yourself: when was the last time the opposition party made big deals with a lame duck Administration?Every polemic I have seen on the carbon tax—including Inglis’—particularly and specifically ignores recent global warming science in complete contravention of a mountain of evidence now accruing that global warming was dramatically overforecast by scientists who had every incentive to do just that. Furthermore, with regard to “revenue neutrality,’ the notion that gazillions of dollars will float through Washington “unmolested” (h/t to Heritage’s David Kreutzer for that zinger) is as foolhardy as ignoring what is happening in climate science.Ignoring the science means disregarding 14 separate experiments published in the scientific literature in the last two years, all showing that way too much global warming was forecast. The fact that there isn’t any temperature trend whatsoever in the last 16 years is forcing scientists to confront the reality that the carbon taxers are choosing to evade.The failure of the forecasts of dramatic warming is systematic. A presentation in late June at the American Geophysical Union’s Washington meeting on climate science and policy, titled “Policy Implications of Climate Models on the Verge of Failure,” demonstrated that, using the normative rules of science, the forecasts presuming big warming must now be abandoned.One can use the EPA’s own model (curiously, acronymed MAGICC) to assess the effects on global temperature of emissions reductions that would be caused by a carbon tax. Assuming outrageously high taxes that would reduce them by 83% (giving Americans the per-capita emissions of 1867), the amount of warming that would be prevented is too small to measure on the 50-year time scale. Anything less does even less.Irrationalities like conservatives supporting something that cannot happen (a revenue-neutral energy tax) don’t arise in a vacuum, which prompts some speculation as to who is supplying the massive amount of money needed to propagandize something that seems so absurd.A recent Congressional Budget Office (CBO) analysis, “Effects of a Carbon Tax on the Economy and the Environment” may include a clue. The report is pretty much boilerplate except for where it departs into a specific section on the implementation of the tax on coal producers:*“…analysts suggest that because the bulk of coal is used to generate electricity, emissions resulting from coal could be covered by taxing electricity generators on the basis of their actual emissions”.*Whose analysts?Taxing coal at the point of electricity generation will be a decreasing expense to the industry (since EPA has pretty much outlawed any new coal-fired power plants), more than made up for by the bonanza of tax-free coal “leaking” from the highly-regulated U.S. to ports around the world.Maybe this explains the sudden emergence of a bizarre carbon tax based on a completely irrational set of assumptions being aggressively pushed by an obscure think tank and a former congressman.

### AFF—Links to Ptx

Links to politics

Leonhardt 12 (David, the Washington bureau chief of The New York Times, “There’s Still Hope for the Planet,” 7-21-12, <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/07/22/sunday-review/a-ray-of-hope-on-climate-change.html>)

The successes make it possible at least to fathom a transition to clean energy that does not involve putting a price on carbon — either through a carbon tax or a cap-and-trade program that requires licenses for emissions. It was exactly such a program, supported by both Barack Obama and John McCain in the 2008 campaign, that died in Congress in 2010 and is now opposed by almost all Congressional Republicans and some coal-state and oil-state Democrats. To describe the two approaches is to underline their political differences. A cap-and-trade program sets out to make the energy we use more expensive. An investment program aims to make alternative energy less expensive. Most scientists and economists, to be sure, think the best chance for success involves both strategies: if dirty energy remains as cheap as it is today, clean energy will have a much longer road to travel. And even an investment-only strategy is not guaranteed to continue. The clean-energy spending in Mr. Obama’s 2009 stimulus package has largely expired, while several older programs are scheduled to lapse as early as Dec. 31. In the current political and fiscal atmosphere, their renewal is far from assured. Still, the clean-energy push has been successful enough to leave many climate advocates believing it is the single best hope for preventing even hotter summers, more droughts and bigger brush fires. “Carbon pricing is going to have an uphill climb in the U.S. for the foreseeable future,” says Robert N. Stavins, a Harvard economist who is a leading advocate for such pricing, “so it does make sense to think about other things.”