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### Neolib

#### Movements against neoliberalism are growing in Latin America and spill over -- the plans reifies neoliberalism --- ethics require we de-link to preserve the environment and indigenous culture.

Harris 8 (Richard L Harris: Professor of Global Studies at California State University, Monterey Bay; Managing Editor of the Journal of Developing Societies (SAGE India); and Coordi­ nating Editor of Latin American Perspectives (SAGE USA). “Latin America’s Response to Neoliberalism and Globalization,” http://www.nuso.org/upload/articulos/3506\_2.pdf)

The economic, political and social development of the Latin American and Caribbean countries is obstructed by the power relations and international structures that regulate the world capitalist system. The structures of this system provide a hierarchical political and economic exoskeleton that constrains all national efforts to pursue any significant degree of self-directed, inward-oriented, balanced and environmentally sustainable development. Indeed, the geopolitical power structures that preserve and support the world capitalist system have made it almost impossible for the governments of the core as well as the peripheral countries in this system to pursue a path of inward-oriented, equitable, democratically controlled and environmentally sustainable development (Amin 2001b:20). Since the 1980s, inter-American relations and the economic, political and social development of the Latin American and Caribbean states have been shaped by these geo­ political structures and the neoliberal strategic agenda put forward by the government of the United States of America (USA), the major transnational corporations and the three major international financial institutions (IFIs) that operate in the Latin American and Caribbean region (Harris and Nef, 2008). This later group of IFIs includes the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank, and the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB). The policies of these IFIs based in Washington generally follow the dictates of the government of the USA due to the controlling influence that it exercises over these institutions. Their agenda for the Latin American and Caribbean region gives priority to promoting and protecting the interests of the major investors and transnational corporations that are largely based in the USA and operate in the region. It also serves to maintain and strengthen the geopolitical hegemony of the USA over the Western Hemisphere (Harris and Nef). But conditions are changing. Washington’s neoliberal agenda for controlling the capi­ talist development of the Western Hemisphere and maintaining US hegemony over the region is increasingly threatened by a progressive alternative agenda for the regio­ nal integration of the Latin American and Caribbean countries that has begun to gain widespread support in the region. This alternative agenda for the region calls for the autonomous economic development of the region free of the hegemonic control and influence of the USA and the IFIs based in Washington. Not only does this type of development pose a fundamental threat to the hegemony of the USA in the region, it threatens the dominance of transnational capital throughout the Americas. Moreover, it also poses a significant threat to the global expansion and integration of the world capitalist system in general and to the global hegemonic coalition led by the government and transnational corporations of the USA. Today, political and economic strategies are being developed for moving from the prevailing export-oriented neoliberal model of economic development to new in­ ward-oriented models of sustainable development, tailored to the diverse conditions, economic capacities, political structures, natural endowments and cultural values of the societies involved. Moreover, a growing number of international and regional civil society organizations have emerged in recent years to create such alternatives. What the forums, networks, programs, and activities of these various types of organizations reveal is that there is a growing international network of organizations and social movements committed to promoting new, more equitable forms of international cooperation and regulation that support inward-oriented and sustainable development as well as genuine democracy at the regional and national levels. At the same time, these organizations argue that the present global trading regime that has been erected under the WTO should and can be replaced by a new global trading system that replaces the present system of so-called free but in fact unfair trade, with a sys­ tem that ensures «fair trade» and promotes South-South economic exchange and coo­ peration. Most of the progressive alternatives advocated by these organizations and the new left-leaning governments that have been elected to office in the region give priority to aligning the external relations of the countries in the region to the internal needs of the majority of the population. That is to say, decisions about what to export and what to import should be aligned with the needs of the population rather than the interests of transnational capitalists and transnational corporations or the hegemonic interests of the USA. Some of these alternative strategies involve what Walden Bello (2002) has referred to as «deglobalization.» That is to say, they involve unlinking the economies of these peripheral capitalist societies from the advanced capitalist centers of the world economy, particularly in the USA. They also involve throwing off the constraints that have been imposed upon the economic policies and structures of the­ se countries by the IFIs (IMF, World Bank, and IDB), the WTO and the other agents and regulatory regimes that regulate the world capitalist system. In fact, there appears to be growing interest throughout Latin America in revivifying the Pan-American ideal of unification, currently perhaps best expressed in Hugo Chávez’ Bolivarian dream of turning South America into a regional economic hegemon (DeLong, 2005). The governments of Bolivia, Cuba, Ecuador, Nicaragua and Uruguay have indicated they want to join the government of Venezuela in creating a regional union. It has been proposed that this coalescing continental confederation should shift the region’s extra-continental trade towards Europe, Asia and South Africa and away from North America. The prospect of this happening appears to have alarmed Washington more than the increasing number of electoral triumphs of leftist politicians in the region (Delong). There has also been considerable talk in the region about creating a single currency for the South American countries that would be modeled on and perhaps tied to the Euro rather than the US Dollar. This discussion is symptomatic of what appears to be an emerging desire to create an integrated economic and political community that is strikingly different from the type of hemispheric economic integration scheme being pursued by the Washington and its allies in the region (DeLong). Moreover, there is an increasing tendency in the region to find alternatives to trading with the USA. In particular, several Latin American nations (Brazil, Cuba, Venezuela and Chile) have been strengthening their economic relations with Asia, particularly with China. But the widespread popular opposition to neoliberalism and so-called globalization, and the shift to the Left in the region’s politics, represent much more than a serious challenge to US hegemony, they also represent a serious threat to the existing pattern of capitalist development in the region. Central to Washington’s strategy for the hemisphere has been the imposition of a neoliberal model of capitalist development on the region which involves the increasing integration of the region’s economies into a hemispheric ‘free trade’ area or rather a trade bloc that is dominated by the USA. This project is itself an essential part of the strategy of the USA for the domination of the global economy by its transnational corporations. The restructuring of the economies of the region under the mantra of neoliberalism and the banner of globalization has been aimed at giving the USA-based transnational corporations and investors free reign within the region and a strong hemispheric base from which to dominate the world economy In opposition to the neoliberal, polyarchical and globalizing model of development that has been imposed by the government of the USA and its allies in the region, the growing movement for an alternative form of development that is both genuinely democratic, equitable and environmentally sustainable appears to be gaining ground in various parts of Latin America and the Caribbean. This alternative model of development requires the reorganization and realignment of the existing economies in the region. It also requires the replacement of the existing political regimes, which serve the interests of the transnational bloc of social forces that are behind the integration of the region into the new global circuits of accumulation and production that the major trans­ national corporations and the IFIs have been constructing since the 1970s. In addition to fundamental economic changes, most of the existing pseudo-democratic political regimes in the region need to be thoroughly democratized so that they are responsive to and capable of serving the needs and interests of the majority of the people rather than the ruling polyarchies and the transnational corporations operating in the region. An essential requirement for realigning the region’s economies so that they produce people-centered and environmentally sustainable development is the integration of these economies into a regional economic and political union that has the resources, structures and the power to operate independently of the government of the USA and the transnational corporations based in the USA as well as in the European Union and Japan. If this type of regional integration takes place, it will enable the Latin American and Caribbean states to break free of the hegemonic influence of the USA, and reverse the denationalization (‘globalization’) of the Latin American and Caribbean economies. Instead of the corporate-driven hemispheric integration of the region under the hegemony of the USA, a new system of regional economic cooperation and both equitable as well as environmentally sustainable development is desperately needed to improve the lives of the vast majority of the people living in Latin America and the Caribbean. This type of regional, equitable and sustainable development can only be success­ fully carried out by truly democratically elected political leaders with broad-based popular support who are sincerely committed to achieving this alternative rather than the elitist neoliberal model. It probably will also require democratic socialist political institutions and structures of production and distribution. Regionalism has been the dream of the democratic left for some time. The European Union has its origins in the French socialist dream of ending Franco-German enmity through unifying Europe, and African regionalism was the vision of African socialists such as Julius Nyerere of Tanzania who saw regional integration as the only means to progress beyond tribalism and colonialism and create a united and democratic Africa (Faux, 2001:4). Viewed from the perspective of those who want to create a people-cen­ tered, democratic, equitable and environmentally sustainable social order in the Ame­ ricas, the corporate-dominated process of capitalist pseudo-globalization taking place in the region and around the world urgently needs to be replaced by what Samir Amin has referred to as a new system of «pluricentric regulated globalization» (Amin, 2001a). This alternative form of globalization requires the development of regional economic and political unions in Africa, Asia, Latin America, the Caribbean, the Middle East and elsewhere, which collaboratively promote people-centered, democratic and envi­ ronmentally sustainable forms of development on a regional basis. According to Amin, these regional unions of states are needed to collaborate as partners in collecti­ vely regulating the global restructuring of the world economy for the benefit of the vast majority of humanity rather than the transnational corporations and the northern centers of the world capitalist system in the USA, Europe and Japan. This type of regional-based regulative order is needed to regulate and redirect inter­ national economic, social, and political relations so that these relations serve the inte­ rests and needs of the vast majority of the world’s population. The present power structures and regulatory regime of the world capitalist system support the transna­ tional corporate-driven restructuring and denationalization of the economies of both the societies at the core and in the periphery of this system. The Latin American and Caribbean countries need to ‘de-link’ step-by-step from this exploitative and inequitable system. They need to redirect and restructure their eco­ nomies so that they serve the needs of the majority of their people while also protec­ ting their natural resources and ecosystems. The alternative policies of economic, poli­ tical and social development proposed and in some cases adopted by the new leftist leaders, the progressive civil society organizations and their supporters, combined with the project of regional integration associated with the new Unión de Naciones Suramericanas (UNASUR), are significant indications of unprecedented and pro­ found transformation unfolding in the Americas. A growing number of civil society organizations and social movements throughout the Americas are pressuring the governments of the region to follow what the pro­ gressive civil society networks such as the Alianza Social Continental/ Hemispheric Social Alliance (ASC/HSA) describes as a regional model of integration that supports the environmentally sustainable and democratic development of all the societies in the region (see ASC-HSA, 2006). The ASC/HSA also contends that the UNASUR pro­ ject and the Bolivarian dream of unification is threatened by the so-called free trade agreements that Washington has negotiated with Chile, Colombia, Peru, the Central American countries and the Dominican Republic. As the ASC/HSA makes clear in its documents and public information campaigns, these agreements compromise the national sovereignty, obstruct the local production of medicines, threaten public health, facilitate the profit-driven privatization of water and vital services such as health and sanitation, and threaten the survival of indigenous cultures, biodiversity, food sovereignty, and local control over natural resources. The «Alternatives for the Americas» proposal developed by this inter-American network of progressive civil society organizations and social movements calls on all governments in the region to subordinate trade and investments to sustainability and environmental protection as well as social justice and local democratic control over economic and social development (ASC/HSA 2002:5). The growing number and political influence of these kinds of networks, organizations and movements provide unquestionable evidence of the emergence of the social for­ ces and political conditions that Panitch (1996:89) and others (Harris, 1995:301-302; Jo­ nas and McCaughan, 1994) predicted in the 1990s would arise in opposition to neoli­ beralism, corporate-dominated pseudo globalization and the extension and consolida­ tion of the hegemony of the USA. It now seems increasingly possible that these forces and the political mobilization that they have helped to create will transform the politi­ cal regimes in the region as well as the nature of inter-American relations, bring about the regional integration of the Latin American countries and free these countries from US hegemony and the form of ‘turbo-capitalism’ to which they have been subjected. At this point, we can only speak in general terms about the new model(s) of develop­ ment that will replace the neoliberal model of uneven and inequitable development that has pillaged most of the region.

#### Environment collapse causes extinction – tipping points are coming

**Foster et al., Oregon sociology professor, 2010**

(John, The Ecological Rift: Capitalism’s War on the Earth, pg 14-8, ldg)

It is common today to see this ecological rift simply in terms of climate change, which given the dangers it poses and the intractable problems for capitalism it presents has grabbed all the headlines. But recently scientists—in a project led by Johan Rockstrom at the Stockholm Resilience Centre, and including Crutzen and the leading U.S. climatologist, James Hansen—have developed an analysis of nine "planetary boundaries" that are crucial to maintaining an earth-system environment in which humanity can exist safely. Climate change is only one of these, and the others are ocean acidification, stratospheric ozone depletion, the nitrogen and the phosphorus cycles, global freshwater use, change in land use, biodiversity loss, atmospheric aerosol loading, and chemical pollution. For the last two, atmospheric aerosol loading and chemical pollution, there are not yet adequate physical measures, but for the other seven processes clear boundaries have been designated. Three of the boundaries—those for climate change, ocean acidification, and stratospheric ozone depletion—can be regarded as tipping points, which at a certain level lead to vast qualitative changes in the earth system that would threaten to destabilize the planet, causing it to depart from the "boundaries for a healthy planet." The boundaries for the other four processes—the nitrogen and phosphorus cycles, freshwater use, change in land use, and biodiversity loss—are better viewed as signifying the onset of irreversible environmental degradation. Three processes have already crossed their planetary boundaries: climate change, the nitrogen cycle, and biodiversity loss. Each of these can therefore be seen, in our terminology, as constituting an extreme "rift" in the planetary system. Stratospheric ozone depletion was an emerging rift in the 1990s, but is now stabilizing, even subsiding. Ocean acidification, the phosphorus cycle, global freshwater use, and land system change are all rapidly emerging global rifts, though not yet extreme. Our knowledge of these rifts can be refined, and more plan-etary rifts may perhaps be discovered in the future. Nevertheless, the analysis of planetary boundaries and rifts, as they present themselves today, helps us understand the full scale of the ecological crisis now confronting humanity. The simple point is that the planet is being assaulted on many fronts as the result of human-generated changes in the global environment.4 In the planetary boundaries model developed by Rockstrom and his associates, each ecological process has a preindustrial value (that is, the level reached before the advent of industrial capitalism), a pro-posed boundary, and a current status. In the case of climate change the preindustrial value was 280 parts per million (ppm) of carbon dioxide concentration in the atmosphere; its proposed boundary is 350 ppm (necessary if tipping points such as a catastrophic rise in sea level are to be avoided); and its current status is 390 ppm. Biodiversity loss is measured by the rate of extinction (number of species lost per million species per year). The preindustrial annual rate, referred to as the "natural" or "background" rate of species loss, was 0.1-1 per million; the proposed boundary is 10 per million; whereas the current rate is greater than 100 per million (100-1,000 times the preindustrial back-ground rate). With respect to the nitrogen cycle, the boundary is con-cerned with the amount of nitrogen removed from the atmosphere for human use in millions of tons per year. Before the rise of industrial capitalism (more specifically before the discovery of the Haber-Bosch process early in the twentieth century), the amount of nitrogen removed from the atmosphere was 0 tons. The proposed boundary, to avoid irreversible degradation of the earth system, is 35 million tons per year. The current status is 121 million tons per year. In each of these extreme rifts, the stability of the earth system as we know it is being endangered. We are at red alert status. If business as usual continues, the world is headed within the next few decades for major tipping points along with irreversible environmental degradation, threatening much of humanity. Biodiversity loss at current and projected rates could result in the loss of upward of a third of all living species this century. The pumping of more and more nitrogen into the biosphere is resulting in the creation of dead zones in lakes and ocean regions (a phenomenon also affected by phosphorus). Each one of these rifts by itself constitutes a global ecological crisis. These ruptures reveal that the limits of the earth system are not determined by the sheer physical scale of the economy but by the particular rifts in natural processes that are generated.5 The emerging rifts in the other ecological processes, which have not yet overshot their boundaries, are scarcely less threatening. For the phosphorus cycle (categorized as part of a single planetary boundary together with the nitrogen cycle), the preindustrial quantity flowing into the oceans per year was approximately 1 million tons; the proposed boundary is 11 million tons (based on the assumption that ocean anoxic events begin at ten times the background rate); and its current status is already 8.5 to 9.5 million tons. In regard to ocean acidification, the value refers to a global mean saturation state of arag-onite (a form of calcium carbonate) in surface seawater. A decline in the number indicates an increase in the acidity of the ocean. The preindustrial value was 3.44 (surface ocean aragonite saturation state); the proposed boundary—after which there would be a massive die-down of shell-forming organisms—is 2.75; and the current status is 2.90. In the case of freshwater use, the preindustrial annual consumption of freshwater in km3 (cubic kilometers) was 415; the estimated boundary is 4,000 km3 (marking a threshold beyond which the irreversible degradation and collapse of terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems is likely); and the current rate of consumption is 2,600 km3. For change in land use, the parameters are set by the percentage of global ice-free land surface converted to cropland. In preindustrial times, this percentage was very low. The proposed boundary is 15 percent (after which there is the danger of triggering catastrophic effects on ecosystems), and the current status is 11.7 percent. In each of these emerging rifts, we are faced with an orange alert status, in which we are rapidly moving toward extreme conditions, whereby we will pass the planetary boundaries, undermining the earth system that supports the conditions of life. No measure for chemical pollution has yet been determined, but proposals include measuring the effects of persistent organic pollu-tants (otherwise known as POPs), plastics, endocrine disrupters, heavy metals, and nuclear waste on ecosystems and the earth system in general. Likewise, no measure has yet been determined for atmospheric aerosol loading (the overall particulate concentration in the atmosphere on a regional basis), which can disrupt monsoon systems, lead to health problems, and interact with climate change and freshwater boundaries. Stratospheric ozone depletion is the one previously emerging rift that was brought under control (as far as anthropogenic drivers were concerned) in the 1990s, reducing what was a rapidly growing threat to life on the planet due to an increase in ultraviolet radiation from the sun. The preindustrial value of ozone concentration was 290 (Dobson Units—the measurement of atmospheric ozone columnar density, where 1 Dobson Unit is defined as 0.01 millimeters thick under standard pressure and temperature); the proposed planetary boundary is a concentration of 276 (after which life on the planet would experience devastating losses); and the current status is 283. Between 60°S and 60°N latitude, the decline in stratospheric ozone concentrations has been halted. Nevertheless, it will take decades for the Antarctic ozone hole to disappear, and Arctic ozone loss will likely persist for decades. Life on the planet had a close call.6 The mapping out of planetary boundaries in this way gives us a better sense of the real threat to the earth system. Although in recent years the environmental threat has come to be seen by many as simply a question of climate change, protecting the planet requires that we attend to all of these planetary boundaries, and others not yet determined. The essential problem is the unavoidable fact that an expanding economic system is placing additional burdens on a fixed earth system to the point of planetary overload. It has been estimated that in the early 1960s humanity used half of the planet's biocapacity in a year. Today this has risen to an overshoot of 30 percent beyond the earth's regenerative capacity. Business-as-usual projections point to a state in which the ecological footprint of humanity will be equivalent to the regenerative capacity of two planets by the mid-2030s.7 Rockstrom and his associates concluded their article in Nature by stating: "The evidence so far suggests that, as along as the [planetary boundary] thresholds are not crossed, humanity has the freedom to pursue long-term social and economic development." Although this is undoubtedly true, what is obviously not addressed in this conclu-sion—but is clearly the point of their whole analysis—is that these thresholds have in some cases already been crossed and in other cases will soon be crossed with the continuation of business as usual. Moreover, this can be attributed in each and every case to a primary cause: the current pattern of global socioeconomic development, that is, the capitalist mode of production and its expansionary tendencies. The whole problem can be called "the global ecological rift," referring to the overall break in the human relation to nature arising from an alienated system of capital accumulation without end.'

#### Vote Neg to reject the Aff’s neoliberal economic engagement in favor of a commons-based approach. That solves and creates space to challenge neoliberalism

**De Angelis, East London political economy professor, 2003**

(Massimo, “Reflections on alternatives, commons and communities”, Winter, <http://www.commoner.org.uk/deangelis06.pdf>, DOA: 7-2-12, ldg)

This movement has posed the question of a plurality of “alternatives” to the social processes and arrangements that produce the horrors of modern global capital. In order to take the many calls for and practices of alternatives seriously, we have to make them relevant to the real people at the fringe or outside the movement. In other words, we want to move from movement to society not so much by persuading people to “join” our movement, but through a language and a political practice that by tracing the connections between diverse practices attempts to dissolve the distinctions between inside and outside the movement, i.e., actually moves ‘from movement to society’. To make the possibility of a new world that contains many worlds an actuality, we have to be able to shape our own discourse in such a way as to echo the needs and aspirations coming from below. We have to give coherence to their plurality, without imposing a model or reiterating dead ideologies. We need a discourse that helps to articulate the many alternatives that spring out of the points of crises of neoliberal capital, which seriously threaten to dispossess people of their livelihood and impose on them new or more intensified commodified patterns of life. We need a discourse that builds on the plurality of the many concrete struggles and their methods and help us to articulate a vision – not a plan – of the whole. Then we can better evaluate what are the global implications of our local struggles, as well as the local implications of global struggles for the building of a world that contains many worlds. But most of all, we need a discourse that recognizes the power we have to shape alternatives, at every level in society, that sets out from the simple fact that, contrarily to common belief, alternatives do exist, are everywhere and plural. To clarify, I think that every social node, that is every individual or network of individuals is a bearer of alternatives. This is evident not only when struggles erupt in any of the waged or unwaged local and trans-local nodes of social production. We just need to look around in the relative normality of daily routines to see that every social node “knows” of different ways to do things within its life-world and sphere of action longs for a different space in which things can be done in different ways. Each social node expresses needs and aspirations that are the basis of alternatives. For example: the alternative to working 10 hours a day is working 6; the alternative to poverty is access to the means of existence; the alternative to indignity is dignity; the alternative to building that dam and uprooting communities is not building that dam and leaving communities where they are; the alternative to tomatoes going rotten while transported on the back of an old woman for 20 miles is not GM tomatoes that do not rot, but access to land near home, or a home, or a road and a truck. Since every social node is aware of a spectrum of alternatives, the problem is simply how to make these alternatives actual? What resources are needed? How to coordinate alternatives in such a way that they are not pitted against each other as is the case of the competitive markets’ understanding of alternatives? How to solve the many existing problems without relying on the alienating coordinating mechanism of the market and creating instead social relations of mutual enrichment, dignity, and respect? These are I believe the bottom line questions on which a new political discourse must be based. Once we acknowledge the existence of the galaxy of alternatives as they emerge from concrete needs and aspirations, we can ground today’s new political discourse in the thinking and practice of the actualization and the coordination of alternatives, so as each social node and each individual within it has the power to decide and take control over their lives. It is this actualization and this coordination that rescues existing alternatives from the cloud of their invisibility, because alternatives, as with any human product, are social products, and they need to be recognized and validated socially. Our political projects must push their way through beyond the existing forms of coordination, beyond the visible fist of the state, beyond the invisible hand of competitive markets, and beyond the hard realities of their interconnections that express themselves in today forms of neoliberal governance, promoting cooperation through competition and community through disempowerment. As I will argue, this new political discourse is based on the project of defending and extending the space of commons, at the same time building and strengthening communities through the social fields.

### PTX

#### Raising the debt ceiling is likely but uncertain – time is running out

Stuart 9-26 (Jim Stewart, political blogger, Princeton graduate, “Shutdown and/or Default,” 9-26-2013, http://jimstuartnewblog.blogspot.com/2013/09/shutdown-andor-default.html)

After today, four days to go before a possible shutdown. After that, seventeen days to possible default. What's the forecast? Here's what I see, albeit with little clarity:¶ Friday or Saturday the Senate will return a clean CR at sequester spending levels back to the House. Right now, don't think Boehner can pass a clean CR without relying on Democrats. He was hoping to pass an omnibus conditional debt ceiling resolution on Saturday, before the budget vote, to get his caucus to shift focus to the debt ceiling. This afternoon, he found he doesn't have the votes. People want to see what happens on the Budget CR. So Boehner must put a conditional CR back to the Senate, ensuring a Tuesday shutdown, or ask Democrats for help. If Democrats say yes without conditions, there will be no shutdown. If they ask for something, most likely moving the budget target off the sequester levels, we will have shutdown, since the Senate won't have time to respond before the midnight Monday deadline. Best Guess: Boehner will ask for Democratic help and pass a clean CR - so no Shutdown.¶ The debt ceiling could follow a similar trajectory: the House will pass a contingent debt ceiling resolution containing a long list of demands - one year Obamacare delay, the Keystone pipeline, drilling on federal lands and offshore, reverse new EPA carbon capture rules, cut back the wings of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, etc. The Senate will strip all this out and send back a clean 14 month debt ceiling increase resolution. Meanwhile a very high stakes game of chicken will be going on: Obama says he will not negotiate the debt ceiling; Boehner says he has to and ultimately will. Boehner has raised the expectations of the GOP caucus very high - saying the debt ceiling is the maximum point of leverage with the Democrats, and that is where the GOP can make the most progress. I am very clear that Obama will not budge on this, and that the Democratic leadership team in the House and Senate will back him up. Will Boehner realize this in time? In their last big negotiation in 2011, Obama caved to save the country from default. I think Republicans expect him to cave. Will they all realize their mistake in time? And if they do, will they turn back and pass a clean resolution? Best Guess: Boehner will figure it out and decide to move with a clean resolution just in time to get it signed before October 17.¶ This is a highly hopeful forecast and I am basing it mostly on my assessment of Boehner as a person who will do the right thing - not for himself, but for his Party and his country, once he sees there are no good alternatives. Do not think he will take the lead in causing a shutdown; nor will he refuse to take a path that prevents default just to please the base. I am not at all confident, though. I assign just a 50-60% probability to the above scenario - in other words, not very high.¶ And here's another low probability forecast: If the game plays out as above, we will land on October 18 with a very angry and frustrated GOP base, an ecstatic Democratic Party, a deeply wounded Speaker Boehner, and the next budget deadline coming up on November 15, less than 30 days away. I think there's a chance that Boehner, possibly realizing his time is up as Speaker, will lead a Grand Bargain negotiation with Obama (cancel the sequester, replace it with a mix of targeted cuts, new tax revenues from tax reform, and chained CPI for Medicare and Social Security) that will pass the House with Democratic votes and be signed into law.¶ Pretty far out, I admit. I give it a 30% chance. But that's not zero. And wouldn't that be a great day for the country!

#### PC is key

Lillis & Wasson 9-7 (Mike Lillis, and Erik Wasson, The Hill, “Fears of wounding Obama weigh heavily on Democrats ahead of vote,” 9-7-2013, http://thehill.com/homenews/house/320829-fears-of-wounding-obama-weigh-heavily-on-democrats#ixzz2fOPUfPNr)

The prospect of wounding President Obama is weighing heavily on Democratic lawmakers as they decide their votes on Syria. Obama needs all the political capital he can muster heading into bruising battles with the GOP over fiscal spending and the debt ceiling. Democrats want Obama to use his popularity to reverse automatic spending cuts already in effect and pay for new economic stimulus measures through higher taxes on the wealthy and on multinational companies. But if the request for authorization for Syria military strikes is rebuffed, some fear it could limit Obama's power in those high-stakes fights. That has left Democrats with an agonizing decision: vote "no" on Syria and possibly encourage more chemical attacks while weakening their president, or vote "yes" and risk another war in the Middle East. “I’m sure a lot of people are focused on the political ramifications,” a House Democratic aide said. Rep. Jim Moran (D-Va.), a veteran appropriator, said the failure of the Syria resolution would diminish Obama's leverage in the fiscal battles. "It doesn't help him," Moran said Friday by phone. "We need a maximally strong president to get us through this fiscal thicket. These are going to be very difficult votes."

#### << plan saps >>

#### Failure collapses global trade, investment and growth

Davidson 9-10 (Adam Davidson, co-founder of NPR’s Planet Money (Adam, “Our Debt to Society” New York Times, <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/09/15/magazine/our-debt-to-society.html?pagewanted=all>)

If the debt ceiling isn’t lifted again this fall, some serious financial decisions will have to be made. Perhaps the government can skimp on its foreign aid or furlough all of NASA, but eventually the big-ticket items, like Social Security and Medicare, will have to be cut. At some point, the government won’t be able to pay interest on its bonds and will enter what’s known as sovereign default, the ultimate national financial disaster achieved by countries like Zimbabwe, Ecuador and Argentina (and now Greece). In the case of the United States, though, it won’t be an isolated national crisis. If the American government can’t stand behind the dollar, the world’s benchmark currency, then the global financial system will very likely enter a new era in which there is much less trade and much less economic growth. It would be, by most accounts, the largest self-imposed financial disaster in history. Nearly everyone involved predicts that someone will blink before this disaster occurs. Yet a small number of House Republicans (one political analyst told me it’s no more than 20) appear willing to see what happens if the debt ceiling isn’t raised — at least for a bit. This could be used as leverage to force Democrats to drastically cut government spending and eliminate President Obama’s signature health-care-reform plan. In fact, Representative Tom Price, a Georgia Republican, told me that the whole problem could be avoided if the president agreed to drastically cut spending and lower taxes. Still, it is hard to put this act of game theory into historic context. Plenty of countries — and some cities, like Detroit — have defaulted on their financial obligations, but only because their governments ran out of money to pay their bills. No wealthy country has ever voluntarily decided — in the middle of an economic recovery, no less — to default. And there’s certainly no record of that happening to the country that controls the global reserve currency. Like many, I assumed a self-imposed U.S. debt crisis might unfold like most involuntary ones. If the debt ceiling isn’t raised by X-Day, I figured, the world’s investors would begin to see America as an unstable investment and rush to sell their Treasury bonds. The U.S. government, desperate to hold on to investment, would then raise interest rates far higher, hurtling up rates on credit cards, student loans, mortgages and corporate borrowing — which would effectively put a clamp on all trade and spending. The U.S. economy would collapse far worse than anything we’ve seen in the past several years.

#### Trigger nuclear wars – and turns multilat and global democracy

Merlini 11 (Cesare, nonresident senior fellow, Center on the United States and Europe, chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Italian Institute for International Affairs, “A Post-Secular World?” Survival, 53(2), 2011, ebsco, ldg)

Two neatly opposed scenarios for the future of the world order illustrate the range of possibilities, albeit at the risk of oversimplification. The first scenario entails the premature crumbling of the post-Westphalian system. One or more of the acute tensions apparent today evolves into an open and traditional **conflict** between states, perhaps even **involving the use of nuclear weapons.** The crisis might be triggered by a collapse of the global economic and financial system, the vulnerability of which we have just experienced, and the prospect of a second Great Depression, with consequences for peace and democracy similar to those of the first. Whatever the trigger, the unlimited exercise of national sovereignty, exclusive self-interest and rejection of outside interference would self-interest and rejection of outside interference would likely be amplified, emptying, perhaps entirely, the half-full glass of multilateralism, including the UN and the European Union. Many of the more likely conflicts, such as between Israel and Iran or India and Pakistan, have potential religious dimensions. Short of war, tensions such as those related to immigration might become unbearable. Familiar issues of creed and identity could be exacerbated. One way or another, the secular rational approach would be sidestepped by a return to theocratic absolutes, competing or converging with secular absolutes such as unbridled nationalism**.**

### Article 20 Conditions CP

#### The United States federal government should pass the Transboundary Hydrocarbons Agreement if, and only if, the agreement excludes Article 20.

#### The counterplan solves the whole aff and avoids the link to politics

Gary 13 (Ian Gary is the Senior Policy Manager for Extractive Industries at Oxfam America and the author of Oxfam America’s report “Ghana’s Big Test: Oil’s Challenge to Democratic Development.”April 9th, 2013, http://politicsofpoverty.oxfamamerica.org/author/ian-gary/#sthash.F7Bnwsac.dpuf)//moxley

We do have a big problem with an irrelevant provision inserted into the bill designed to weaken the payment disclosure requirements in Section 1504 of the Dodd-Frank Act, also known as the Cardin-Lugar provision. That law provides for the annual disclosure of payments made by oil, gas and mining companies to host governments around the world – final rules were issued by the SEC in August last year. H.R. 1613 would exempt any covered company from reporting payments from in accordance with any transboundary hydrocarbons agreement anywhere in the world.¶ The American Petroleum Institute (API) – backed by companies such as Exxon, Shell, Chevron and BP – is suing the SEC in federal court and is now hoping that its Congressional allies can help weaken this landmark law. Oxfam is intervening to defend the rule. Meanwhile, the European Union has reached agreement to put in place similar reporting requirements.¶ I spoke this week with Neil Brown who was, until very recently, a top Senate Republican aide working on energy issues for Senator Lugar, who was the ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. His response: “this exemption is unnecessary and inclusion would only forestall quick approval of this important agreement.”¶ He should know. As both the co-author of a Senate Foreign Relations Committee minority staff report for Senator Lugar on “Oil, Mexico and the Transboundary Agreement” as well as someone intimately familiar with the “Cardin-Lugar” provision in Dodd-Frank, Mr. Brown would know if the reporting requirements in Dodd-Frank Section 1504 present any issue in approving the US-Mexico TBA. The short answer – they don’t. The minority staff report envisions reporting under Section 1504 and says that under Section 1504 covered companies “would already have to disclose payments” to the SEC if “they invest in Mexico”.¶ The US-Mexico TBA requires that certain information be kept confidential unless disclosure is required by law. The TBA text demonstrates that the US and Mexico have already made the correct policy judgment that the specific confidentiality provisions of the TBA should be subordinated to each country’s commitment to openness and subject to each country’s disclosure requirements. Nothing in the TBA would require the exemption provided by H.R. 1613.¶ Tellingly, the Senate Energy Committee has introduced a bi-partisan bill, S. 812, sponsored by Senators Ron Wyden (D-OR) and Lisa Murkowski (R-AK) to approve the US-Mexico TBA, and it contains no Section 1504 exemption provision. If Congress is truly interested in approving this agreement and providing the “rules of the road” for joint development of oil and gas reserves straddling the US-Mexico maritime boundary, then it should adopt the clean Senate bill without the reporting exemption.¶ Former Senator Jeff Bingaman, past Senate Energy Committee chairman, told Reuters that the exemption proposed by the House “complicates things significantly” for passage of the bill. Referring to the Section 1504 exemption language, he said, “They’ve added in some things that are going to make it difficult to pass in that form.”¶ The Mexican Congress ratified the TBA a year ago, and the Obama administration – and the oil industry – would like to see it approved. The Obama administration, though, has made clear that implementation of Section 1504 is a priority.¶ In a letter to Oxfam, Sec. of State Kerry said, “The Department of State and Administration strongly support transparency in the extractives sectors, as outlined in Section 1504 of Dodd-Frank, and the new rule issued by the SEC. The new SEC standard directly advances our foreign policy interest in increasing transparency and reducing corruption, particularly in the oil, gas and mineral sectors.” ¶ My guess is that the oil industry lobby wants this TBA approved far more than it wants this unnecessary Section 1504 exemption. Surya Gunasekara, a tax and trade counsel with the American Petroleum Institute told me that there is “no doubt” that API cares more about Gulf of Mexico access than the proposed Section 1504 exemption.

### T QPQ

#### Economic engagement must be a QPQ

Shinn 96 [James Shinn, C.V. Starr Senior Fellow for Asia at the CFR in New York City and director of the council’s multi-year Asia Project, worked on economic affairs in the East Asia Bureau of the US Dept of State, “Weaving the Net: Conditional Engagement with China,” pp. 9 and 11, google books]

In sum, conditional engagement consists of a set of objectives, a strategy for attaining those objectives, and tactics (specific policies) for implementing that strategy.

* The objectives of conditional engagement are the ten principles, which were selected to preserve American vital interests in Asia while accommodating China’s emergence as a major power.
* The overall strategy of conditional engagement follows two parallel lines: economic engagement, to promote the integration of China into the global trading and financial systems; and security engagement, to encourage compliance with the ten principles by diplomatic and military means when economic incentives do not suffice, in order to hedge against the risk of the emergence of a belligerent China.
* The tactics of economic engagement should promote China’s economic integration through negotiations on trade liberalization, institution building, and educational exchanges. While a carrots-and-sticks approach may be appropriate within the economic arena, the use of trade sanction to achieve short-term political goals is discouraged.
* The tactics of security engagement should reduce the risks posed by China’s rapid military expansion, its lack of transparency, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and transnational problems such as crime and illegal migration, by engaging in arms control negotiations, multilateral efforts, and a loosely-structured defensive military arrangement in Asia.8

[To footnotes]

8. Conditional engagement’s recommended tactics of tit-for-tat responses are equivalent to using carrots and sticks in response to foreign policy actions by China. Economic engagement calls for what is described as symmetric tit-for-tat and security engagement for asymmetric tit-for-tat. A symmetric response is one that counters a move by China in the same place, time, and manner; an asymmetric response might occur in another place at another time, and perhaps in another manner. A symmetric tit-for-tat would be for Washington to counter a Chinese tariff of 10 percent on imports for the United States with a tariff of 10 percent on imports from China. An asymmetric tit-for-tat would be for the United States to counter a Chines shipment of missiles to Iran with an American shipment of F-16s to Vietnam (John Lewis Gaddis, Strategies of Containment: A critical Appraisal of Postwar American National Security Policy. New York: Oxford University Press, (1982). This is also cited in Fareed Zakaria, “The Reagan Strategy of Containment,” Political Science Quarterly 105, no. 3 (1990), pp. 383-88).

#### Vote negative

#### a) Limits – the embargo means there’s a near-infinite range of “one exception” affs – conditionality forces the aff to find deals that Cuba would accept

#### b) Ground – unconditional engagement denies us “say no” and backlash arguments which are a crucial part of engagement

### Pemex

Mexican growth is strong – no recession effects left-over

Vardi 12 (Nicholas, Forbes, “The Mexican Miracle: Despite Drug War, Economy Is Booming”, October, 2012, http://www.forbes.com/sites/nathanvardi/2012/10/15/the-mexican-mircale/)

When Vikram Pandit, the chief executive of Citigroup, was asked on Monday to break down the emerging markets that had contributed to some good-looking financial results for the third-biggest U.S. bank, the first country he pointed to was Mexico.¶ Driven by Mexico, Citigroup’s Latin-American consumer banking revenue grew 7% year-over-year in the third quarter to $2.4 billion, while the bank’s revenue in Asia was down. “We think that Mexico is extremely well-poised for growth,” Pandit said on Citigroup’s earnings conference call. “I was just there not too long ago and with the leadership change there in addition to prospects for reforms and what you are seeing on the ground—that is a high spot definitely.” Citigroup’s stock was up 4% on Monday.¶ Not too long ago, the idea that big-shot American CEOs would be touting Mexico would have seemed unlikely. When the financial crisis hit the U.S. in 2008, FORBES predicted a “Mexican Meltdown.” The explosion of the drug war between the Mexican drug cartels and the government, coupled with the sure-to-come drop in exports to the contracting U.S. economy, seemed like it would derail Mexico again and ensure that other emerging markets like Brazil would keep passing it by. The U.S. Joint Forces Command lumped Mexico in the same category as Pakistan and worried it was becoming a failed state.¶ Mexico’s economy was hit very hard by the financial crisis and its recession was severe, but its recovery miraculously has been even stronger. Even with the weak U.S. recovery and the ongoing drug violence, Mexico has boomed. Top officials in the Mexican government predict the country’s economic growth could reach 5% in 2012, after gross domestic product increased by 3.9% and 5.5% in the last two years.¶ At the same time, Brazil’s economy has slowed and Mexico is starting to catch up to its regional rival. The Mexican stock market has performed well, with the benchmark IPC index up nearly 13% in 2012 and more than 20% in the last year. Pemex, the state-owned oil company that dominates the Mexican economy, recently announced deep-water oil discoveries in the Gulf of Mexico, suggesting the company might be able to slow the decline of its production.¶ Enrique Pena Nieto of the PRI has been ratified as the winner of the presidential election and the transfer of power appears to be going on with much less social unrest than when Felipe Calderon was elected in 2006. It’s not just U.S. banks that are benefiting from Mexico’s resurgent economy: Wal-Mart said its important Mexican stores increased monthly sales by 15.3% in September to $2.59 billion. Wal-Mart opened 20 Mexican stores in September alone.¶ Wal-Mart, of course, demonstrates both the opportunity and peril with which foreign investors view Mexico. Wal-Mart’s Mexican unit is the company’s most important foreign subsidiary, but it has been embroiled in an embarrassing and costly bribery controversy that was first exposed by The New York Times. Indeed, foreign direct investment has remained weak. But if the new leadership in Mexico can open Mexico’s energy sector to foreign investment, even that statistic could soon turn around for Mexico.¶ The biggest evidence of Mexico’s recent relative success can probably been seen in the number of Mexicans who are staying or returning to Mexico. As Calderon recently noted in The Wall Street Journal, the net rate of migration of Mexican workers toward the United States has recently been zero. “We are in the middle of the rebirth,” he said.

Corruption and nationalization makes PEMEX collapse inevitable – the plan can’t overcome

Camarena 10 (Rodrigo, is an analyst and consultant on Latin American business, politics and public policy, “Mexico's Energy Reform and the Future of Pemex” October 2010, http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/6759/mexicos-energy-reform-and-the-future-of-pemex)

Mexico's Energy Reform and the Future of Pemex ¶ The ebullient celebration in Brazil over Petrobas' historic $70 billion share-issue last month was bitterly received in Mexico City, where the state-owned oil company Pemex is mired in debt, inefficiency and ongoing political wrangling. ¶ With little having changed since Mexican President Felipe Calderón sought to reform the country's energy sector two years ago, the contrast between Petrobras' successes and Pemex's failures has reignited discussion of Pemex's future and renewed the public's interest in the beleaguered Mexican oil giant.¶ Once Latin America's largest company, Pemex has persistently lost profits and market share to other state-led oil companies, including PetroChina, Russia's Lukoil, and Petrobras. Pemex's inability to expand production and compete internationally stems from decades of mismanagement, corruption and a politically sensitive constitutional provision barring the company from receiving private investment, as most of its state-led competitors already do.¶ Pemex's status as a fully state-owned enterprise has left the company vulnerable to limited financing, a dysfunctional corporate bureaucracy and corrupt public officials. Due to a lack of competitive investment and technology as well as a failure to develop new reserves, Pemex's output has declined by nearly one-third since 2004. If current trends hold, Mexico is on track to becoming a net oil importer by 2020, with some estimates projecting this taking place as early as 2016. ¶ Making matters worse, Mexico's federal government relies on taxes from Pemex's falling profits for roughly 40 percent of the total national budget, from which it funds not only Pemex itself but also the country's development and its expensive war against organized crime. ¶ In 2008, seeking to reverse the country's fortunes, Calderón's government passed one of the country's most significant energy-sector reforms since Mexico nationalized its oil industry in 1938. The reforms aimed to give Pemex greater budgetary authority, update its statist corporate structure, and allow the company to contract foreign firms to improve production and exploit untapped resources in the depths of the Gulf of Mexico -- where most of the country's hydrocarbon deposits lie.¶ To Calderón's displeasure, implementation of the 2008 law has been slow and largely unsuccessful. The law's stipulation that industry experts be added to the company's boards -- formerly made up entirely of political appointees -- has led to friction in the chain of command and to delayed decision-making. The provision allowing Pemex to contract foreign firms is currently undergoing a lengthy Supreme Court review following complaints from opposition legislators.

#### PEMEX not key to the Mexican economy-overall increases despite PEMEX failures

FT, 2013 (Financial Times, 2/1/13, “Pemex blast puts onus on energy reforms,” http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/eb947824-6c88-11e2-953f-00144feab49a.html#axzz2NSCSJswg)

While the Mexican stock market has hit record highs recently and the economy is forecast to grow more than 3.5 per cent in 2013, faster than Brazil for the third year in a row, output at Pemex has slumped. From a peak of 3.4m barrels of oil a day in 2004, production has fallen to about 2.6m bpd. Experts say that without greater foreign investment and technology Mexico could cease to be a major energy exporter within six years, even though it sits on promising deepwater reserves in the Gulf of Mexico. “So what will the Pemex explosion mean for the national debate on energy reform? It puts Pemex firmly in the spotlight for a start,” tweeted Duncan Wood, director of the Mexico Institute at the Woodrow Wilson centre in Washington. “Pemex needs to be modernised from top to bottom, from exploration and production to basic practices ... Will legislators [now] recognise that Pemex has fallen behind the times?” The contrast between Pemex and the rest of Mexico’s export sector is stark. While foreign car and electronic goods manufacturers have poured investment into the country, boosting national exports to a record, under the Mexican constitution Pemex is only allowed to offer limited service contracts with private companies.

#### Competitiveness is a false theory – empirics

Paul Krugman, Professor of Economics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1994 [“Competitiveness: A Dangerous Obsession,” Foreign Affairs, Volume 73, Issue 2, March/April, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via Academic Search Elite]

Guess what? Delors didn't confront the problems of either the welfare state or the EMS. He explained that the root cause of European unemployment was a lack of competitiveness with the United States and Japan and that the solution was a program of investment in infrastructure and high technology. It was a disappointing evasion, but not a surprising one. After all, the rhetoric of competitiveness--the view that, in the words of President Clinton, each nation is "like a big corporation competing in the global marketplace"--has become pervasive among opinion leaders throughout the world. People who believe themselves to be sophisticated about the subject take it for granted that the economic problem facing any modern nation is essentially one of competing on world markets--that the United States and Japan are competitors in the same sense that Coca-Cola competes with Pepsi--and are unaware that anyone might seriously question that proposition. Every few months a new best-sell-er warns the American public of the dire consequences of losing the "race" for the 21st century.[1] A whole industry of councils on competitiveness, "geo-economists" and managed trade theorists has sprung up in Washington. Many of these people, having diagnosed America's economic problems in much the same terms as Delors did Europe's, are now in the highest reaches of the Clinton administration formulating economic and trade policy for the United States. So Delors was using a language that was not only convenient but comfortable for him and a wide audience on both sides of the Atlantic. Unfortunately, his diagnosis was deeply misleading as a guide to what ails Europe, and similar diagnoses in the United States are equally misleading. The idea that a country's economic fortunes are largely determined by its success on world markets is a hypothesis, not a necessary truth; and as a practical, empirical matter, that hypothesis is flatly wrong. That is, it is simply not the case that the world's leading nations are to any important degree in economic competition with each other, or that any of their major economic problems can be attributed to failures to compete on world markets. The growing obsession in most advanced nations with international competitiveness should be seen, not as a well-founded concern, but as a view held in the face of overwhelming contrary evidence. And yet it is clearly a view that people very much want to hold--a desire to believe that is reflected in a remarkable tendency of those who preach the doctrine of competitiveness to support their case with careless, flawed arithmetic. This article makes three points. First, it argues that concerns about competitiveness are, as an empirical matter, almost completely unfounded. Second, it tries to explain why defining the economic problem as one of international competition is nonetheless so attractive to so many people. Finally, it argues that the obsession with competitiveness is not only wrong but dangerous, skewing domestic policies and threatening the international economic system. This last issue is, of course, the most consequential from the standpoint of public policy. Thinking in terms of competitiveness leads, directly and indirectly, to bad economic policies on a wide range of issues, domestic and foreign, whether it be in health care or trade.

### Spills

Drilling in the gulf causes oil spills – uniquely disastrous to BioD

Greenpeace 13 (Greenpeace, February 22, 2013, “Transboundary agreement spells disaster for the Gulf”, http://www.greenpeace.org/usa/en/media-center/news-releases/Transboundary-agreement-spells-disaster-for-the-Gulf/)//moxley

In response to the United States and Mexico signing an agreement to develop oil and gas reservoirs that cross the international maritime boundary between the two countries in the Gulf of Mexico Greenpeace United States and Mexico have signed their own transboundary agreement.¶ Greenpeace US and Mexico signed the agreement concerning their governments continued obsession with helping the gas and oil industry profit off polluting the climate and devastating the Gulf of Mexico. “The US and Mexican governments say their agreement is “designed to enhance energy security in North America,” an impossibility given the continued support for fossil fuel production over secure, renewable energy sources. President Obama's failure to permanently reject the Keystone XL pipeline, his expanding coal mining on public lands, and approval of oil exploration in the Arctic lay the groundwork for this new policy,” said Greenpeace US Climate Campaigner Kyle Ash.¶ “This agreement opens new areas to dangerous, expensive, and controversial offshore drilling techniques. This is what led to the deaths of eleven workers and over 200 million gallons of oil spewing into the Gulf just two years ago,’ said Mr Ash. “The US-Mexican joint statement called for “the highest degree of safety and environmental standards,” which the US Congress has failed to improve since the Deepwater disaster. A recent report from the National Research Council reaffirmed that deepwater drilling remains unsafe.”¶ Drilling could take place in the Gulf at depths typically greater than 8,500 feet, deeper than at any drilling site in the world. The BP Deepwater Horizon catastrophe occurred in water 5,000 feet deep¶ “Deepwater exploration is a huge risk to the environment and a waste of resources for the country. Each oil spill at sea disrupts the ecosystem, causing ecological disturbances, some temporary, others permanent. State-owned oil company Pemex has a history of oil spills off the coast of Tamaulipas, Veracruz, Tabasco and Campeche and now with plans for deepwater exploration in the Gulf of Mexico, the potential for disaster increases exponentially,” said Greenpeace Mexico Climate Campaigner Beatriz Olivera.

Non-unique – spill just happened – our evidence post dates

Skaggs 7-9-13 (Christina, “US Coast Guard confirms natural gas leak in Gulf of Mexico”, July 9th, 2013, http://www.wlox.com/story/22797968/us-coast-guard-confirms-natural-gas-leak-in-gulf-of-mexico)

The U.S. Coast Guard confirmed a natural gas leak in the Gulf of Mexico has forced the evacuation of a gas production platform 74 miles southwest of Port Fourchon, LA. According to the Coast Guard, the leak began Sunday at Ship Shoal Block 225 platform B, which is a natural gas and crude oil platform owned by Energy Resources Technology (ERT).¶ The Coast Guard and Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement (BSEE) are responding to what the Coast Guard calls "the loss of well control".¶ Once ERT learned of the leak, the company began work to temporarily plug the well and contacted the Coast Guard and BSEE, according to Coast Guard officials.¶ The Coast Guard and BSEE inspectors conducted overflights early Tuesday. Coast Guard officials said rainbow sheen runs more than four miles wide by three quarters of a mile long. Coast Guard and BSEE will conduct an investigation of the incident to determine the cause of the loss of well control.

Gulf is resilient

Berywn 13 (Bob, Summit County Voice, “Environment: Is the Gulf of Mexico resilient to oil spills?”, April 9th, 2013, http://summitcountyvoice.com/2013/04/09/environment-is-the-gulf-of-mexico-resilient-to-oil-spills/)

Nearly three years after the Deepwater Horizon drill rig exploded and the busted Macondo Well spewed millions of gallons of crude into the Gulf of Mexico, scientists are still trying to figure out to what happened to all the oil.¶ Only a tiny amount was captured or burned at the surface, and vast quantity — nobody knows exactly how much — was “dispersed” with chemicals injected directly into the stream of oil streaming out of the broken pipes, but a surprisingly large percentage of the oil may have been broken down by microbes.¶ Some of the oil settled to the seafloor, damaging coral miles from the site of the disaster. There’s also evidence that the oil damaged Gulf of Mexico oysters growing in coastal areas, and sickened dolphins in Barataria Bay. And in Florida, researchers found remnants of the oil lingering in “scary high” concentrations in the splash zone along Gulf beaches.¶ But overall, the Gulf may be more resilient than previously believed, according to Terry Hazen a bioremediation expert at the University of Tennessee-Oak Ridge National Laboratory.¶ Hazen and his research team used a powerful new approach for identifying microbes in the environment to discover previously unknown and naturally occurring bacteria that consume and break down crude oil. They concluded that there was a population explosion among those bacteria already adapted to using oil as a food source.¶ “It was surprising how fast they consumed the oil,” Hazen said. “In some locations, it took only one day for them to reduce a gallon of oil to a half gallon. In others, the half-life for a given quantity of spilled oil was six days … “The Deepwater Horizon oil provided a new source of nutrients in the deepest waters,” he said.¶ Rather than culturing the microbes in a lab, the researchers combined genetic data and other analyses of the DNA, proteins and other footprints of bacteria to provide a more detailed picture of microbial life in the water.¶ Their findings suggest that a great potential for intrinsic bioremediation of oil plumes exists in the deep sea and other environs in the Gulf of Mexico. Oil-eating bacteria are natural inhabitants of the Gulf because of the constant supply of oil as food.¶ “The bottom line from this research may be that the Gulf of Mexico is more resilient and better able to recover from oil spills than anyone thought,” Hazen said. “It shows that we may not need the kinds of heroic measures proposed after the Deepwater Horizon spill, like adding nutrients to speed up the growth of bacteria that break down oil or using genetically engineered bacteria. The Gulf has a broad base of natural bacteria, and they respond to the presence of oil by multiplying quite rapidly.”¶ Hazen recently presented his Deepwater Horizon disaster research findings at the 245th National Meeting and Exposition of the American Chemical Society, the world’s largest scientific society.

#### Status quo solves environmental cooperation

Quinn 12 [Andrew Quinn, director of the fellowship at the Aspen Institute—an international nonprofit dedicated to fostering enlightened leadership and open- minded dialogue, “Mexico, U.S. sign cross-border deep water oil deal”, February 20, 2012, http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/02/20/us-mexico-oil-us-idUSTRE81J1G020120220]

(Reuters) - Mexico and the United States signed an agreement on Monday to help U.S. firms and Mexican oil monopoly Pemex exploit deep water oil resources in the Gulf of Mexico that straddle the countries' maritime boundaries.¶ The deal, negotiated last year, will lift the moratorium on oil and gas exploration and production for 1.5 million acres in the Gulf and sets up legal guidelines for companies to jointly develop any trans-boundary reservoirs.¶ "These reservoirs could hold considerable reserves ... but they don't necessarily stop neatly at our maritime boundary. This could lead to disputes," U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said at a ministerial meeting of Group of 20 nations in Los Cabos Mexico. "The agreement we are signing today will help prevent such disputes."¶ Both the U.S. Senate and its Mexican counterpart have to approve the agreement before it goes into effect.¶ Interior Secretary Ken Salazar called the region an "area of high interest" to oil companies.¶ "I think there is a very good chance ... the trans-boundary area will be developed in the short term," he told reporters from a call in Washington.¶ Mexico - the world's No. 7 oil producer - is far behind the United States in exploring for deep water oil reserves and has drilled less than 20 wells in its territorial waters in the Gulf. Pemex estimates there are more than 29 billion barrels of crude equivalent in the area, or 58 percent of the country's prospective resources.¶ Carlos Morales, Pemex's director of exploration and production, told Reuters in an interview on Monday that the company plans to drill six or seven new deep water wells this year and plans eight new wells annually over the next five years.¶ So far most of the discoveries in Mexico's deep waters have been natural gas.¶ DANGERS IN DEEP WATER¶ Mexico's oil industry regulator worries Pemex does not have the capability or the safeguards in place to move into ultra-deep drilling.¶ One of the wells Pemex plans to drill this year will be at depths of nearly 10,000 feet, more than 3,000 feet deeper than it had gone before.¶ Safety concerns loom large after the explosion on BP's Deepwater Horizon rig in April 2010 that killed 11 workers and spewed more than 4 million barrels of oil into the Gulf.¶ The U.S.-Mexico agreement covers oil spill and safety rules, an U.S. Interior Department official said.¶ Mexico is hoping to attract help from private companies to explore for oil in the region with a 2008 oil reform that allows for incentive based operating contracts, but no projects have yet been announced¶ "This agreement also creates new opportunities for our businesses. American energy companies will be able - for the first time - to collaborate with Pemex, their Mexican counterpart," said Clinton.¶ Mexico, which relies on oil revenues to fund a third of the federal budget, closely guards its oil resources nationalized since 1938.¶ "This agreement was negotiated invariably under the principle of respecting sovereign rights. Mexican oil wealth is and will continue to be of the Mexicans," President Felipe Calderon said at the event.¶ Pemex - a major oil exporter to the United States - saw oil output decline dramatically at its largest, aging fields but has managed to stabilize production at around 2.55 million barrels per day (bpd).¶ The state-oil company has been slow to replace lost reserves with new discoveries.¶ Last August, however, Pemex announced the discovery of a new light crude oil deposit in the Gulf of Mexico offshore from the southern Mexican state of Campeche.¶ The Kinbe-1 find has 150 million barrels of proven, probable and possible (3P) reserves, part of the Tsimin and Xux fields that hold a total of 2 billion barrels of crude, Pemex's Morales said.¶ "We are talking about a giant oil field," Morales said. "These areas will start producing in 2014."

#### Dominant species are more important to ecology than diversity

**Mokani et al, 08** (Karel, School of Botany and Zoology, Australia National University, \*AND Julian Ash, School of Botany and Zoology, Australia National University, \*AND Stephen Roxburgh, Bushfire Cooperative Research Centre, School of Biological, Earth, and Environmental Sciences, University of New South Wales and ENSIS, May 7, 2008, “Functional identity is more important than diversity in influencing ecosystem processes in a temperate native grassland,” Journal of Ecology Volume 96, Issue 5, Wiley, Hensel)

In conclusion, the results from our study suggest that the traits of the **dominant species are of primary importance** in determining the effect of the biota on ecosystem processes, supporting Grime’s (1998) **mass ratio hypothesis**. Functional diversity was also important in some instances, indicating that complementarity may influence ecosystem processes, but not always positively. In contrast, we found species richness to be relatively poor at explaining variation in ecosystem processes. The results we present suggest that changes in community dominance hierarchies deserve the greatest attention when managing communities for the maintenance of ecosystem processes.

#### **No regulations – TBA doesn’t solve spills – doesn’t solve existing deficits in safety procedures**

US News ’12 [4/24/12, US News is an information distributer to the misguided masses, “Interior's Ken Salazar: No Promises on Oil Prices”, <http://www.usnews.com/news/blogs/washington-whispers/2012/04/24/interiors-ken-salazar-no-promises-on-oil-prices>]

Salazar outlined a few "low-hanging fruits" he would like to see Congress tackle this election year, but offered little optimism. "I am not trying to give a laundry list of 100 things, because I am not sure they can get it done," Salazar said. He criticized Congress for failing to pass a single piece of legislation relating to offshore oil and gas safety since the disastrous BP Gulf of Mexico oil spill of 2010. The secretary also criticized Congress for not supporting the U.S. and Mexico's Transboundary Hydrocarbons Agreement, which allows both countries to expand joint drilling operations in the Gulf of Mexico.

### Relations

Drug violence is declining – most recent ev

WSJ 6-28-13 (Wall Street Journal, “Mexico Sees Decline in Drug-Related Killings”, June 28th, 2013, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887324328204578573760968965312.html)

Drug-related killings that turned parts of Mexico into the bloodiest spots on the globe appear to have decreased in recent months - a welcome trend in a nation exhausted by years of violence associated with organized crime, even if the reasons behind it are hard to pin down.¶ The bloodshed is still alarmingly high, as the northern border and even the Acapulco beach resort continue to suffer from cartel turf wars.¶ In his first six months in office, around 6,300 people died in killings seen as linked to organized crime. But that is a drop of about 18% compared with an estimated 7,700 in the previous six months.¶ A separate study by a nonprofit group, the Mexican Institute of Competitiveness, used all reported murders, not just those classified as organized crime-related. It then seasonally adjusted the murder rates - since summer months tend to see a spike - and came up with a less-pronounced drop of 6% to around 10,000 murders, compared with about 10,600 in the six months before Mr. Peña Nieto took office.¶ The study's lead author, Alejandro Hope, a former government intelligence official, said the seasonally adjusted decline seems to have flattened out in recent months, suggesting further gains may be hard to come by.¶ "The situation is improving at a very slow rate," said Mr. Hope. "My nightmare scenario is that we get used to 20,000 or 25,000 people getting killed every year."

#### Drug cooperation is high now and will continue to grow – Nieto and Obama’s meetings

FNL 7/5 [July 5, 2013. Fox News Latino. “U.S. Wants More Intelligence Cooperation With Mexico, White House Report States” <http://latino.foxnews.com/latino/news/2013/07/05/us-wants-more-intelligence-cooperation-with-mexico-white-house-report-states/#ixzz2aos85oqW>]

#### A newly released White House report on the U.S. border with Mexico highlights the Obama administration's strategic shift toward forgoing a closer working relationship with its southern neighbor. This, despite recent restrictions by Enrique Peña Nieto's government on who American intelligence services can contact in Mexico. The White House's 2013 National Southwest Border Counternarcotics Strategy illustrated nine points that focus on interdiction, tackling drug cartels along the border, halting money laundering, building up stronger communities and strengthening ties between the two nations in terms of counternarcotics. “The U.S.-Mexican bilateral relationship **continues to grow** based on strong, multi-layered institutional ties,” the report stated. “Based on principles of shared responsibility, mutual trust, and respect for sovereign independence, the two countries’ efforts have built confidence that continues to transform and strengthen the bilateral relationship in 2013 and beyond.” While the U.S. report touts a need for greater cooperation, new Mexican security policies could hamper that. A recent decision by the Mexican government has ordered a halt in direct communications between American intelligence agencies and their counterparts south of the border. Now instead of directly consulting local law enforcement, agencies like the DEA and FBI will have to contact Mexico's Interior Ministry before being passed along through the proper channels. Intelligence sharing, however, was a major talking point when President Barack Obama met with his Mexican counterpart back in May. Despite scarce details about the meeting, the two leaders discussed border security and the use of drones along the 1,954-mile shared border. Peña Nieto downplayed the notion that the new, more centralized arrangement would damage its security partnership with the United States. He said Obama agreed during their private meeting earlier in the day to "cooperate on the basis of mutual respect" to promote an efficient and effective strategy. "I think the U.S. government wants to make sure that Peña Nieto is on the same page as Obama, that he wants to pursue the cartels as consistently and aggressively as [former Mexican President] Calderón did during his presidency," Alex Sanchez, a security analyst at the Council on Hemispheric Affairs, told ABC News. Even as the Obama administration hopes that Peña Nieto will continue to go on the offensive against the drug cartels in Mexico, the report suggests a more humanitarian approach to the drug war. Besides counternarcotics efforts, a solid portion of the report concerns community building measures along the border, ways to deal with substance abuse and violence, as well as health and education programs. “The crime and breakdown in public health and safety that affect many border communities has a close nexus with substance use —including abuse of alcohol and other drugs— can have a far-reaching effect on the resilience of communities,” the report stated. “Heavily Hispanic communities along the border have been particularly hard hit.” The report’s focus on community building seems to go along with Peña Nieto’s strategy in combating the drug war. Instead of the “kingpin” approach that his predecessor Felipe Calderón took, which focused on apprehending or killing high-ranking cartel members, Peña Nieto has moved to a plan to reduce the levels of violence in the country and bolster trust of law enforcement among the populace. The report has some analysts hopeful that there will be **better working relations** between the U.S. and Mexico, especially in light of the new rules concerning U.S. intelligence agencies. “The election of Peña Nieto sparked vocal concerns among U.S. political leaders over his stated desire to move priorities away from arrests and drug seizures, and towards violence reduction, and there have also been reports of tensions between the incoming government and U.S. officials over the level of U.S. involvement in Mexican security policies,” the Latin American intelligence website Insight Crime stated. “However, the U.S. strategy displays no sign of this friction, only expressing a desire to increase cooperation, which despite the public murmuring is likely to be the case.”

**Multilateralism fails – organizations fail and exclusion of countries is inevitable – the US is not key**

**Gallagher 10 –** leading Australian consultant on trade and public policy (Peter, “Plurilateralism… get used to it,” 12/20/10, [http://www.petergallagher.com.au/index.php/site/article/plurilateralism...-get-used-to-it)//AY](http://www.petergallagher.com.au/index.php/site/article/plurilateralism...-get-used-to-it%29//AY)

Those Orga­ni­za­tions will go on. So will mul­ti­lat­er­al­ism. This week is only another reminder that col­lab­o­ra­tive man­age­ment of the global com­mons (peace, trade… pos­si­bly emis­sions) is, and always has been, very dif­fi­cult to achieve. The ‘one-world, one vision’ approach endorsed by the U.N. in its cur­rent form and backed for sixty years by the U.S. and Europe (chiefly) may be too hard to sus­tain for the next lit­tle while. Dur­ing the past decade, the veil of mul­ti­lat­eral col­lab­o­ra­tion thrown over the inner-workings of the U.N./Bretton-Woods man­age­ment frame­work has grown thin­ner and thin­ner. **There has always been a cer­tain amount of stiff-arming** behind the veil. But, with appro­pri­ate restraint—including by Japan—it worked for a long time to deliver effec­tive global col­lab­o­ra­tion. After this week, it will never be quite the same. But there’s no need for panic. It’s a shame but no emer­gency that a U.N. meet­ing turns out to be another expen­sive dud. Just relax and try to enjoy the ride. Enjoy the rich­ness of greater global diver­sity, for one thing. The extra­or­di­nary thing about this week in Copen­hagen is not what we didn’t see (an agree­ment on emis­sions) but what we *did* see, clearly for the first time. The veil of mul­ti­lat­er­al­ism has fallen long enough to show the world the present real­i­ties behind it. First, of course, the expen­sive, chaotic sham of 192 nations in at least as many lim­ou­sines, from Tuvalu to the United States, try­ing to agree on 1 text with at least 2 tar­gets lubri­cated by a $100billion bribe (that turned out to be only a $10billion i.o.u.) Sec­ond, and more impor­tant, The Pres­i­dent of the United States being intro­duced to a meet­ing to which he not been invited—*at which he did not even have a seat*—to nego­ti­ate a nar­row deal, sav­ing the appear­ance of col­lab­o­ra­tion, with Brazil, China, India and South Africa. To enter the room, Obama had to leave Europe and Japan out in the cold. He had to work out a deal with four giant economies that col­lec­tively hold quite a few mark­ers on the future of the global com­mons, but most of whom are by any mea­sure still poor coun­tries. The [account](http://bit.ly/8172r2) of this meet­ing is a vision of the global frame­work for col­lab­o­ra­tion now and in the next few decades. What we now have as a frame­work for global orga­ni­za­tion is a roil­ing, argu­men­ta­tive, pluri­lat­er­al­ism where alliances and coali­tions slip and slide along a dozen dif­fer­ent planes of inter­na­tional endeav­our. Farewell to the old two-handed back-room brawls and staged con­sen­sus of the *pax atlantica*. In the new frame­work broad, top-down ‘solu­tions’ like Kyoto’s tar­gets and the WTO’s ‘Sin­gle Under­tak­ing’ cannnot be made to work by a fly­ing visit from the U.S. Pres­i­dent or alter­nate hand-wringing and blus­ter from Brussels. The bad news—if you’d like the world to be a set­tled place ruled by, say, a benef­i­cent dic­ta­tor (oxy­moron) from Wash­ing­ton or even Beijing—is that ‘global gov­er­nance’ now becomes a tricky mat­ter of rec­on­cil­ing and align­ing many dif­fer­ent, prob­a­bly autonomous, or at best regional attempts to deal with the man­age­ment of global com­mons. **Guar­an­teed to be messy.**

#### US unilateral action is inevitable – ideology – committing to multilateralism in one instance doesn’t solve

**Bass 9** (James E Bass, Major, US Air Force, “Unilateral vs. Multilateral Engagement: A Scenario-Based Approach to Guiding America’s Future Foreign Policy,” Air Command and Staff College, Air University, p. 3-6, April 2009, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA539615)

According to Stewart Patrick of the Center on International Cooperation, **America’s preference for unilateral engagement is explained by three inherent characteristics.** **First, a sense of “exceptionalism” that evolved from America’s founding principles has had major influence on US policy goals and engagement.**5 As a champion for liberal principles the US is motivated to cooperate with others to promote universal prosperity and security. Nevertheless, **American exceptionalism also motivates the US to protect its values, and avoid any engagement that might infringe upon its sovereignty**.6 In fact, America’s preoccupation with safeguarding sovereignty yielded a predilection for unilateralism throughout the 1900’s.7 Not until it attained great power status, did the US consent to multilateralism. Specifically, after World War II, the US employed multilateralism to rebuild a favorable international framework that would counter the strategic threat posed by the Soviet Union. The Cold War dominated foreign policy until the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991. During the Cold War period foreign policy was dictated by the executive branch and focused primarily on the threat of nuclear war. The President committed to multilateral agreements where it served national security.8 **Second, the system of checks and balances built into the US Constitution produced a separation of powers that limits the government’s ability to endorse multilateral commitments**. Specifically, two-thirds of the Senate must support a treaty for ratification to occur. **This construct makes it possible for political minorities to hinder multilateral engagement.**9 For example, during World War I the Republican-controlled Senate rejected US membership in the League of Nations despite President Wilson’s support.10 **Third, America’s current hegemonic status provides incentive to act unilaterally because multilateral engagement is based on rules and norms rather than power.** As a consequence, the weaker power is strengthened from the benefits of multilateral cooperation, while the stronger power endures the costs of restraint.11 For example, a given UN convention limiting freedom of action with regard to national instruments of power could severely hamper achievement of US strategic objectives putting vital interests at risk. On the same note, such a convention could embolden a weaker adversary to hold US interests at risk without fear of retribution assuming that the US will limit its response within the restraints of the convention. Here **it is helpful to note specific instances in which the three inherent characteristics aforementioned have guided US action on foreign policy issues**. To begin with, **the US has used military force without United Nations (UN) approval**. While the US did attain UN approval for coalition intervention to expel Iraqi forces from Kuwait, America’s frustrations with the impediments of multilateralism lead it to act without UN approval in the 1998 bombing of Iraq and the 1999 ousting of Serbian forces from Kosovo. **These interventions set a precedent for the future unilateral use of force**.12 Indeed, **the US demonstrated its most dramatic disregard for international institutions in March of 2003** when President Bush unilaterally issued Saddam Hussein an ultimatum despite a lack of UN support. While the US made an effort to gain UN authorization for the war in Iraq, there is little doubt that the administration had already determined its intended course of action prior to submitting the UN proposal for use of force in February of 2003. America’s praiseworthy efforts to gain UN support was a multilateral endeavor that initially suppressed anti-American sentiments.13 However, the “Bush Doctrine” and America’s failed efforts to restore stability in post-war Iraq proved US policy to be shortsighted resulting in international opposition to US policy and calling into question traditional east-west alliances.14 At the same time, the US has increasingly restricted support for UN peacekeeping operations since its failures in Somalia and Bosnia-Herzegovina.15 In addition to declining peacekeeping assistance, the US is also to blame, in part, for the shortcomings in UN effectiveness due to its neglectful financial provisions. In fact, the UN case is only one of several instances in which the US demonstrated a disregard for international institutions through its waning financial support during the 1990s.16 **The US has also shown disregard for multilateral cooperation on global security issues.** Regarding weapons of mass destruction (WMD) threats, the US Senate approved the Chemical Weapons Convention in 1997 only after insisting on exemptions that diluted its impact, and in 1999 the Senate weakened nonproliferation efforts and snubbed allies when it rejected the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.17 Also in 1999, the US upset international order by espousing support for a national missile defense (NMD) system that violated the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty. Risking global strategic stability, in 2001 the Bush administration pushed Moscow for modification of the ABM Treaty, and subsequently withdrew unilaterally in 2002 after failing to secure Russia’s cooperation.18 Yet another example of US indifference to multilateral cooperation with regard to WMD threats involves the 1972 Biological Weapons Convention (BWC). Ineffective due to the absence of a compliance scheme, international efforts to implement verification procedures were rejected by the Bush administration in 2001on the grounds that they did not coincide with US national interests.19 **US lack of interest in multilateral cooperation on global security issues extends beyond WMD threats**. For example, in 1997 the Clinton administration refused to sign the Ottawa Convention banning antipersonnel land mines. Despite the fact that the convention has been signed by 156 countries, the US still declines accession arguing that land mines are a critical component of its Korea strategy.20 Also in 2001, a draft UN convention to limit small arms trafficking was singularly opposed by the Bush administration’s insistence on curtailment of the conventions terms. The US was uncompromising on limits to civilian small arms ownership and advocated several other changes that weakened the draft convention.21 The US has held many countries to high standards on international issues such as human rights, technology transfers, antiterrorism, and narcotics interdiction, imposing punishment on those that fail to meet US standards.22 Nevertheless, the US has frequently been wary of taking on international commitments. For example, the US has declined to ratify the International Criminal Court and the UN conventions on the Rights of the Child and Elimination of Discrimination Against Women. While the US was a major contributor to the growth of multilateral free trade initiatives in the 1990s, such as the North American Free Trade Agreement and the World Trade Organization, it engaged in unilateralism to gain market concessions.23 **The US has also been reluctant to embrace conventions that address world-wide issues such as global warming**, evidenced by the Bush administration’s refusal to ratify the Kyoto Protocol on climate change in 2001.

#### human rights violations is an alt cause

**Burgsdorff, 9–** Ph. D in Political Science from Freiburg University, EU Fellow at the University of Miami (Sven Kühn von, “Problems and Opportunities for the Incoming Obama Administration”, March 2009 [http://aei.pitt.edu.proxy.lib.umich.edu/11047/1/vonBurgsdorfUSvsCubalong09edi.pdf)DF](http://aei.pitt.edu.proxy.lib.umich.edu/11047/1/vonBurgsdorfUSvsCubalong09edi.pdf%29DF)

In addition, the US needs to improve its international human rights reputation which was ¶ severely damaged by US engagements in Iraq and the treatment of prisoners in Guantanamo. The ¶ perception that the US does not do its utmost to fully respect international law is an issue that ¶ renders difficult joint efforts to make the UN a meaningful instrument for acting decisively against ¶ human rights violations.2¶ If the US wants to act more effectively in multilateral fora in general on ¶ human rights matters, Washington, as a matter of priority, needs to restore US credibility, thus ¶ making human rights a more defendable key priority in international relations. Together, the EU and ¶ US stand a far better chance of furthering democratic change and sustainable improvement of the ¶ living conditions in Cuba. It is also then that other foreign partners, notably from Latin America, ¶ could be more easily approached to engage on Cuba along commonly agreed upon agendas. A ¶ realistic scenario, however, has to consider that political change in Cuba will probably take longer¶ and most likely be preceded by economic reform measures coming from the regime itself. Foreign ¶ actors wishing to assist in this process in a meaningful manner, are well advised to pursue a long ¶ term, incentives-based approach to both the Cuban authorities and Cuba’s emerging civil society,¶ including the human rights defenders.

#### China is investing in PEMEX now – plan pushes them out.

Yang 13 (Yang Jingjie is a reporter for Global Times. Global Times a daily Chinese tabloid focusing on international issues. “Increase in Mexican oil exports indicates thawing ties”, Global Times, April 9, 2013, http://www.globaltimes.cn/content/773515.shtml#.Ueht4I1OSSo)

Observers say Mexican state oil company Pemex's decision to significantly boost oil exports to China will help optimize the imbalanced bilateral trade structure and indicates thawing ties following their leadership transitions. On the sidelines of the Boao Forum for Asia on Saturday, Pemex Chief Executive Emilio Lozoya said the company would begin increasing exports to China by 30,000 barrels a day starting this month, according to a two-year agreement between Pemex and China's Sinopec, Reuters reported. The level of exports to China could increase over time as part of the agreement, he added. Mexico, the seventh largest oil producer in the world, exports nearly 80 percent of its oil to the US and only some 50,000 barrels to China each month, according to China Radio International. Lin Boqiang, director of the China Center for Energy Economics Research at Xiamen University, told the Global Times that the increase stemmed from China's potential for growth in demand, against the backdrop of shrinking US imports as a result of its shale boom. A report released by OPEC last week expected China to overtake the US as the world's largest oil importer by 2014. This would also diversify China's sources of oil imports, "as only about 9 percent of the imports came from Latin America last year," Lin added. Data from the China Petroleum and Chemical Industry Federation showed last year nearly half of China's oil imports came from the Middle East. Yang Zhimin, a researcher with the Institute of Latin American Studies at the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, told the Global Times that the supply of oil is not solely decided by market demands, given its strategic nature. "We can't rule out the possibility of US influence in Mexico's decision, but the current president Enrique Pena Nieto won't follow the US as closely as his predecessor did." Pena Nieto, who is from the center-left Institutional Revolutionary Party, last year replaced rightist Felipe Calderon as president. Yang noted that the visit by Pena Nieto, which was paid just weeks after Xi became president, was a move aimed at mending bilateral ties. His predecessor Calderon met the Dalai Lama in 2011, drawing discontent and objection from Beijing. Yang said the new oil deal would also help narrow the bilateral trade imbalance. Mexico said its trade deficit with China reached $51.2 billion in 2012.

#### China’s influence in Latin America is key to their soft power

Malik, 06 – PhD in International Relations (Mohan, "China's Growing Involvement in Latin America," 6/12, [http://uyghuramerican.org/old/articles/300/1/info@uyghuramerican.org](http://uyghuramerican.org/old/articles/300/1/info%40uyghuramerican.org))

China's forays into Latin America are part of its grand strategy to acquire "comprehensive national power" to become a "global great power that is second to none." Aiming to secure access to the continent's vast natural resources and markets, China is forging deep economic, political and military ties with most of the Latin American and Caribbean countries. There is more to China's Latin American activism than just fuel for an economic juggernaut. China now provides a major source of leverage against the United States for some Latin American and Caribbean countries. As in many other parts of the developing world, China is redrawing geopolitical alliances in ways that help propel China's rise as a global superpower. Beijing's courtship of Latin American countries to support its plan to subdue Taiwan and enlist them to join a countervailing coalition against U.S. global power under the rubric of strengthening economic interdependence and globalization has begun to attract attention in Washington. Nonetheless, Beijing's relations with the region are neither too cozy nor frictionless. For Latin America and the Caribbean countries, China is an enviable competitor and rival, potential investor, customer, economic partner, a great power friend and counterweight to the United States, and, above all, a global power, much like the United States, that needs to be handled with care. As in Asia and Africa, China is rapidly expanding its economic and diplomatic presence in Latin America -- a region the United States has long considered inside its sphere of influence. China's interest in Latin America is driven by its desire to secure reliable sources of energy and raw materials for its continued economic expansion, compete with Taiwan for diplomatic recognition, pursue defense and intelligence opportunities to define limits to U.S. power in its own backyard, and to showcase China's emergence as a truly global great power at par with the United States. In Latin America, China is viewed differently in different countries. Some Latin American countries see China's staggering economic development as a panacea or bonanza (Argentina, Peru, and Chile view China as an insatiable buyer of commodities and an engine of their economic growth); others see it as a threat (Mexico, Brazil, and the Central American republics fear losing jobs and investment); and a third group of countries consider China their ideological ally (Bolivia, Cuba, and Venezuela). While China's growing presence and interests have changed the regional dynamics, it still cannot replace the United States as a primary benefactor of Latin America. Chinese investment in the region is US$8 billion, compared with $300 billion by U.S. companies, and U.S.-Latin America trade is ten times greater than China-Latin America trade. Nonetheless, China is the new kid on the block that everyone wants to be friendly with, and Beijing cannot resist the temptation to exploit resentment of Washington's domineering presence in the region to its own advantage. For Washington, China's forays into the region have significant political, security and economic implications because Beijing's grand strategy has made Latin America and Africa a frontline in its pursuit of global influence. China's Grand Strategy: Placing Latin America in the Proper Context China's activities in Latin America are part and parcel of its long-term grand strategy. The key elements of Beijing's grand strategy can be identified as follows: Focus on "comprehensive national power" essential to achieving the status of a "global great power that is second to none" by 2049; Seek energy security and gain access to natural resources, raw materials and overseas markets to sustain China's economic expansion; Pursue the "three Ms": military build-up (including military presence along the vital sea lanes of communication and maritime chokepoints), multilateralism, and multipolarity so as to counter the containment of China's regional and global aspirations by the United States and its friends and allies; Build a network of Beijing's friends and allies through China's "soft power" and diplomatic charm offensive, trade and economic dependencies via closer economic integration (free trade agreements), and mutual security pacts, intelligence cooperation and arms sales.

#### Chinese international influence is an existential impact – it controls every scenario for extinction

--can address terrosim – bc not the west

--

Zhang 2012 (Prof of Diplomacy and IR at the Geneva School of Diplomacy. “The Rise of China’s Political Softpower” 9/4/12 http://www.china.org.cn/opinion/2012-09/04/content\_26421330.htm)

As China plays an increasingly significant role in the world, its soft power must be attractive both domestically as well as internationally. The world faces many difficulties, including widespread poverty, international conflict, the clash of civilizations and environmental protection. Thus far, the Western model has not been able to decisively address these issues; the China model therefore brings hope that we can make progress in conquering these dilemmas. Poverty and development The Western-dominated global economic order has worsened poverty in developing countries. Per-capita consumption of resources in developed countries is 32 times as large as that in developing countries. Almost half of the population in the world still lives in poverty. Western countries nevertheless still are striving to consolidate their wealth using any and all necessary means. In contrast, China forged a new path of development for its citizens in spite of this unfair international order which enabled it to virtually eliminate extreme poverty at home. This extensive experience would indeed be helpful in the fight against global poverty. War and peace In the past few years, the American model of "exporting democracy'" has produced a more turbulent world, as the increased risk of terrorism threatens global security. In contrast, China insists that "harmony is most precious". It is more practical, the Chinese system argues, to strengthen international cooperation while addressing both the symptoms and root causes of terrorism. The clash of civilizations Conflict between Western countries and the Islamic world is intensifying. "In a world, which is diversified and where multiple civilizations coexist, the obligation of Western countries is to protect their own benefits yet promote benefits of other nations," wrote Harvard University professor Samuel P. Huntington in his seminal 1993 essay "The Clash of Civilizations?". China strives for "being harmonious yet remaining different", which means to respect other nations, and learn from each other. This philosophy is, in fact, wiser than that of Huntington, and it's also the reason why few religious conflicts have broken out in China. China's stance in regards to reconciling cultural conflicts, therefore, is more preferable than its "self-centered" Western counterargument. Environmental protection Poorer countries and their people are the most obvious victims of global warming, yet they are the least responsible for the emission of greenhouse gases. Although Europeans and Americans have a strong awareness of environmental protection, it is still hard to change their extravagant lifestyles. Chinese environmental protection standards are not yet ideal, but some effective environmental ideas can be extracted from the China model. Perfecting the China model The China model is still being perfected, but its unique influence in dealing with the above four issues grows as China becomes stronger. China's experiences in eliminating poverty, prioritizing modernization while maintaining traditional values, and creating core values for its citizens demonstrate our insight and sense of human consciousness. Indeed, the success of the China model has not only brought about China's rise, but also a new trend that can't be explained by Western theory. In essence, the rise of China is the rise of China's political soft power, which has significantly helped China deal with challenges, assist developing countries in reducing poverty, and manage global issues. As the China model improves, it will continue to surprise the world.

#### Overwhelming opposition to the AFF – the plan is an insurmountable obstacle which kills Nieto’s credibility

Starr 12 - Director, U.S.-Mexico Network Associate Professor (NTT) University Fellow, Center on Public Diplomacy University of Southern California (Pamela, “U.S.-Mexico Relations and Mexican Domestic Politics”, October 6 of 2012, <https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=3&cad=rja&ved=0CD4QFjAC&url=http%3A%2F%2Fcollege.usc.edu%2Fusmexnet%2Fwp-content%2Fuploads%2F2010%2F10%2FCamp-Oxford-paper-final.doc&ei=mTLYUZTDMbOLyQGT14GwCQ&usg=AFQjCNH_cqiYTQRo7SFmpfWugH9ABshhCg&sig2=_M2KmLNnt3e8v4vVshc_fQ>)

The final implication of Mexican nationalism for U.S.-Mexico relations is the nearly insurmountable obstacle it erected to political alliances between Mexican actors and their U.S. counterparts, which has broken down only gradually and incompletely since the mid-1990s. For decades, the fear of being tarred as a traitor to the nation prevented Mexican leaders from seeking allies to their cause in the United States and thereby deprived U.S. actors of an easy point of entry into Mexican politics. Mexicans who ignored this taboo paid the price even in the final years of the twentieth century. In the 1980s, the then opposition National Action Party openly elicited U.S. backing for its charges of electoral fraud and associated actions of civil disobedience, producing a nationalist backlash in Mexico that sharply undercut the legitimacy of its claims. In the early 1990s, Mexican opponents of the North American Free Trade Agreement formed an alliance with their U.S. and Canadian counterparts, leading to accusations of having organized traitorous “campaigns against Mexico in the United States.” ¶ Carlos Salinas’ 1990 decision to summon U.S. assistance to lock in his domestic economic reform agenda through a bilateral trade treaty and his active lobbying to gain U.S. congressional approval of the treaty dealt a blow to this long-standing taboo. As a result, cross-border alliances are now increasingly common and accepted, but they are heavily concentrated among civil society actors. Mexico’s continuing anxiety about U.S. political domination, however, means that tolerance for cross-border political alliances is much less developed. While Mexican policy makers and analysts of the bilateral relationship have significantly more freedom of action to work with their U.S. counterparts in the early twenty-first century than did their predecessors, they still must watch their step or risk having their reputation sullied for being excessively “pro-gringo.” Mexicans remain uneasy living next door to a superpower; they continue to worry that the United States might get the notion to translate its power into domination of Mexico, its politics, policy, and culture, and they thus still approach their neighbor with trepidation. As a result, Mexican politicians and policy makers still must take care to avoid the appearance of being too willing to accept support and guidance from north of the border.

#### Nieto key to the drug war – new strategy stops the root cause of cartels and empirics prove – turns the case

Grillo et al 13 - journalist and author of the book El Narco: Inside Mexico's Criminal Insurgency, has been reporting on the Mexican Drug War and the Latin American illegal drug trade since 2001 (Ioan, Dolly Mascarenas, “Mexico Goes After the Narcos — Before They Join the Gangs”, February 25 of 2013, Time, <http://world.time.com/2013/02/25/mexico-goes-after-the-narcos-before-they-join-the-gangs/>)

Recently installed President Enrique Peña Nieto hopes to reverse this trend with a new anticrime strategy — transforming poor neighborhoods like Nezahualcóyotl where cartels make their bastions and preventing young people from joining their criminal armies. On Feb. 12, Peña Nieto announced there would be more than $9 billion for crime prevention aimed at 57 hot spots. “We must put special emphasis on prevention, because we can’t only keep employing more sophisticated weapons, better equipment, more police, a higher presence of the armed forces in the country as the only form of combating organized crime,” Peña Nieto said. Rather than just shooting or incarcerating the seemingly endless ranks of cartel gunmen, the President hopes to stop young people from becoming assassins in the first place.¶ The 57 target areas include traditional hotbeds of violence such as cities on the U.S. border and Acapulco, on the Pacific Coast. But they also include places where cartels have been encroaching more recently, such as Nezahualcóyotl, commonly referred to as Neza. Named after an Aztec poet king, Neza was populated by squatters who built shantytowns in the 1970s and has since grown to more than 1 million people on the rim of Mexico City’s urban sprawl — growth that has attracted the attention of investors like billionaire Carlos Slim. Cartels like La Familia have moved into its slums from marijuana-growing mountains to sell drugs, extort businesses and kidnap for ransom. Some of their new members hail from Neza’s streets.¶ Roberto Campa, who has been named to run the national prevention program, says there is a clear link between conditions in these ghettos and the rise of cartels. “When you see the circumstances tha,t young people live in in many of these communities, you can easily explain why they are involved in these [criminal] activities,” Campa tells TIME. “You find young people suffer violence in the home, in many cases are from broken homes, where there is presence of alcohol or drugs, in communities where they have no chance to enjoy their free time. They form groups in the barrio, and then they are in gangs and then they are openly involved with organized crime. Yes, without a doubt, we have to work with containing [crime], with all the issues of police, prisons, prosecutors and the presence of armed forces. But on the other side, we have to start systematically confronting the causes of these problems.”¶ The plan includes gang-outreach schemes, community centers and employment projects to try to steer the young away from criminal life. There will also be construction programs aimed at transforming chaotic urban jungles into prettier spaces where people will feel inspired to say no to crime mobs. Mexican officials cite Ciudad Juárez as an example of where prevention programs have worked. In 2010, Juárez suffered over 3,000 homicides, making it the most murderous city on the planet by some counts. In response, the Mexican government poured money into social work, including tripling the number of community centers. This helped reduce homicides by three-quarters, to less than 750 last year. Medellín, Colombia, is also a case study in urban renewal. It was named the most violent city in the world in 1993, when it was the virtual fiefdom of cocaine king Pablo Escobar. But murders declined enormously as mayors erected state-of-the-art buildings in its slums and cable cars transporting residents up its hills to increase economic opportunity.

#### Nieto has to credibility to follow through with his reform efforts now – but he has to tread carefully

Thomson 4-24 - Adam Thomson is the FT's Mexico and Central America correspondent (Adam, “President Enrique Peña Nieto works to soothe Mexico tensions”, April 24 of 2013, Financial Times, <http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/628aabae-acfa-11e2-9454-00144feabdc0.html#axzz2YVlziShn>)

Mexico’s four-month-old administration on Wednesday appeared to overcome its first political crisis after opposition leaders said that they had largely settled their differences with the government.¶ The agreement, which came after an emergency meeting of party heads, appears to put the government’s economic reform back on track in a turnaround that will doubtless ease investor concerns.¶ Billions of dollars have flowed into Mexico in recent months on hopes that centrist President Enrique Peña Nieto of the Institutional Revolutionary Party will push a series of reforms aimed at transforming Latin America’s second-largest economy into a more vibrant emerging market.¶ The inflows have pushed the local stock market index to record highs. In one clear sign of investors’ new-found fascination with Mexico, the local currency this month strengthened against the US dollar, reaching an 18-month high.¶ Speaking after the meeting on Wednesday, Jesús Zambrano, leader of the leftwing Democratic Revolution Party, suggested that things were getting back to normal after a tense week. “At least we have laid the foundations for continuing along the reform path,” Reforma, the Mexican daily, quoted him as saying.¶ A statement by Mexico’s interior ministry, which organised the meeting, confirmed that the parties had agreed to keep working together to further the so-called Pact for Mexico, a list of economic, social and political reform pledges signed in December by party leaders.¶ “Everyone reaffirmed their conviction that the reform agenda laid out in the Pact comes before party interests,” said the statement.¶ In Lima, Luis Videgaray, Mexico’s finance minister, expressed optimism that a banking-reform bill, which the government had planned to unveil this week but postponed because of the political tension, would get back on track.¶ “I haven’t the slightest doubt the financial reform will be presented in the next few days,” he told Reuters. “I’m sure it’ll have strong support from the political forces and representatives in the Pact for Mexico.”¶ The latest events come after Democratic Revolution Party members and the conservative National Action Party, both signatories to the Pact, recently accused government officials of using social-assistance programmes in the state of Veracruz to gain an advantage in forthcoming elections.¶ Almost half of Mexico’s 31 states go to the polls in the coming months, and political rivalries have already started to surface in the run-up to voting day.¶ Roy Campos, a pollster in Mexico City, argues that Mr Peña Nieto’s swift and energetic response to the building storm – after initially underestimating the problem – went a long way to resolving what could have become much worse.¶ Not least, on Tuesday Mexico’s leader gave a rousing speech in the state of Puebla where he asked all the political parties to join him in helping to ensure that social programmes were protected from the threat of use for political gain “Let’s bulletproof them,” he said.¶ That, says Mr Campos, allowed everyone involved to claim some sort of victory – the opposition parties that they brought the administration to task, and Mr Peña Nieto that he was able to pull in the opposition in a joint crusade against corruption.¶ “Peña Nieto has recovered very quickly,” says Mr Campos. “The pact is far from broken.”¶ Yet it seems clear that the Veracruz scandal serves as a reminder of how carefully Mr Peña Nieto must tread in the coming months as he seeks to bring his economic reform agenda to fruition.¶

# 2NC

## Case

### Relations

SQ Solves

Drug violence is declining – that’s WSJ – proven because

1. Drug related killings have declined 18 percent – disregard aff rhetoric because statistical data is the only indisputable fact

2. The situation is improving slowly – prefer neg cards on drug violence because our ev is predictive of the way future reforms affect violence – theirs \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Perfer our ev – Most recent – only it assumes Nieto’s recent reforms

#### ‘No brink – drug violence for the past 2 decades

Best evidence goes neg – drug violence is declining

Bargent 2-7-13 (James, Independent journalism from Colombia and Latin America, “Mexico Drug War Violence Slowing: Report”, Febraury 7th, 2013, http://www.insightcrime.org/news-briefs/mexico-drug-war-violence-slowing-report)

A new report analyzing the data behind Mexico’s drug war shows in 2012 organized crime related killings declined or leveled off while becoming increasingly concentrated in key strategic areas. The report, compiled by the San Diego University’s Trans-Border Institute, analyzed a range of data sources -- both official and independent -- to build a comprehensive picture of the shifting violence patterns in Mexico.¶ The most significant trend identified was the slowing rate of drug war killings. While the conclusions of different data sets varied widely, they agreed that in 2012 the substantial year on year increases Mexico has seen since 2007 came to an end.¶ According to data collated by Mexican newspaper Reforma, organized crime related murders dropped by over 21 percent, falling to 8,989 from 12,284. Projections for the government’s as yet unreleased figures show a 28% drop. However, figures from another media source, Milenio, showed an increase in its crime related murder tallies but by less than 1 percent – far lower than in previous years.¶ The report also highlights how Mexico’s drug war violence is increasingly concentrated. Between 2007 and 2011, the number of municipalities that recorded no murders dropped by 28 percent, while the number of municipalities with 25 or more annual homicides grew from 50 to 240. However, in 2012, (for which, the report points out, the data set is incomplete) the number of municipalities free from violence increased 16% while the number with more than 25 homicides decreased more than 25% to 178.¶ Over half the organized crime linked murders nationwide came from just five states; Sinaloa, Chihuaha, Nuevo Leon, Guerrero and Coahuila (although the order depends of the data set). 2012 also saw Acapulco assume the mantle of Mexico’s most violent city, even though the murder rate leveled off, while the cities of Monterrey, Torreon, and Nuevo Laredo posted the largest increases in crime related killings.¶ InSight Crime¶ While the authorities will probably lay claim to the slowdown in drug violence, it is likely a more influential factor has been changing dynamics in the Mexican underworld, as reflected by the shifting geographical patterns.¶

#### Security cooperation is as good as it’s ever been – new communication methods

AP 7/23 [July 23, 2013. Associated Press. “DHS secretary discusses cooperation with Mexican domestic security chief at border meeting” <http://articles.washingtonpost.com/2013-07-23/world/40859585_1_mexico-city-u-s-border-patrol-u-s-rep>]

#### Security cooperation with Mexico is as good as it has ever been with the new administration of President Enrique Pena Nieto, U.S. Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano said Tuesday. Napolitano, who is leaving her post to head the University of California, met with Mexican Interior Secretary Miguel Angel Osorio Chong in this border city and announced plans for a bi-national security communications network and coordinated patrols between U.S. Border Patrol and Mexico’s Federal Police. No details of the programs were released. “What we have been working on is improved intelligence sharing between our countries on a real-time basis and making sure as, Secretary Osorio Chong said, that the gaps are filled and they are filled in a timely way,” Napolitano said. “But the emphasis on intel sharing, information sharing, making risk assessments that address the risk both countries face ... those things I think are continuing and are even stronger than they have been.” Napolitano’s visit comes one week after the capture of alleged Zeta leader Miguel Angel Trevino Morales, which appeared to be the result of U.S.-Mexico intelligence sharing. Mexico would not say what role the U.S. played in the capture, but the arrest and killing of many top capos has come with intelligence from U.S. law enforcement. Trevino Morales, considered among the most violent of Mexico’s drug lords, was caught July 15 by Mexican marines along with two others on a dirt road outside Nuevo Laredo, across the border from Laredo, Texas. It was a significant arrest for Pena Nieto, whose administration has been at pains to show it is not softening the pursuit of organized crime since he took office Dec. 1. His predecessor, Felipe Calderon, was repeatedly lauded by the U.S. for unprecedented cooperation between the two countries as he led an aggressive offensive against Mexico’s drug cartels. The Pena Nieto administration in April announced that contact for U.S. law enforcement would go through a “single door,” Osorio Chong’s office, signaling an end to direct sharing of resources and intelligence among law enforcement of both nations. U.S. Rep. Henry Cuellar, a Democrat from Laredo, said Tuesday that he had congratulated Osorio Chong following Trevino Morales’ arrest and called it the latest sign of cooperation. “The U.S. has helped provide for a while intelligence to make sure that they’re successful in reaching targets,” Cuellar said. The meetings took place just inside Mexico at the end of an international bridge linking Matamoros and Brownsville, Texas. Security was heavy at both ends of the bridge, with dog teams inspecting outbound cars on the Brownsville side and soldiers and state and federal police canvassing the bridge on the Mexican side. Napolitano was scheduled to fly on to Mexico City for meetings with Pena Nieto’s Cabinet. It will likely be her last visit to Mexico as homeland security secretary since she announced earlier this month that she will be leaving the post.

### Oil

No impact

#### No impact to the environment

Holly Doremus 2k Professor of Law at UC Davis, "The Rhetoric and Reality of Nature Protection: Toward a New Discourse," Winter 2000 Washington & Lee Law Review 57 Wash & Lee L. Rev. 11, lexis

Reluctant to concede such losses, tellers of the ecological horror story highlight how close a catastrophe might be, and how little we know about what actions might trigger one. But the apocalyptic vision is **less credible today than it seemed in the 1970s.** Although it is clear that the earth is experiencing a mass wave of extinctions, n213 the **complete elimination of life on earth seems unlikely.** n214 **Life is remarkably robust**. **Nor is human extinction probable** any time soon. Homo sapiens is **adaptable to nearly any environment**. Even if the world of the future includes far fewer species, it likely will hold people. n215 One response to this credibility problem tones the story down a bit, arguing not that humans will go extinct but that ecological disruption will bring economies, and consequently civilizations, to their knees. n216 But this too may be **overstating the case**. Most ecosystem functions are **performed by multiple species**. This **functional redundancy** means that **a high proportion of species can be lost without precipitating a collapse**. n217 Another response drops the horrific ending and returns to a more measured discourse of the many material benefits nature provides humanity. Even these more plausible tales, though, suffer from an important limitation. They call for nature protection only at a high level of generality. For example, human-induced increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide levels may cause rapid changes in global temperatures in the near future, with drastic consequences for sea levels, weather patterns, and ecosystem services. n218 Similarly, the loss of large numbers of species undoubtedly reduces the genetic library from which we might in the future draw useful resources. n219 But it is difficult to translate these insights into convincing arguments against any one of the small local decisions that contribute to the problems of global warming or biodiversity loss. n220 It is easy to argue that **the** material **impact of any individual decision to increase** carbon **emissions slightly or to destroy a small amount of habitat will be small.** It is difficult to identify the specific straw that will break the camel's back. Furthermore, **no unilateral action at the local or even national level can solve these global problems**. Local decisionmakers may feel paralyzed by the scope of the problems, or may conclude that any sacrifices they might make will go unrewarded if others do not restrain their actions. In sum, at the local level at which most decisions affecting nature are made, the material discourse provides little reason to save nature. Short of the ultimate catastrophe, the material benefits of destructive decisions frequently will exceed their identifiable material costs. n221

#### Their impact evidence is alarmist and empirically denied

Kaleita 7 Amy Kaleita is an Environmental Studies Fellow and Assistant Professor of agricultural and biosystems engineering at Iowa State University. She holds a PhD in agricultural engineering from the University of Illinois. "Hysteria's History: Environmental Alarmism in Context," Pacific Research Institute, http://www.pacificresearch.org/docLib/20070920\_Hysteria\_History.pdf

Apocalyptic stories about the irreparable, catastrophic damage that humans are doing to the natural environment have been around for a long time. These hysterics often have some basis in reality, but are blown up to illogical and ridiculous proportions. Part of the reason they’re so appealing is that they have the ring of plausibility along with the intrigue of a horror flick. ¶ In many cases, the alarmists identify a legitimate issue, take the possible consequences to an extreme, and advocate action on the basis of these extreme projections. In 1972, the editor of the journal *Nature* pointed out the problem with the typical alarmist approach: “[Alarmists’] most common error is to suppose that the worst will always happen.”82 But of course, if the worst always happened, the human race would have died out long ago. ¶ When alarmism has a basis in reality, the challenge becomes to take appropriate action based on that reality, not on the hysteria. The aftermath of*Silent Spring*offers examples of both sorts of policy reactions: a reasoned response to a legitimate problem and a knee-jerk response to the hysteria. ¶ On the positive side,*Silent Spring* brought an end to the general belief that all synthetic chemicals in use for purposes ranging from insect control to household cleaning were uniformly wonderful, and it ushered in an age of increased caution on their appropriate use. In the second chapter of her famous book, Carson wrote, “It is not my contention that chemical insecticides must never be used. I do contend that… we have allowed these chemicals to be used with little or no advance investigation of their effect on soil, water, wildlife, and man himself.” ¶ Indeed, Carson seemed to advocate reasoned response to rigorous scientific investigation, and in fact this did become the modern approach to environmental chemical licensure and monitoring. An hour-long CBS documentary on pesticides was aired during the height of the furor over*Silent Spring*. In the documentary, Dr. Page Nicholson, a water-pollution expert with the Public Health Service, wasn’t able to answer how long pesticides persist in water once they enter it, or the extent to which pesticides contaminate groundwater supplies. Today, this sort of information is gathered through routine testing of chemicals for use in the environment.¶ Ironically, rigorous investigation was not used in the decision to ban DDT, primarily due to the hysteria*Silent Spring*generated. In this example, the hysteria took on a life of its own, even trumping the author’s original intent. There was, as we have seen, a more sinister and tragic response to the hysteria generated by*Silent Spring*. Certain developing countries, under significant pressure from the United States, abandoned the use of DDT. This decision resulted in millions of deaths from malaria and other insect-borne diseases. In the absence of pressure to abandon the use of DDT, these lives would have been spared. It would certainly have been possible to design policies requiring caution and safe practices in the use of supplemental chemicals in the environment, without pronouncing a death sentence on millions of people. **¶** A major challenge in developing appropriate responses to legitimate problems is that alarmism catches people’s attention and draws them in. Alarmism is given more weight than it deserves, as policy makers attempt to appease their constituency and the media. It polarizes the debaters into groups of “believers” and “skeptics,” so that reasoned, fact-based compromise is difficult to achieve. Neither of these aspects of alarmism is healthy for the development of appropriate policy. ¶ Further, alarmist responses to valid problems risk foreclosing potentially useful responses based on ingenuity and progress. There are many examples from the energy sector where, in the presence of economic, efficiency, or societal demands, the marketplace has responded by developing better alternatives. That is not to say that we should blissfully squander our energy resources; on the contrary, we should be careful to utilize them wisely. Butenergy-resource hysteria should not lead us to circumvent scientific advancement by cherry-picking and favoring one particular replacement technology at the expense of other promising technologies. **¶** Environmental alarmism should be taken for what it is—a natural tendency of some portion of the public to latch onto the worst, and most unlikely, potential outcome. Alarmism should not be used as the basis for policy. Where a real problem exists, solutions should be based on reality, not hysteria.

### Pemex

SQ solves

Mexican growth sustainable – reforms

Levishon 5-3-13 (Ben, Emerging Markets Daily, May 3rd, 2013, “Mexico: Get Ready for Supersized Growth, Barclays Says” http://blogs.barrons.com/emergingmarketsdaily/2013/05/03/mexico-get-ready-for-supersized-growth-barclays-says/)

Mexico is supercharging its economy, and a little scandal is unlikely to derail its momentum, Barclays says.¶ In a report released yesterday, Barclays’ Marco Oviedo says that Mexico’s economy could grow at a much faster path than had been achievable in the past, thanks to the nation’s reform agenda. He writes:¶ As the structural reform agenda is being pushed rapidly, the positive effects could start to add up. In an optimistic scenario, the estimated effects from the reforms in growth mean that the economy should display strong rates in the medium term: 0.3-0.7% additional growth from the labor reform, 1.5% from a successful energy reform and additional 0.1% from higher investments in the telecommunications sector. Thus, if the economy’s potential growth is in fact closer to 4%, the Mexican economy could reach 6% annual growth on a sustainable manner in the following years. Moreover, even if potential growth is rather lower, 5% y/y could be reachable, which is still a positive outlook. ¶ That will depend on reforms continuing, however. Last week, investors worried that a corruption scandal could put an end to the reform momentum that has helped boost Mexico’s economy–and its markets. Oviedo, however, a little vote buying isn’t enough to derail changes that are in everybody’s best interests.¶ Oviedo notes that:¶ President Peña Nieto is being perceived as a very efficient political coordinator, even by¶ the opposition…One key elements of his main strategy is to negotiate the terms of the structural reforms within the Pacto por Mexico…The agreement includes all the initiatives that each party would push in their own political agendas.

Mexican growth is sustainable --- at worst there are alt causes

Diaz 12 (Carlos Díaz Guell, “Mexico’s Economic Growth More Sustainable”, November 2012, http://www.thecorner.eu/world-economy/mexicos-economic-growth-more-sustainable/17044/)

#### Mexico is one of the Latin American economic powerhouses. More than 4,000 Spanish companies operate in the country, so its slow but sure convergence towards more sustainable growth rates–after having experienced spikes that were superior to the real potential–has a special interest for Spain. In the third quarter of the year, Mexico recorded a year on year 3.3 percent GDP versus a forecast 3.7 percent.¶ On the supply side, the services sector grew by 3.3 percent, industry by 3.6 percent and agriculture by 1.7 percent. Seasonally adjusted, the GDP expanded 0.45 percent quarter on quarter, in line with rates seen since mid-2009.¶ Also, it is worth noting that albeit the latest growth rates have been moderated, data from previous quarters were revised upwards–up to 4.9 percent and 4.4 percent for the first and second quarter of 2012. The aggregated expansion until September is now 4.2 percent, a figure consistent with an economy that starts to show some degree of relaxation.¶ The market consensus points at 3.8 percent GDP for the whole of the current year, and supports expectations of a 3.6 percent GDP for 2013.¶ As for the global economy, the main uncertainties are external and linked to a possible restrictions in international financing and a drop in capital flows triggered by sovereign debt tensions in the euro zone, conflicts in the Middle East, and the resolution of the US’ so-called fiscal cliff.

No solvency

**1. Pemex is in massive debt and even the best predictions say itll be at least 5 years. Corruption and nationalization make Pemex structurally ineffective, the aff cant solve for alt causes – Camarena 10**

Can’t overcome corruption

Global Post 5-17-13 (Global Post, “Mexican daily: Pemex admits "serious" corruption”, May 17th, http://www.globalpost.com/dispatch/news/agencia-efe/130517/mexican-daily-pemex-admits-serious-corruption)

State-owned Petroleos Mexicanos admits that "serious" corruption exists in some areas of the company and that contracting processes in particular have been plagued by "interference from organized crime," a leading Mexican daily said Friday.¶ In a front-page story, El Universal said Pemex representatives and members of the Mexican Construction Industry Chamber drew that conclusion at a meeting in late April.¶ Pemex executives acknowledged that corruption is fueled "by the elevated potential economic benefit of illegal acts, impunity and the spaces opened up due to unnecessary flexibility," the newspaper reported.¶ El Universal's story was published just days after rival daily Reforma reported that Pemex was suing former company executive Cesar Nava in the U.S. courts for his alleged involvement in a conspiracy to defraud the oil giant.¶ Nava, erstwhile chairman of Mexico's conservative National Action Party, has been named in briefs expanding the $500 million lawsuit Pemex filed last December against Siemens AG and South Korea-based SK Engineering & Construction Co. for ostensibly bribing Pemex executives, Reforma said.¶ As Pemex's legal director in 2002, Nava intervened to stop the company from collecting $102.8 million from Siemens and SK to compensate for contract violations in the overhaul of the Cadereyta refinery, according to the court documents cited by that daily.¶ The defendants obtained $182.4 million by systematically overcharging Pemex for work on the refinery, the lawsuit maintains.¶ According to El Universal, during the meeting with construction industry executives, Pemex officials said there was "interference from organized crime" in the state oil monopoly's contracting processes.¶ That has led to "serious levels of corruption" within some Pemex segments, and company executives acknowledge they have not been able to put a halt to that activity, in part because many cases "have become lost in the courts."

#### The reason PEMEX isn’t inclined to drill for more gas is that the government has tied prices to the US. The plan does not change this. Low prices and high demand mean importing from the US is inevitable and PEMEX will inevitably collapse.

#### PEMEX collapse inevitable-price controls mean there’s no incentive to increase drilling

Davis, 2012 (Lucas, Associate Professor of Economic Analysis and Policy at the Haas School of Business at the University of California, Berkeley, “Natural Gas Shortages in Mexico”, Energy Institute at Haas, http://energyathaas.wordpress.com/2012/09/24/natural-gas-shortages-in-mexico/)

As U.S. Henry Hub prices have continued to decrease, demand for natural gas in Mexico has skyrocketed, particularly among industrial users. And today in Mexico there is a severe shortage of natural gas. A recent article from Bloomberg (click here) reports that large industrial customers in Mexico are seeing ~50% curtailments. Mexico would like to import more from the United States, but north-south pipelines are extremely limited and already running near 100% capacity. This is a classic textbook example of a price control. When you impose a price control lower than the market clearing price, demand exceeds supply so there is deadweight loss. Mexican buyers with high willingness-to-pay aren’t able to buy natural gas, and the Mexican producer, PEMEX, doesn’t have much incentive to increase production. In addition to deadweight loss, price controls leads to misallocation. Prices serve to coordinate actions of buyers and sellers, but they also serve to allocate goods to the buyers who value them the most. Without a market mechanism to clear the market, PEMEX is deciding who gets gas on a “case-by-case” basis. This doesn’t guarantee an efficient allocation, and leads to wasted resources as industry executives fly back and forth from Mexico City trying to increase their allotments.

CMPT NO Impact

#### Economic growth is not key to U.S mlitary Hegemony

Dymski 02- [Post-Hegemonic U.S. Economic Hegemony: Minskian and Kaleckian Dynamics in the Neoliberal Era Gary A. Dymski\*;<http://economics.ucr.edu/papers/papers02/02-13.pdf>]

Hegemony here means a nation’s ability to determine the terms and conditions on which cross-border exchanges of goods, services, and financial assets are made. A global hegemon can dictate these terms and conditions globally. A nation that achieves economic hegemony over a given sphere must stand ready to stabilize financial flows in that sphere when these become disorganized. A hegemon is not responsible for maintaining prosperity in its sphere of influence; but to continue as hegemon it must at least prevent other nations from replacing it—and this depends largely on military power. Until 1971, the U.S. enjoyed global economic hegemony because it underwrote the Bretton Woods system of fixed exchange rates. It was hegemonic in the sense defined by Kindleberger (1973, 1974)—it underwrote the system of fixed exchange rates, and operated as a lender of last resort within that system. After 1971, the U.S. has been a global economic hegemon in the sense defined above, though not in Kindleberger’s sense: it has been a posthegemonic hegemon. This hegemony has rested on the U.S. economy’s importance in global trade, the U.S. dollar’s role as a reserve currency and unit of global exchange, and the dominance of U.S. markets and institutions in global finance. This recent period, an era of great instability and recurrent crashes, has seen a step-by-step global deregulation of financial markets and a relaxation of controls on cross-border capital movements. In this period, global growth has been slower and more unstable; but U.S. military hegemony has, if anything, become stronger. With fewer restrictions on cross-border capital movements, a slower pace of global economic growth, and continued U.S. military power, the U.S. has increasingly been a “safe harbor” magnet for globally mobile wealth. These changes in the character of U.S. global economic hegemony are root cause of changes in the character and timing of U.S. cyclical fluctuations. 2.

## PTX

### O/V

#### Link turns case:

Haass 00 – Richard N. Haass, Vice President and Director of Foreign Policy Studies at the Brookings Institution, and Meghan L. O’Sullivan, Fellow with the Foreign Policy Studies Program at the Brookings Institution, “Terms of Engagement: Alternatives to Punitive Policies”, Survival, 42(2), Summer, p. 13

Building support at home Engagement strategies often fail not simply because of disagreements between the US and the country it is engaging, but because American domestic political considerations warp the strategy or make it untenable. Détente between the US and the Soviet Union is the best case in point. Kissinger and Nixon carefully crafted their ‘linkage’ strategy, where the Soviet Union would be offered political and economic incentives in return for restrained behaviour in the strategic arena. This trade-off did encourage Brezhnev to negotiate and sign significant arms-control agreements, and certainly, some of the agreements and the summits at which they were signed accorded the Soviet Union much desired increased political status. However, Kissinger’s capacity to pursue détente was damaged by the inability of the Nixon administration to deliver the promised trade concessions. While Kissinger and Nixon had promised the Soviet Union MFN trading status in return for its cooperation in other global arenas, they failed to convince Congress of the importance of this deal. As a result, Congress passed the Jackson-Vanik amendment, which linked MFN status to the internal behaviour of the Soviet regime. This move tied the hands of Kissinger and helped undermine the strategy of détente. Although the strong backing of domestic public opinion will always be valuable to those implementing an engagement strategy, the support of Congress and representatives of key constituencies and businesses is critical to success. Securing support for engagement among these key actors in democratic societies requires intense coordination between various branches of government. As the case of North Korea aptly illustrates, engagement strategies are too often hindered by executive efforts to evade congressional involvement and congressional attempts to thwart executive endeavours. From the perspective of the executive branch, a strength of the Agreed Framework was that it was not a treaty with North Korea. While this technicality spared the agreement from the necessity of Senate ratification, Congress later asserted itself through its reluctance to finance commitments made under the accord.

#### Deglobalization b/c of inaction would reverse interdependence and proves the status quo solves war

**Hillebrand 10** - Professor of Diplomacy @ University of Kentucky and a Senior Economist for the Central Intelligence Agency. [Evan E. Hillebrand, ?Deglobalization Scenarios: Who Wins? Who Loses?,? Global Economy Journal, Volume 10, Issue 2 2010, <http://www.bepress.com/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1611&context=gej>)

A long line of writers from Cruce (1623) to Kant (1797) to Angell (1907) to Gartzke (2003) have theorized that economic interdependence can lower the likelihood of war. Cruce thought that free trade enriched a society in general and so made people more peaceable; Kant thought that trade shifted political power away from the more warlike aristocracy, and Angell thought that economic interdependence shifted cost/benefit calculations in a peace-promoting direction. Gartzke contends that trade relations enhance transparency among nations and thus help avoid bargaining miscalculations.

There has also been a tremendous amount of empirical research that mostly supports the idea of an inverse relationship between trade and war. Jack Levy said that, “While there are extensive debates over the proper research designs for investigating this question, and while some empirical studies find that trade is associated with international conflict, most studies conclude that trade is associated with peace, both at the dyadic and systemic levels” (Levy, 2003, p. 127).

There is another important line of theoretical and empirical work called Power Transition Theory that focuses on the relative power of states and warns that when rising powers approach the power level of their regional or global leader the chances of war increase (Tammen, Lemke, et al, 2000). Jacek Kugler (2006) warns that the rising power of China relative to the United States greatly increases the chances of great power war some time in the next few decades. The IFs model combines the theoretical and empirical work of the peacethroughtrade tradition with the work of the power transition scholars in an attempt to forecast the probability of interstate war. Hughes (2004) explains how he, after consulting with scholars in both camps, particularly Edward Mansfield and Douglas Lemke, estimated the starting probabilities for each dyad based on the historical record, and then forecast future probabilities for dyadic militarized interstate disputes (MIDs) and wars based on the calibrated relationships he derived from the empirical literature.

The probability of a MID, much less a war, between any random dyad in any given year is very low, if not zero. Paraguay and Tanzania, for example, have never fought and are very unlikely to do so. But there have been thousands of MIDs in the past and hundreds of wars and many of the 16,653 dyads have nonzero probabilities. In 2005 the mean probability of a country being involved in at least one war was estimated to be 0.8%, with 104 countries having a probability of at least 1 war approaching zero. A dozen countries12, however, have initial probabilities over 3%.

The globalization scenario projects that the probability for war will gradually decrease through 2035 for every country—but not every dyad--that had a significant (greater than 0.5% chance of war) in 2005 (Table 6). The decline in prospects for war stems from the scenario’s projections of rising levels of democracy, rising incomes, and rising trade interdependence—all of these factors figure in the algorithm that calculates the probabilities. Not all dyadic war probabilities decrease, however, because of the power transition mechanism that is also included in the IFs model. The probability for war between China and the US, for example rises as China’s power13 rises gradually toward the US level but in these calculations the probability of a China/US war never gets very high.14

Deglobalization raises the risks of war substantially. In a world with much lower average incomes, less democracy, and less trade interdependence, the average probability of a country having at least one war in 2035 rises from 0.6% in the globalization scenario to 3.7% in the deglobalization scenario. Among the top-20 war-prone countries, the average probability rises from 3.9% in the globalization scenario to 7.1% in the deglobalization scenario. The model estimates that in the deglobalization scenario there will be about 10 wars in 2035, vs. only 2 in the globalization scenario15. Over the whole period, 2005-2035, the model predicts four great power wars in the deglobalization scenario vs. 2 in the globalization scenario.16

IV. Winners and Losers

Deglobalization in the form of reduced trade interdependence, reduced capital flows, and reduced migration has few positive effects, based on this analysis with the International Futures Model. Economic growth is cut in all but a handful of countries, and is cut more in the non-OECD countries than in the OECD countries. Deglobalization has a mixed impact on equality. In many non-OECD countries, the cut in imports from the rest of the world increases the share of manufacturing and in 61 countries raises the share of income going to the poor. But since average productivity goes down in almost all countries, this gain in equality comes at the expense of reduced incomes and increased poverty in almost all countries. The only winners are a small number of countries that were small and poor and not well integrated in the global economy to begin with—and the gains from deglobalization even for them are very small.

Politically, deglobalization makes for less stable domestic politics and a greater likelihood of war. The likelihood of state failure through internal war, projected to diminish through 2035 with increasing globalization, rises in the deglobalization scenario particularly among the non-OECD democracies. Similarly, deglobalization makes for more fractious relations among states and the probability for interstate war rises.

#### Reducing defense spending signals weakness, undercuts relations and cooperation with allies

Kagan ‘09 (Robert, senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2/3/09, “No Time To Cut Defense,”)

A reduction in defense spending this year would unnerve American allies and undercut efforts to gain greater cooperation. There is already a sense around the world, fed by irresponsible pundits here at home, that the United States is in terminal decline. Many fear that the economic crisis will cause the United States to pull back from overseas commitments. The announcement of a defense cutback would be taken by the world as evidence that the **American retreat has begun.**

#### Turns private investment -- Failure to raise the debt ceiling causes investor uncertainty and collapses the economy

Masters 13 (Jonathan, Deputy Editor at the Council on Foreign Relations, Backgrounder, jan 2 2013"US Debt Ceiling. Costs and Consequences")

Most economists, including those in the White House and from former administrations, agree that the impact of an outright government default would be severe. Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke has said **a U.S. default could be a** [**"recovery-ending event"**](http://blogs.wsj.com/economics/2011/03/01/bernanke-warns-on-debt-limit-chaos/) **that would likely spark another financial crisis**. Short of default, officials warn that legislative delays in raising the debt ceiling could also inflict significant harm on the economy.¶ Many analysts say congressional gridlock over the debt limit will likely sow significant uncertainty in the bond markets and place upward pressure on interest rates. Rate increases would not only hike future borrowing costs of the federal government, but would also raise capital costs for struggling U.S. businesses and cash-strapped homebuyers. In addition, rising rates could divert future taxpayer money away from much-needed federal investments in such areas as infrastructure, education, and health care.¶ The protracted and politically acrimonious debt limit showdown in the summer 2011 prompted Standard and Poor's to take the unprecedented step of downgrading the U.S. credit rating from its triple-A status, and **analysts fear such brinksmanship** in early 2013 could bring about similar moves from other rating agencies.¶ A 2012 study by the non-partisan Government Accountability Office estimated that [delays in raising the debt ceiling](http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-12-701) in 2011 cost taxpayers approximately $1.3 billion for FY 2011. BPC estimated the ten-year costs of the prolonged fight at roughly $19 billion.¶ The stock market also was thrown into frenzy in the lead-up to and aftermath of the 2011 debt limit debate, with the [Dow Jones Industrial Average](http://www.bizjournals.com/nashville/news/2011/08/08/slideshow-dows-10-worst-days-ever.html) plunging roughly 2,000 points from the final days of July through the first days of August. Indeed, the Dow recorded one of its worst single-day drops in history on August 8, the day after the S&P downgrade, tumbling 635 points.¶ Speaking to the [Economic Club of New York](http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/11/20/idUSW1E8KA00A20121120) in November 2012, Fed Chairman Ben Bernanke warned that congressional inaction with regard to the fiscal cliff, the raising of the debt ceiling, and the longer-term budget situation **was creating uncertainty** that "appears already to be affecting private spending and investment decisions and may be contributing to an increased sense of caution in financial markets, with adverse effects on the economy."

#### Failure to raise the debt ceiling causes debt downgrade, stock market collapse, low consumer confidence and spending

Barro 9/18 (Josh, Business Insider, "Two Charts That Show Why Another Debt Ceiling Fight is a Very Bad IDea")

Since Republicans in Congress seem intent on flirting (again) with hitting the debt ceiling, the Joint Economic Committee's Democratic staff is out with a report reminding us that doing so is a terrible, horrible, no good, very bad idea.¶ Here's what happens when you lead the financial markets to think the U.S. government might fail to pay its obligations:¶ Your debt gets downgraded (Standard & Poors cut the U.S. sovereign bond rating to AA+ as a result of the last crisis).¶ The stock market plunges (down 16% in three weeks during the last debt ceiling crisis).¶ Consumer confidence falls, which means people don't buy as much and the economy slows down. Last time, a deal to raise the debt ceiling was reached in August, but consumer confidence didn't reach pre-crisis levels until January 2012.¶ People arguing about economic policy talk a lot about "uncertainty," and usually they're B.S.ing. But the debt ceiling is one of the few topics where uncertainty is really the big deal.¶ When the government risks creating a payment crisis, people start to wonder whether they're going to get their Social Security checks or their paychecks or their bond interest. And they wonder what broader effects a payment crisis may have on the economy.¶ All that causes people to stop spending and prepare for crisis. It slows down the economy. And it makes us look stupid, as a country. We shouldn't do it.

### Olive branch

#### Political capital is key to avoid making concessions on the debt ceiling

**Garnham, 9/17/13** (Peter, “Summers not over for dollar strength” Euromoney,

Full article: <http://www.euromoney.com/Article/3255829/Category/16/ChannelPage/0/Summers-not-over-for-dollar-strength.html?single=true&copyrightInfo=true>)

That is because seeking his confirmation in the US Senate could have cost Obama valuable political capital. As Geoffrey Yu, strategist at UBS, points out, that could have meant that reaching an agreement on raising the debt ceiling afterwards would have therefore required even greater concessions from Obama and created additional fiscal drag on the US economy. Overall, it would seem the ripple effects from Summers’ withdrawal from the race to become Fed chairman and the negative impact on the dollar could disappear quickly.

#### Concessions will split the Democratic base and make a deal impossible

**Cook, 9/17**/13 - Economic and Fiscal Policy Correspondent at National Journal (Nancy, “How Dangerous Is the Rift Among Democrats?” National Journal, <http://www.nationaljournal.com/congress/how-dangerous-is-the-rift-among-democrats-20130917>)

Remember that split among congressional Republicans on fiscal strategy? Well, now it seems the Democrats have the makings of a similar problem.

In recent weeks, congressional D's have been uncharacteristically independent, breaking with their leadership and the Obama administration. First they opposed military action in Syria, warning the president they would deny his request to strike. And then came Larry Summers, who was brought down by a handful of Senate Democrats who let the White House know they would not confirm him as Fed chief.

All this bodes quite poorly for President Obama (and Harry Reid and Nancy Pelosi) as the spending and debt fights approach.

If Obama's advisers take anything away from the Syria and Summers episodes, Capitol Hill aides and lawmakers suggest it should be the message that Democrats are not going to get in line with a budget deal that compromises their liberal positions. No longer should the White House feel free, as it has in the past, to consider tweaks to programs like Medicare or Social Security, for instance (unless, of course, Republicans agree to extract more money from taxpayers).

Reid and one of his primary deputies, Sen. Patty Murray, continue to oppose the "chained CPI" proposal that would change the way government benefits are calculated and make them less generous—one of the ideas the president offered up in past budget negotiations. House Democrats largely are not in favor of one of the president's other previous budget offers—to cut Medicare by $400 billion.

These concessions would be an incredibly hard sell to Democrats during a year where the country's annual deficit continues to fall, says a House Democratic leadership aide.

"A lot of our members were concerned about the drift of the negotiations during the fiscal cliff," the aide said. "Our sense is that any deal this fall would not be as large so there is not as much of a necessity to offer up those items."

The White House hasn't ruled those items out though; it's not really even engaging in the discussion at all yet. If lawmakers start to draw lines in the sand, the president will have fewer tools to use and fewer levers to pull to score a deal that keeps the government running and the United States current on its debt.

#### this is the link -- making concessions bad – appealing to the GoP is the wrong group to appeal to – obstructionism is ideological – keeping Dems on board is the only way to overcome it – solves their non-uniques and takes out their turns

Benen 9-12 (Steve Benen, analyst, “Republican leaders vs. the GOP's 'Neanderthals'” The Maddow Blog, 9-12-2013, http://maddowblog.msnbc.com/\_news/2013/09/12/20454025-republican-leaders-vs-the-gops-neanderthals?lite)

A significant, outcome-changing contingent within the House GOP caucus is driven by such irrational hatred of the Affordable Care Act that it won't accept anything short of everything. Party leaders realize this approach would trigger a shutdown that the public would blame on Republicans. But if Boehner crafted a far-right spending measure to make extremists happy, this would quickly be rejected by the Senate and White House, again leading to a shutdown that the public would blame on Republicans. The best way out is for the Speaker to give up on the radical wing of his party and strike a deal with House Democrats by scrapping the destructive sequestration policy. The shutdown would be averted; the economy would get a boost (remember when Congress occasionally thought about the economy?); and the Speaker would win plaudits for bipartisan cooperation and governing.

#### Dem unity key – only way Boehner can pass anything

Weisman 9-12 (Jonathan Weisman, political analyst, 9-12-2013, “Boehner seeks help on deficit discussions”, NYT, http://www.twincities.com/national/ci\_24084222/boehner-seeks-help-deficit-discussions?source=rss)

With Congress momentarily freed from the Syrian crisis, lawmakers plunged back into their fiscal standoff Thursday as Speaker John Boehner appealed to the Obama administration and Democratic leaders to help him resolve divisions in the Republican ranks that could lead to a government shutdown by month's end.¶ In meetings with Democratic and Republican congressional leaders Thursday after a session with Treasury Secretary Jacob Lew on Wednesday, Boehner sought a resumption of negotiations that could keep the government running and yield a deficit-reduction deal that would persuade recalcitrant conservatives to raise the government's borrowing limit.¶ Much of the federal government will shut down Oct. 1 unless Congress OKs new spending bills to replace expiring ones, and by mid-October, the Treasury Department will lose the borrowing authority to finance the government and pay its debts.¶ "It's time for the president's party to show the courage to work with us to solve this problem," said Boehner, who argued that budget deals have been part of past agreements to raise the debt limit.¶ But a bloc of 43 House Republicans undercut the speaker's deficit-reduction focus, introducing yearlong funding legislation that would increase Pentagon and veterans' spending and delay President Barack Obama's health care law for a year -- most likely adding to the budget deficit. That bloc is large enough to thwart any compromise that does not attract Democratic support.
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## PTX

### A2 Uniqueness

#### PC resolves your warrants – Obama just needs to stick to his message – only plan disrupts

Milbank 9-29 (Dana Milbank, syndicated columnist, “Obama should pivot to Dubya’s playbook,” Albuquerque Journal, 9-29-2013, http://www.abqjournal.com/270985/opinion/obama-can-win-standoffs-with-uncharacteristic-resolve.html)

If President Obama can stick to his guns, he will win his October standoff with Republicans.¶ That’s an awfully big “if.”¶ This president has been consistently inconsistent, predictably unpredictable and reliably erratic. Consider the events of Thursday morning:¶ Obama gave a rousing speech in suburban Washington, in defense of Obamacare, on the eve of its implementation. “We’re now only five days away from finishing the job,” he told the crowd.¶ But before he had even left the room, his administration let slip that it was delaying by a month the sign-up for the health-care exchanges for small businesses. It wasn’t a huge deal, but it was enough to trample on the message the president had just delivered.¶ Throughout his presidency, Obama has had great difficulty delivering a consistent message. Supporters plead for him to take a position — any position — and stick with it. His shifting policy on confronting Syria was the most prominent of his vacillations, but his allies have seen a similar approach to the Guantanamo Bay prison, counterterrorism and climate change. Even on issues such as gun control and immigration where his views have been consistent, Obama has been inconsistent in promoting his message. Allies are reluctant to take risky stands, because they fear that Obama will change his mind and leave them standing alone.¶ Now come the budget showdowns, which could define the rest of his presidency. Republican leaders are trying to shift the party’s emphasis from the fight over a government shutdown to the fight over the debt-limit increase, where they have more support. A new Bloomberg poll found that Americans, by a 2-to-1 margin, disagree with Obama’s view that Congress should raise the debt limit without any conditions.¶ But Obama has a path to victory. That poll also found that Americans think lawmakers should stop trying to repeal Obamacare. And that was before House Republicans dramatically overplayed their hand by suggesting that they’ll allow the nation to default if Obama doesn’t agree to their laundry list of demands, including suspending Obamacare, repealing banking reforms, building a new oil pipeline, easing environmental regulations, limiting malpractice lawsuits and restricting access to Medicare.¶ To beat the Republicans, Obama might follow the example of a Republican, George W. Bush. Whatever you think of what he did, he knew how to get it done: by simplifying his message and repeating it, ad nauseam, until he got the result he was after.¶ Obama instead tends to give a speech and move along to the next topic. This is why he is forever making “pivots” back to the economy, or to health care. But the way to pressure Congress is to be President One Note.¶ In the debt-limit fight, Obama already has his note: He will not negotiate over the full faith and credit of the United States. That’s as good a theme as any; it matters less what the message is than that he delivers it consistently.¶ The idea, White House officials explained to me, is to avoid getting into a back-and-forth over taxes, spending and entitlement programs. “We’re right on the merits, but I don’t think we want to argue on the merits,” one said. “Our argument is not that our argument is better than theirs; it’s that theirs is stupid.”¶ This is a clean message: Republicans are threatening to tank the economy — through a shutdown or, more likely, through a default on the debt — and Obama isn’t going to negotiate with these hostage-takers.¶ Happily for Obama, Republicans are helping him to make the case by being publicly belligerent. After this week’s 21-hour speech on the Senate floor by Sen. Ted Cruz (R-Tex.), the publicity-seeking Texan and Sen. Mike Lee (R-Utah) objected to a bipartisan request to move a vote from Friday to Thursday to give House Republicans more time to craft legislation avoiding a shutdown. On the Senate floor, Sen. Bob Corker (R-Tenn.) accused them of objecting because they had sent out e-mails encouraging their supporters to tune in to the vote on Friday. The Post’s Ed O’Keefe caught Cruz “appearing to snicker” as his colleague spoke — more smug teenager than legislator.¶ Even if his opponents are making things easier for him, Obama still needs to stick to his message. As in Syria, the president has drawn a “red line” by saying he won’t negotiate with those who would put the United States into default. If he retreats, he will embolden his opponents and demoralize his supporters.

#### He’s winning because he’s using capital to unify Democrats and exploit GOP divisions

**Allen, 9/19/13** (Jonathan, Politico, “GOP battles boost Obama” <http://www.politico.com/story/2013/09/republicans-budget-obama-97093.html>)

There’s a simple reason President Barack Obama is using his bully pulpit to focus the nation’s attention on the battle over the budget: In this fight, he’s watching Republicans take swings at each other.

And that GOP fight is a lifeline for an administration that had been scrambling to gain control its message after battling congressional Democrats on the potential use of military force in Syria and the possible nomination of Larry Summers to run the Federal Reserve.

If House Republicans and Obama can’t cut even a short-term deal for a continuing resolution, the government’s authority to spend money will run out on Oct. 1. Within weeks, the nation will default on its debt if an agreement isn’t reached to raise the federal debt limit.

For some Republicans, those deadlines represent a leverage point that can be used to force Obama to slash his health care law. For others, they’re a zero hour at which the party will implode if it doesn’t cut a deal.

Meanwhile, “on the looming fiscal issues, Democrats — both liberal and conservative, executive and congressional — are virtually 100 percent united,” said Sen. Charles Schumer (D-N.Y.).

Just a few days ago, all that Obama and his aides could talk about were Syria and Summers. Now, they’re bringing their party together and shining a white hot light on Republican disunity over whether to shut down the government and plunge the nation into default in a vain effort to stop Obamacare from going into effect.

The squabbling among Republicans has gotten so vicious that a Twitter hashtag — #GOPvsGOPugliness — has become a thick virtual data file for tracking the intraparty insults. Moderates, and even some conservatives, are slamming Texas Sen. Ted Cruz, a tea party favorite, for ramping up grassroots expectations that the GOP will shut down the government if it can’t win concessions from the president to “defund” his signature health care law.

“I didn’t go to Harvard or Princeton, but I can count,” Sen. Bob Corker (R-Tenn.) tweeted, subtly mocking Cruz’s Ivy League education. “The defunding box canyon is a tactic that will fail and weaken our position.”

While it is well-timed for the White House to interrupt a bad slide, Obama’s singular focus on the budget battle is hardly a last-minute shift. Instead, it is a return to the narrative arc that the White House was working to build before the Syria crisis intervened.

#### Obama will win on debt ceiling if he maintains his position of strength

**Liasson, 9/21/13** (Mara, “Have Obama's Troubles Weakened Him For Fall's Fiscal Fights?” NPR, <http://www.npr.org/blogs/itsallpolitics/2013/09/21/224494760/have-obamas-troubles-weakened-him-for-falls-fiscal-fights>)

"[Obama] had some missteps within the caucus," Manley says, but "now that he has those situations behind him ... he can turn his attention to the debt limit and the spending issues." Manley says the president will be well-positioned to take on Republicans in those fiscal fights, "if only because ... their policies are so out of the mainstream that they won't enjoy any support on the Hill and/or with the American people." The plan to bomb Syria was extremely unpopular. But on budget issues, the president is on firmer footing with the public, who may not like Obamacare but don't want it repealed or defunded. So, in the House at least, Republicans are making demands the president cannot and will not meet. "You have never seen, in the history of the United States, the debt ceiling or the threat of not raising the debt ceiling being used to extort a president or a governing party, and trying to force issues that have nothing to do with the budget and have nothing to do with the debt," Obama has said. White House officials say Democrats will always have internal divisions, but right now they are nothing compared with the fights inside the GOP. "There is essentially a civil war brimming in the Republican Party right now," says Dan Pfeiffer, the president's senior adviser. Pfeiffer points to open warfare between Tea Party conservatives and moderates, and even between House and Senate conservatives, as Republicans struggle to settle on a viable budget strategy. "The important thing is, as we head into these budget battles this fall, Democrats ... are in lock-step about the way to approach this," he says, "which is that we are not going to negotiate on the debt ceiling — we're not going to allow the full faith and credit of the United States to be held hostage by the Republicans, who want to ... deny health insurance to millions of Americans. We're in lock-step and they're divided, so I feel pretty good about that." Despite the setbacks of the spring and summer, the Obama team is counting on the latent power of the presidency — one of the most resilient institutions in American life. Unlike on Syria, Obama seems to have a budget strategy. He's hanging tough on his two red lines: no negotiations on the debt ceiling and no changes to Obamacare. The president is willing for now to let the Republicans flirt with the unpopular and dangerous possibilities of a government shutdown and a debt default. It's a high-stakes game of chicken, and one where the White House feels confident it has the upper hand.

### A2 passed house

#### Non starter – fights are still in the senate – debt ceiling needs all remaining floor time to pass – and it’s getting it now – thumpers don’t apply

Gerson 9/18/13 - served as a senior adviser to President George W. Bush (Michael, Virginian Pilot, “The politics of paralysis” lexis)

The remainder of legislative time and attention that hasn't been spent on Syria this year will now be consumed by the budget and debt-ceiling debates - in which the best possible outcome is the avoidance of self-inflicted wounds.¶ Republican leaders seem prepared to combine the continuing resolution and debt-ceiling increase, extend both for a year with the budget at level spending, and impose a one-year delay in implementing Obamacare. They won't get the last part - Obama would veto anything including it - but the Republican base insists.¶ The Obama administration, in return, offers nothing. It is continuing the practice of starting a negotiation process by refusing to negotiate.¶ Coming to an eventual compromise between one side that demands the moon and the other side that demands and offers nothing at all won't be easy. The protection of Obamacare is the one "red line" the administration holds absolutely sacred.¶ But conservatives sense opportunity in a weakened president and a deeply unpopular law. And Speaker John Boehner's room to maneuver is extremely limited by a small faction of his party that is just big enough to paralyze him. It is a recipe for confidence-shaking, market-spooking, down-to-the-wire confrontation.¶ In the shadow of this conflict, little else will grow. According to Yuval Levin of the Ethics and Public Policy Center, "only things that have to pass - or else the government shuts down or the economy crashes - are going to pass this year."

#### Only moving the plan up the agenda crowds it off

Ornstein 9-1 (Norm Ornstein, resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, 9/1/13, Showdowns and Shutdowns, www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2013/09/01/showdowns\_and\_shutdowns\_syria\_congress\_obama)

Then there is the overload of business on the congressional agenda when the two houses return on Sept. 9 -with only nine legislative days scheduled for action in the month. We have serious confrontations ahead on spending bills and the debt limit, as the new fiscal year begins on Oct. 1 and the debt ceiling approaches just a week or two thereafter. Before the news that we would drop everything for an intense debate on whether to strike militarily in Syria, Congress-watchers were wondering how we could possibly deal with the intense bargaining required to avoid one or more government shutdowns and/or a real breach of the debt ceiling, with devastating consequences for American credibility and the international economy. Beyond the deep policy and political divisions, Republican congressional leaders will likely use both a shutdown and the debt ceiling as hostages to force the president to cave on their demands for deeper spending cuts. Avoiding this end-game bargaining will require the unwavering attention of the same top leaders in the executive and legislative branches who will be deeply enmeshed in the Syria debate. The possibility -even probability -of disruptions caused by partial shutdowns could complicate any military actions. The possibility is also great that the rancor that will accompany the showdowns over fiscal policy will bleed over into the debate about America and Syria.

### A2 Olive Branch Link

#### Link outweighs the link turn – even if popular, it’s not a priority for the GOP and not important enough to switch votes on immigration anyway

Cardenas and Noriega, 12

Roger F. Noriega, José R. Cárdenas, American Enterprise Institute, 12/5/12

Roger F. Noriega (rnoriega@aei.org) was a senior US State Department official from 2001 to 2005. He is currently a visiting fellow at AEI and managing director of Vision Americas LLC, which represents foreign and domestic clients. José R. Cárdenas (jrc@visionamericas.com) is a contributor to AEI’s Venezuela-Iran Project and a director with Vision Americas, http://www.aei.org/outlook/foreign-and-defense-policy/regional/latin-america/an-action-plan-for-us-policy-in-the-americas/

A Security and Stability Agenda Shared land and maritime borders make security in Western Hemisphere countries a permanent priority for the US government. The security challenges confronting Mexico, Central America, and Venezuela are more dramatic today than in recent memory. In the final year of the George W. Bush administration, Mexico and the United States agreed on a $1 billion counter-narcotics assistance package. Yet, despite the enormous opportunity this presented to bring Mexico and the United States into a closer and mutually beneficial security cooperation, the aid was so slowly delivered that Mexicans have been left to wonder if their raging drug war is a priority for the United States. Conservative lawmakers who were the driving force behind Plan Colombia a decade ago have been less active on Mexico, focusing instead on border security as a means to fight illegal immigration and leaving Mexicans to square off with bloodthirsty cartels on their own.

### A2 Lobbies Link

#### Non controversial energy legislation requires PC to overcome poison pill riders

Chemnick, 12

Jean Chemnick, E&E reporter, E&E Daily: Wednesday, February 1, 2012, http://www.eenews.net/public/EEDaily/2012/02/01/1

Kerry conceded that it would be difficult to pass almost anything in an election year, "but we're going to do stuff that's not controversial." Sen. Joe Lieberman (I-Conn.), who with Kerry introduced comprehensive climate change legislation in the last Congress, said supporters of action on global warming remain disappointed that it failed. "But if we get some energy independence, alternative energy, energy efficiency legislation adopted, I think we will thereby also diminish carbon pollution, which I think it's all about," he said. Sen. Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.), who worked with Kerry and Lieberman on the climate bill but was not ultimately a co-sponsor, said that he saw opportunities for bipartisan collaboration, especially on efficiency measures. "I think there's a market now for energy efficiency and a market for domestic energy production," he said. In particular, Graham singled out his Home Star bill, which would have provided incentives for residential efficiency retrofits that he sponsored last Congress with Sen. Mark Warner (D-Va.). "I think there would be bipartisan support for that," Graham added. But it is unclear whether Home Star would be a candidate for any proposed package this year. The Warner-Graham bill has not been reintroduced, and while a version passed the House in 2010, when the Democrats were in the majority, the Senate version was never approved by the Finance Committee. The bills the Energy and Natural Resources Committee has approved this Congress with bipartisan support include an industrial energy efficiency bill co-sponsored by Sens. Jeanne Shaheen (D-N.H.) and Rob Portman (R-Ohio), a measure to establish a new carbon capture and sequestration program at the Energy Department and bills to promote solar energy and geothermal. Aside from the goal of producing legislation, the Tuesday group also provides an opportunity for its members to talk about climate and energy issues. Energy Secretary Steven Chu addressed the senators in November. Daniel Weiss of the Center for American Progress Action Fund said that any of the bills approved by the energy committee would have a good chance of making it to the floor of the Senate. But while Kerry and his colleagues may succeed in crafting a bill that would garner broad bipartisan support, Senate Republicans might move to attach amendments to it that would roll back U.S. EPA pollution restrictions, approve the Keystone XL pipeline or open new areas along the West Coast or in Alaska to petroleum production, Weiss said. Similar attempts are likely in the Republican-controlled House. "The challenge would be to keep poison-pill amendments off of the bill without getting it pulled," he said.

#### Oil Lobby power exaggerated

Mearsheimer and Walt, ‘7

John J. Mearsheimer and Stephen M. Walt, Israel Lobby and Foreign Policy, p. 143, http://www.thirdworldtraveler.com/Israel/US\_Israel\_Lobby\_2\_ILUSFP.html

If Arab petrodollars or energy companies were driving American policy, one would expect to see the United States distancing itself from Israel and working overtime to get the Palestinians a state of their own. Countries like Saudi Arabia have repeatedly pressed Washington to adopt a more evenhanded position toward the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, but to little avail, and even wielding the "oil weapon" during the 1973 October War had little effect on U.S. support for Israel or on overall American policy in the region. Similarly, if oil companies were driving U.S. policy, one would also have expected Washington to curry favor with big oil producers like Saddam Hussein's Iraq, Muammar Gaddafi's Libya, or the Islamic Republic of Iran, so that U.S. companies could make money helping them develop their energy resources and bringing them to market. Instead, the United States imposed sanctions on all three of these countries, in sharp opposition to what the oil industry wanted: Indeed in some cases the U.S. government deliberately intervened to thwart business deals that would have benefited U.S. companies. If the oil lobby were as powerful as some critics believe, such actions would not have occurred

#### Even the credible possibility of default will destroy the economy

**Davis, 9/18/13 -** professor of political science at Brigham Young University(Richard, Deseret News, “Raise the debt ceiling, then talk about spending less” <http://www.deseretnews.com/article/865586538/Raise-the-debt-ceiling-then-talk-about-spending-less.html>)

This is a strategy popular with the Republican right wing, but it is bad policy for the nation. Paying the nation’s bills is not about politics. It sends the wrong signal to investors that U.S. political leaders are not serious about the consequences of default. The nation’s bond rating was lowered after the last near-default. That would happen again if the government defaulted. Even the possibility of default makes investors jittery and undermines our reputation as a nation that always lives up to its promise to pay its bills. A lower bond rating costs taxpayers more money because borrowing comes at a heavier price, just as a lower credit score for failure to pay bills hurts an individual.

#### PC key – spills over to the debt ceiling

**Parsons, 9/12/13** (Christi, Los Angeles Times, “Obama's team calls a timeout”

[http://www.latimes.com/nation/la-na-obama-congress-20130913,0,2959396.story](http://www.latimes.com/nation/la-na-obama-congress-20130913%2C0%2C2959396.story))

After a week in which President Obama narrowly averted a bruising defeat on Capitol Hill over a military strike on Syria, the decision had the feeling of a much-needed timeout. The messy debate over a resolution to authorize military force put a harsh light on the president's already rocky relationship with Congress. Despite a charm offensive earlier this year, complete with intimate dinners and phone calls, Obama faced contrary lawmakers in both parties, a climate that is certain to persist through the next round of legislative fights, if not to the end of his second term. In deciding to seek approval for military action, Obama banked on the long-standing deference to the commander in chief on matters of national defense. But by the time he pressed "pause" on the intense White House lobbying effort, he was finding as much defiance as deference. Although the White House cast the issue as a matter of national security and a crucial test of U.S. power, dozens of lawmakers from both parties were set to deliver a rare rebuke to a president on foreign policy. Even Democratic loyalists seemed unswayed by appeals to preserve the prestige of the presidency — and this president. Hawkish Republicans offering to reach across the aisle to support the president said they found the White House distant and uninterested. The canceled picnic punctuated a week of aggravated feelings. "We obviously have divided government. We have sometimes contentious, sometimes very effective relations with Congress. But we keep at it," said White House spokesman Jay Carney, who denied the picnic cancellation had anything to do with the state of relations between the two branches of government. On Capitol Hill, the week's episode strained Obama's traditional alliance with his fellow Democrats, many of whom were wary of another military involvement, unclear about the president's plans for a missile strike and surprised by his decision to ask them to vote on it. "Not only was it a hard ask, but it was not a well-prepared ask," said Sen. Sheldon Whitehouse (D-R.I.). "His willingness to back away from the ultimatum and pursue the disarmament proposal was extremely welcome, and I think that helped all of us in our relationship with him." Obama's relationship with his Republican critics was not helped. As lawmakers look ahead to the rest of the fall agenda, including the coming budget battles, the administration's performance this week will not be easy to forget, some said. "It's just more lack of confidence that they know what they're doing," said Sen. Tom Coburn (R-Okla.). "There's only so much political capital," said Sen. Rob Portman (R-Ohio). Democrats defended the president, blaming Republicans for a "knee-jerk" opposition to any initiative tied to this White House, a phenomenon that Obama aides regularly cite but that the president appears to have disregarded in his decision to put a use-of-force resolution before Congress. "Historically, when it comes to military force, Republicans and conservatives have led that. Now they're opposed to it," said Sen. Richard J. Durbin (D-Ill.). In a private meeting this week, Durbin said, Obama himself joked that "a lot of Republicans on Capitol Hill are discovering their inner doves on Syria." The next set of negotiations will be far more predictable and on familiar territory. By the end of the month, the president and Congress must agree on a plan to continue funding the government, or it will shut down. And by mid-October, they will have to agree to raise the debt limit, or risk a default. The White House has said it won't negotiate on the debt limit, as it did twice before, counting on the public and business groups to pressure Republicans. Democrats were hopeful the budget issues would put the White House back on more solid political footing. "I think the public has a heck of a lot more confidence in the president on economics and budget than [in] the House Republicans," said Sen. Carl Levin (D-Mich.). That may be wishful thinking, said Ross Baker, a political science professor at Rutgers University, who studies the Senate. "These things carry over. There's no firewall between issues," he said. "Failure in one area leads to problems in other areas." The debate over the war in Syria may be on an extended pause, although prospects of Obama returning to Congress to ask for a use-of-force authorization seem slim. A bipartisan group of senators is drafting an amended authorization, but the group is not expected to fully air its proposal until diplomatic talks conclude. There were some signs that the debate may have won the president some empathy, if not support. At a private lunch with Republican senators this week, Obama asked them not to undermine him on the world stage. Sen. Ron Johnson of Wisconsin, who is part of a group of GOP senators working with the White House on fiscal issues, said the appeal resonated.

### A2 Hirsh

#### Empirically false and the plan is more likely to disrupt Obama’s careful issue selection

Eberly, 13 - coordinator of Public Policy Studies and assistant professor in the Department of Political Science at St. Mary's College of Maryland (Todd, Baltimore Sun, “The presidential power trap” <http://articles.baltimoresun.com/2013-01-21/news/bs-ed-political-capital-20130121_1_political-system-george-hw-bush-party-support/2>)

Only by solving the problem of political capital is a president likely to avoid a power trap. Presidents in recent years have been unable to prevent their political capital from eroding. When it did, their power assertions often got them into further political trouble. Through leveraging public support, presidents have at times been able to overcome contemporary leadership challenges by adopting as their own issues that the public already supports. Bill Clinton's centrist "triangulation" and George W. Bush's careful issue selection early in his presidency allowed them to secure important policy changes — in Mr. Clinton's case, welfare reform and budget balance, in Mr. Bush's tax cuts and education reform — that at the time received popular approval.

However, short-term legislative strategies may win policy success for a president but do not serve as an antidote to declining political capital over time, as the difficult final years of both the Bill Clinton and George W. Bush presidencies demonstrate. None of Barack Obama's recent predecessors solved the political capital problem or avoided the power trap. It is the central political challenge confronted by modern presidents and one that will likely weigh heavily on the current president's mind today as he takes his second oath of office.

#### Hirsh agrees with the thesis of the politics DA even if he disagrees with the term “political capital”

Michael Hirsh, National Journal, 2/7/13, There’s No Such Thing as Political Capital, www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207

Presidents are limited in what they can do by time and attention span, of course, just as much as they are by electoral balances in the House and Senate. But this, too, has nothing to do with political capital. Another well-worn meme of recent years was that Obama used up too much political capital passing the health care law in his first term. But the real problem was that the plan was unpopular, the economy was bad, and the president didn’t realize that the national mood (yes, again, the national mood) was at a tipping point against big-government intervention, with the tea-party revolt about to burst on the scene. For Americans in 2009 and 2010—haunted by too many rounds of layoffs, appalled by the Wall Street bailout, aghast at the amount of federal spending that never seemed to find its way into their pockets—government-imposed health care coverage was simply an intervention too far. So was the idea of another economic stimulus. Cue the tea party and what ensued: two titanic fights over the debt ceiling. Obama, like Bush, had settled on pushing an issue that was out of sync with the country’s mood.¶ Unlike Bush, Obama did ultimately get his idea passed. But the bigger political problem with health care reform was that it distracted the government’s attention from other issues that people cared about more urgently, such as the need to jump-start the economy and financial reform. Various congressional staffers told me at the time that their bosses didn’t really have the time to understand how the Wall Street lobby was riddling the Dodd-Frank financial-reform legislation with loopholes. Health care was sucking all the oxygen out of the room, the aides said.

#### Even if they’re right, Obama believes it’s finite and will act in accordance

Burnett, 13

Bob Burnett, Founding Executive @ CiscoSystems, Berkeley writer, journalist, columnist @ huffington post, 4/5, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/bob-burnett/keystone-xl-obama_b_3020154.html>

On April 3 and 4, President Obama spoke at several San Francisco fundraisers. While he didn't specifically mention the Keystone XL pipeline, the tenor of his remarks indicated that he's likely to approve the controversial project. Obama seems to be most influenced by his inherent political pragmatism. I've heard Barack Obama speak on several occasions. The first was February 19, 2007, at a San Francisco ore-election fundraiser with a lengthy question and answer session. Towards the end of the event a woman asked then presidential-candidate Obama what his position was on same-sex marriage. For an instant, Obama seemed surprised; then he gathered himself and responded he was aware of strong feelings on both sides of this issue and his position was evolving. Five years later, in May of 2012, President Obama announced his support for same-sex marriage. What took Obama so long to make up his mind? No doubt he needed to clarify his own moral position -- although the Protestant denomination he was baptized into, the United Church of Christ, announced its support for same-sex marriage in 2005. But I'm sure the president carefully weighed the political consequences and, last May, thought the timing was right. Over the last six years I've realized Barack Obama has several personas. On occasion he moves us with stirring oratory; that's Reverend Obama, the rock star. Once in a while, he turns philosophical; that's Professor Obama, the student of American history. On April 3, I saw Politician Obama, the pragmatic leader of the Democratic Party. Obama has learned that, as president, he only gets a fixed amount of political capital each year and has learned to ration it. In 2007, he didn't feel it was worth stirring up controversy by supporting same-sex marriage; in 2012 he thought it was. He's a cautious pragmatist. He doesn't make snap decisions or ones that will divert his larger agenda. Intuitively, most Democrats know this about the president. At the beginning of 2012, many Democratic stalwarts were less than thrilled by the prospect of a second Obama term. While their reasons varied, there was a common theme, "Obama hasn't kept his promises to my constituency." There were lingering complaints that 2009's stimulus package should have been bigger and a communal whine, "Obama should have listened to us." Nonetheless, by the end of the Democratic convention on September 6, most Dems had come around. In part, this transformation occurred because from January to September of 2012 Dems scrutinized Mitt Romney and were horrified by what they saw. In January some had muttered, "There's no difference between Obama and Romney," but nine months later none believed that. While many Democrats were not thrilled by Obama's first-term performance, they saw him as preferable to Romney on a wide range of issues. In 2009, Obama got a bad rap from some Dems because they believed he did not fight hard enough for the fiscal stimulus and affordable healthcare. In March of 2011, veteran Washington columnist, Elizabeth Drew, described Obama as: ... a somewhat left-of-center pragmatist, and a man who has avoided fixed positions for most of his life. Even his health care proposal -- denounced by the right as a 'government takeover' and 'socialism' -- was essentially moderate or centrist. When he cut a deal on the tax bill, announced on December 7 [2010], he pragmatically concluded that he did not have the votes to end the Bush tax cuts for the wealthiest, and in exchange for giving in on that he got significant concessions from the Republicans, such as a fairly lengthy extension of unemployment insurance and the cut in payroll taxes. Making this deal also left him time to achieve other things -- ratification of the START treaty, the repeal of don't ask, don't tell. Drew's description of the president as a "left-of-center pragmatist" resonates with my sense of him. He is a political pragmatist who, over the past five years, has learned to guard his political capital and focus it on his highest priorities.In this year's State-of-the-Union address half of the president's remarks concerned jobs and the economy. We gather here knowing that there are millions of Americans whose hard work and dedication have not yet been rewarded. Our economy is adding jobs -- but too many people still can't find full-time employment. Corporate profits have rocketed to all-time highs -- but for more than a decade, wages and incomes have barely budged. It is our generation's task, then, to reignite the true engine of America's economic growth -- a rising, thriving middle class. He also spoke passionately about the need to address to address global warming, "For the sake of our children and our future, we must do more to combat climate change." But it's clear that's a secondary objective. At one of the Bay Area fundraisers, President Obama observed that his big challenge is to show middle-class families that, "we are working just as hard for them as we are for an environmental agenda." Obama isn't going to block the Keystone XL pipeline because he doesn't believe that he can make the case his action will help the middle-class. He's conserving his political capital. He's being pragmatic

#### Link outweighs the link turn on timeframe – especially true for the debt vote

Silber 07 [PhD Political Science & Communication – focus on the Rhetoric of Presidential Policy-Making – Prof of Poli Sci – Samford, [Marissa, WHAT MAKES A PRESIDENT QUACK?, Prepared for delivery at the 2007 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, August 30th-September 2nd, 2007, UNDERSTANDING LAME DUCK STATUS THROUGH THE EYES OF THE MEDIA AND POLITICIANS]

Important to the discussion of political capital is whether or not it can be replenished over a term. If a President expends political capital on his agenda, can it be replaced? Light suggests that “capital declines over time – public approval consistently falls: midterm losses occur” (31). Capital can be rebuilt, but only to a limited extent. The decline of capital makes it difficult to access information, recruit more expertise and maintain energy. If a lame duck President can be defined by a loss of political capital, this paper helps determine if such capital can be replenished or if a lame duck can accomplish little. Before determining this, a definition of a lame duck President must be developed.

### A2 Syria

--a2 thumper – Syria

#### Yes capital- position of Obama is relative to republican strength- which is non-existent

Mardell 9/18/13 (Mark, North America Editor, BBC News, "Obama Presidency: Decline in the Fall?")

It won't be long before there is a new kid on the White House block, and that changes calculations.¶ As for the coming budget battles in Congress, while Mr Obama's position looks weak, the Republicans look weaker - and as close as 2016 is, the mid-term elections of 2014 are even closer.¶ It is unsurprising that, to some, this feels like a turning point.¶ But while fall always turns to winter, it doesn't always spell decline.

**Debt ceiling is at the top of the agenda**

**Moran, 9/18**/13 (Andrew, “Dollar collapse inevitable as CBO warns of unsustainable debt levels,” http://economiccollapsenews.com/2013/09/18/dollar-collapse-inevitable-as-cbo-warns-of-unsustainable-debt-levels/, bgm)

**The United States national debt has taken a backseat over the past couple of months due to the potential war with Syria. Over the next few weeks, though, it is expected that the federal debt and budget deficit will capture headlines again because of the looming debt ceiling fight between President Obama and Republican lawmakers.** At the present time, the U.S. faces a $17 trillion national debt and a near $1 trillion budget deficit. The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) published a report Tuesday that warned the U.S. public debt could account for more than 100 percent of the country’s economic output within the next 25 years unless action is taken.

#### Syria doesn’t thump

Greg Sargent, political analyst for The Plum Line, 9-12-2013, “Syria won’t make GOP’s immigration problem go “poof” and disappear”, http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/plum-line/wp/2013/09/12/syria-wont-make-gops-immigration-problem-go-poof-and-disappear/

When looked at through the prism of specific issues — such as immigration reform or the budget arguments to come — the notion that the Syria mess somehow diminishes the chances for key items on Obama’s agenda, or somehow changes the calculus for Republicans with regard to how to approach them, is plainly absurd on its face.

### A2 PC Low Now

**Moving Syria off the docket gives him just enough pc**

**Kornblum 9/11 – Former U.S. ambassador to Germany**

John, “Judy Asks: Is Obama a Lame-Duck President?”, <http://carnegieeurope.eu/strategiceurope/?fa=52932>, CMR

U.S. President Barack **Obama is far from a lame-duck president**.¶ Such charges often arise when a politician is facing difficulties, and it is true that Obama has not been as adroit as he might have been on issues such as Syria. But **if Syrian stocks of poison gas are put under international control,** as was proposed this week, **he will in fact gain in both influence and reputation.**¶ And the reality is that the U.S. economy is improving, the nation’s overseas military involvements are being cut back, and **the Republicans continue to self-destruct**.¶ There is rough sledding ahead, but **the president has** more than enough **political capital to deal with the problems he faces**.

**Obama has capital**

**Lanenkamp 7/13**/13 (Andy, Global political analyst at ECR Research and Interest & Currency Consultants, Huffington Post, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/andy-langenkamp/obama-to-take-over-baton-\_b\_3571885.html)

**The U.S. president still has some political capital at his disposal**. **His approval rating (50 percent) may not be spectacular but it exceeds the dismal endorsement of Congress (15 percent). Many voters still give him the benefit of the doubt;** just 26 percent of Americans are satisfied with the direction the U.S. is taking, but Obama's ratings indicate many do not believe he is to blame for their disappointment. In any case, **the presidential "approval premium" has not been this high since Reagan. Perhaps this will give Mr. Obama the courage to get down to business in Q4 and take decisive steps towards restoring the fiscal health of America.**

#### PC is finite and trades off with debt deal – overcomes ideology – and time constraints is an independent internal link – prefer issue-specific evidence

Moore 9-10 (Heidi Moore, U.S. finance and economics editor, The Guardian (UK), “Syria: the great distraction; Obama is focused on a conflict abroad, but the fight he should be gearing up for is with Congress on America's economic security,” 9-10-2013, http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2013/sep/10/obama-syria-what-about-sequester)

Before President Obama speaks to the nation about Syria tonight, take a look at what this fall will look like inside America.¶ There are 49 million people in the country who suffered inadequate access to food in 2012, leaving the percentage of "food-insecure" Americans at about one-sixth of the US population. At the same time, Congress refused to pass food-stamp legislation this summer, pushing it off again and threatening draconian cuts. ¶ The country will crash into the debt ceiling in mid-October, which would be an economic disaster, especially with a government shutdown looming at the same time. These are deadlines that Congress already learned two years ago not to toy with, but memories appear to be preciously short.¶ The Federal Reserve needs a new chief in three months, someone who will help the country confront its raging unemployment crisis that has left 12 million people without jobs. The president has promised to choose a warm body within the next three weeks, despite the fact that his top pick, Larry Summers, would likely spark an ugly confirmation battle – the "fight of the century," according to some – with a Congress already unwilling to do the President's bidding. ¶ Congress was supposed to pass a farm bill this summer, but declined to do so even though the task is already two years late. As a result, the country has no farm bill, leaving agricultural subsidies up in the air, farmers uncertain about what their financial picture looks like, and a potential food crisis on the horizon. ¶ The two main housing agencies, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, have been in limbo for four years and are desperately in need of reform that should start this fall, but there is scant attention to the problem. ¶ These are the problems going unattended by the Obama administration while his aides and cabinet members have been wasting the nation's time making the rounds on television and Capitol Hill stumping for a profoundly unpopular war. The fact that all this chest-beating was for naught, and an easy solution seems on the horizon, belies the single-minded intensity that the Obama White House brought to its insistence on bombing Syria. ¶ More than one wag has suggested, with the utmost reason, that if Obama had brought this kind of passion to domestic initiatives, the country would be in better condition right now. As it is, public policy is embarrassingly in shambles at home while the administration throws all of its resources and political capital behind a widely hated plan to get involved in a civil war overseas.¶ The upshot for the president may be that it's easier to wage war with a foreign power than go head-to-head with the US Congress, even as America suffers from neglect.¶ This is the paradox that President Obama is facing this fall, as he appears to turn his back on a number of crucial and urgent domestic initiatives in order to spend all of his meager political capital on striking Syria.¶ Syria does present a significant humanitarian crisis, which has been true for the past two years that the Obama administration has completely ignored the atrocities of Bashar al-Assad.¶ Two years is also roughly the same amount of time that key domestic initiatives have also gone ignored as Obama and Congress engage in petty battles for dominance and leave the country to run itself on a starvation diet imposed by sequestration cuts. Leon Panetta tells the story of how he tried to lobby against sequestration only to be told: ¶ Leon, you don't understand. The Congress is resigned to failure.¶ Similarly, those on Wall Street, the Federal Reserve, those working at government agencies, and voters themselves have become all too practiced at ignoring the determined incompetence of those in Washington. ¶ Political capital – the ability to horse-trade and win political favors from a receptive audience – is a finite resource in Washington. Pursuing misguided policies takes up time, but it also eats up credibility in asking for the next favor. It's fair to say that congressional Republicans, particularly in the House, have no love for Obama and are likely to oppose anything he supports. That's exactly the reason the White House should stop proposing policies as if it is scattering buckshot and focus with intensity on the domestic tasks it wants to accomplish, one at a time.¶ The president is scheduled to speak six times this week, mostly about Syria. That includes evening news interviews, an address to the nation, and numerous other speeches. Behind the scenes, he is calling members of Congress to get them to fall into line. Secretary of State John Kerry is omnipresent, so ubiquitous on TV that it may be easier just to get him his own talk show called Syria Today.¶ It would be a treat to see White House aides lobbying as aggressively – and on as many talk shows – for a better food stamp bill, an end to the debt-ceiling drama, or a solution to the senseless sequestration cuts, as it is on what is clearly a useless boondoggle in Syria.¶ There's no reason to believe that Congress can have an all-consuming debate about Syria and then, somehow refreshed, return to a domestic agenda that has been as chaotic and urgent as any in recent memory. The President should have judged his options better. As it is, he should now judge his actions better.

**Their ev assumes politicians have already made up their mind---our uniqueness evidence says that’s not the case.**

# 2NR

## PTX

### A2 Uniqueness/PC no key

#### Business pressure will change minds – but Obama’s capital is key to mobilizing it

**Sink, 9/18/13** (Justin, The Hill, “Amid fiscal fights, Obama courting business leaders”

<http://thehill.com/homenews/administration/322883-amid-fiscal-fights-obama-courting-business-leaders>)

President Obama will address the Business Roundtable (BRT) on Wednesday as he works to get corporate leaders on his side during this fall’s fiscal showdowns with the GOP.

The White House is hoping that Obama can rally the influential organization, made up of conservative chief executives from the nation’s largest corporations, to help build pressure on congressional Republicans.

According to a White House official, the president will ask business leaders "to help send the message to Congress that a default would be disastrous for our economy and for businesses across the country."

"Some Republicans in Congress are playing a reckless political game by threatening to leave the economy hanging in the balance for an ideological agenda that has no chance of becoming law—a game that last time had real consequences, hurting growth and business confidence," the official said.

Obama is expected to note that during debt ceiling negotiations in the summer of 2011, the stock market decreased 17 percent, the nation's credit rating was downgraded, and consumer confidence dropped to its lowest level since the financial crisis. He'll argue to the assembled corporate executives that failure to strike a deal would again endanger the economy — and their bottom lines.

“The president’s focus, as is always the case when he meets with this group, is what we can do together to keep the American economy growing,” White House press secretary Jay Carney said on Tuesday.

But the sell will not be an easy one — the association’s officials have been critical of the president, and members of the group are wary of the administration’s aggressive regulatory push on labor and environmental issues.

And congressional Republicans are accusing the president of employing "scare tactics" to gain leverage.

"No one is threatening to default," said Brendan Buck, a spokesman for House Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio). "The president only uses these scare tactics to avoid having to show the courage needed to deal with our debt crisis. Every major deficit deal in the last 30 years has been tied to a debt limit increase, and this time should be no different."

Obama has leaned on the organization in the past. Shortly after the president’s last visit in December for a speech and closed-door discussion, the CEOs sent a letter to congressional leaders arguing all options — including tax increases — should be on the table as negotiators sought a “fiscal-cliff” deal.

That gesture, a reversal from the group’s stance just five months earlier, ratcheted up pressure on congressional Republicans. The GOP subsequently stumbled, and Obama struck a deal that many Democrats embraced.

#### PC winning now

Easley 9/18/13 (Jason, "Obama's Genius Labeling of GOP Demands Extortion Has Already Won the Debt Ceiling Fight")

President Obama effectively ended any Republican hopes of getting a political victory on the debt ceiling when he called their demands extortion. Nobody likes being extorted. The American people don’t like feeling like they are being shaken down. The White House knows this, which is why they are using such strong language to criticize the Republicans. Obama is doing the same thing to House Republicans that he has been doing to the entire party for the last few years. The president is defining them before they can define themselves.¶ Obama is taking the same tactics that he used to define Mitt Romney in the summer of 2012 and applying them to John Boehner and his House Republicans. While Republicans are fighting among themselves and gearing up for another pointless run at defunding Obamacare, the president is already winning the political battle over the debt ceiling. His comments today were a masterstroke of strategy that will pay political dividends now and in the future. If the president is successful anytime a Republican talks about defunding Obamacare, the American people will think extortion. Republicans keep insisting on unconstitutional plots to kill Obamacare, and the [president is calling them out on it.](http://www.politicususa.com/2013/09/15/obama-turns-tables-tells-republicans-debt-ceiling-demands-unconstitutional.html) Republicans haven’t realized it yet, but while they are chasing the fool’s gold of defunding Obamacare they have already lost on the debt ceiling. By caving to the lunatic fringe in his party, John Boehner may have [handed control of the House of Representatives back to Democrats on a silver platter.](http://www.politicususa.com/2013/09/17/wall-street-journal-warns-gop-government-shutdown-give-democrats-house.html) While Republicans posture on Obamacare, Obama is routing them on the debt ceiling.