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#### The United States federal government should negotiate a mediation-inclusive Bilateral Investment Treaty with China.

#### Solves relations – bilat key

Marchick 12 (David M. Marchick, Managing Director and global head of external affairs, Carlyle Group, author of U.S. National Security and Foreign Direct Investment; Daniel R. Bowles is an associate at the Carlyle Group and assisted in the preparation of this article; “Fostering Greater Chinese Investment in the United States,” Council on Foreign Relations Press, Policy Innovation Memorandum No. 13, February 2012, http://www.cfr.org/china/fostering-greater-chinese-investment-united-states/p27310)

China recently became the world's second-largest economy and has emerged as the world's largest exporter and second-largest destination for foreign direct investment (FDI). In the past two years, China alone has contributed 16 percent of global GDP growth. Yet despite its rapid economic rise, China lags in one important area: outbound foreign direct investment (OFDI). China's OFDI has grown rapidly, but it remains relatively low—lower even than that of Ireland and Singapore. Historically, the United States has garnered approximately 15 percent of total global OFDI flows, yet currently it receives only 2 percent of China's OFDI. President Barack Obama's meetings in February 2012 with Xi Jinping, China's vice president and soon-to-be leader, provide an opportunity to address this issue and establish an economic framework to help rebalance the global economy. Creating a positive economic framework will help mitigate the inevitable stresses on the U.S.-China relationship as leaders in both political parties sharpen their anti-China rhetoric during the 2012 U.S. election. China's outward investment has substantial room to grow, and the United States has the potential to capture a larger share of it—an outcome that would benefit the U.S. and Chinese economies and strengthen the bilateral economic relationship. China could be transformed into a large overseas investor, not just an exporter. At the core of that framework should be an unequivocal policy of fostering additional Chinese investment into the United States, so long as particular investments do not compromise U.S. national security interests.

#### Relations key to prevent multiple scenarios for planetary destruction – and check global conflict escalation

Cohen 9 (William S. Cohen, chairman and CEO of The Cohen Group, strategic business consulting firm, former U.S. secretary of defense; Maurice R. Greenberg, chairman and CEO, C.V. Starr & Co., former chairman and CEO of AIG; “Smart Power in U.S.-China Relations,” http://csis.org/files/media/csis/pubs/090309\_mcgiffert\_uschinasmartpower\_web.pdf)

The evolution of Sino-U.S. relations over the next months, years, and decades has the potential to have a greater impact on global security and prosperity than any other bilateral or multilateral arrangement. In this sense, many analysts consider the U.S.-China diplomatic relationship to be the most influential in the world. Without question, strong and stable U.S. alliances provide the foundation for the protection and promotion of U.S. and global interests. Yet within that broad framework, the trajectory of U.S.-China relations will determine the success, or failure, of efforts to address the toughest global challenges: global financial stability, energy security and climate change, nonproliferation, and terrorism, among other pressing issues. Shepherding that trajectory in the most constructive direction possible must therefore be a priority for Washington and Beijing. Virtually no major global challenge can be met without U.S.-China cooperation. The uncertainty of that future trajectory and the “strategic mistrust” between leaders in Washington and Beijing necessarily concerns many experts and policymakers in both countries. Although some U.S. analysts see China as a strategic competitor—deliberately vying with the United States for energy resources, military superiority, and international political influence alike— analysis by the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) has generally found that China uses its soft power to pursue its own, largely economic, international agenda primarily to achieve its domestic objectives of economic growth and social stability.1 Although Beijing certainly has an eye on Washington, not all of its actions are undertaken as a counterpoint to the United States. In addition, CSIS research suggests that growing Chinese soft power in developing countries may have influenced recent U.S. decisions to engage more actively and reinvest in soft-power tools that have atrophied during the past decade. To the extent that there exists a competition between the United States and China, therefore, it may be mobilizing both countries to strengthen their ability to solve global problems. To be sure, U.S. and Chinese policy decisions toward the respective other power will be determined in large part by the choices that leaders make about their own nation’s interests at home and overseas, which in turn are shaped by their respective domestic contexts. Both parties must recognize—and accept—that the other will pursue a foreign policy approach that is in its own national interest. Yet, in a globalized world, challenges are increasingly transnational, and so too must be their solutions. As demonstrated by the rapid spread of SARS from China in 2003, pandemic flu can be spread rapidly through air and via international travel. Dust particulates from Asia settle in Lake Tahoe. An economic downturn in one country can and does trigger an economic slowdown in another. These challenges can no longer be addressed by either containment or isolation. What constitutes the national interest today necessarily encompasses a broader and more complex set of considerations than it did in the past. The Global Good As a general principle, the United States seeks to promote its national interest while it simultaneously pursues what the CSIS Commission on Smart Power called in its November 2007 report the “global good.”2 This approach is not always practical or achievable, of course. But neither is it pure benevolence. Instead, a strategic pursuit of the global good accrues concrete benefits for the United States (and others) in the form of building confidence, legitimacy, and political influence in key countries and regions around the world in ways that enable the United States to better confront global and transnational challenges. In short, the global good comprises those things that all people and governments want but have traditionally not been able to attain in the absence of U.S. leadership. Despite historical, cultural, and political differences between the United States and China, Beijing’s newfound ability, owing to its recent economic successes, to contribute to the global good is a matter for common ground between the two countries. Today there is increasing recognition that no major global challenge can be addressed effectively, much less resolved, without the active engagement of—and cooperation between—the United States and China. The United States and China—the world’s first- and third-largest economies—are inextricably linked, a fact made ever more evident in the midst of the current global financial crisis. Weak demand in both the United States and China, previously the twin engines of global growth, has contributed to the global economic downturn and threatens to ignite simmering trade tensions between the two countries. Nowhere is the interconnectedness of the United States and China more clear than in international finance. China has $2 trillion worth of largely U.S. dollar-denominated foreign exchange reserves and is the world’s largest holder—by far—of U.S. government debt. Former treasury secretary Henry M. Paulson and others have suggested that the structural imbalances created by this dynamic fueled the current economic crisis. Yet, China will almost certainly be called on to purchase the lion’s share of new U.S. debt instruments issued in connection with the U.S. stimulus and recovery package. Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton’s February 23,2009, reassurance to Beijing that U.S. markets remain safe and her call for continued Chinese investment in the U.S. bond market as a means to help both countries, and the world, emerge from global recession underscored the shared interest—and central role—that both countries have in turning around the global economy quickly. Although China’s considerable holdings of U.S. debt have been seen as a troubling problem, they are now being perceived as a necessary part of a global solution. Similarly, as the world’s two largest emitters of greenhouse gases, China and the United States share not only the collateral damage of energy-inefficient economic growth, but a primary responsibility to shape any ultimate global solutions to climate change. To date, cooperation has been elusive, owing as much to Washington’s reluctance as to Beijing’s intransigence. Painting China as the environmental bogeyman as an excuse for foot-dragging in policymaking is no longer an option; for its part, China, as the world’s top polluter, must cease playing the developing-economy card. Yet energy security and climate change remain an area of genuine opportunity for joint achievement. Indeed, U.S.-China cooperation in this field is a sine qua non of any response to the energy and climate challenges. The sheer size of the Chinese economy means that collaboration with the United States could set the de facto global standards for efficiency and emissions in key economic sectors such as industry and transportation. Climate change also provides an area for cooperation in previously uncharted policy waters, as in emerging Arctic navigational and energy exploration opportunities. Washington and Beijing also share a deep and urgent interest in international peace and stability. The resumption of U.S.-China military contacts is a positive development. As two nuclear powers with worldwide economic and strategic interests, both countries want to minimize instability and enhance maritime security, as seen by parallel antipiracy missions in the waters off Somalia. Joint efforts in support of United Nations peacekeeping, nonproliferation, and counterterrorism offer critical areas for bilateral and multilateral cooperation. Certainly, regional and global security institutions such as the Six-Party Talks concerning North Korea or the UN Security Council require the active engagement of both Washington and Beijing. Even more broadly, crisis management in geographic regions of mutual strategic interest like the Korean peninsula, Iran, or Burma require much more Sino-U.S. communication if the two countries are to avoid miscalculation and maximize opportunities to minimize human suffering. Increasing the number of mid-level military-to-military exchanges would help in this regard. The United States and China could do more to cooperate on law enforcement to combat drug trafficking and organized crime in Western China. Afghanistan is competing with Burma as the main provider of narcotics to China; Washington could use its influence with the International Security Assistance Force in Kabul to develop a joint antinarcotics program. This could potentially build networks and joint capabilities that might be useful for U.S.-China cooperation on the issue of Pakistan. In addition, Washington should also encourage NATO-China cooperation along the Afghan border. Collaborating under the auspices of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) might provide an additional framework for Beijing and Washington to address Central Asian security issues in a cooperative manner. The SCO, which includes Pakistan as an observer and will convene a multinational conference on Afghanistan in March 2009, has long made curbing narcoterrorism in Afghanistan a priority. In addition, the U.S. Drug Enforcement Agency and the Chinese AntiNarcotics Bureau should expand cooperation on interdiction and prosecution of heroin and meth traffickers. To be sure, there are a number of areas of serious divergence between Washington and Beijing. This should surprise no one. The United States has disagreements with even its allies. Two large powers with vastly different histories, cultures, and political systems are bound to have challenges. History has shown, however, that the most effective way of addressing issues is for the U.S. and Chinese governments to engage in quiet diplomacy rather than public recrimination. In the U.S.-China context, there is often little to be gained—and much to be lost in terms of trust and respect—by a polarizing debate. Any differences, moreover, must not necessarily impede Sino-U.S. cooperation when both sides share strong mutual interests. F. Scott Fitzgerald wrote that “the test of a first-rate intelligence is the ability to hold two opposed ideas in the mind at the same time, and still retain the ability to function.”3 Effective policy toward China by the United States, and vice versa, will require this kind of dual-minded intelligence. Moreover, working together on areas of mutual and global interest will help promote strategic trust between China and the United States, facilitating possible cooperation in other areas. Even limited cooperation on specific areas will help construct additional mechanisms for bilateral communication on issues of irreconcilable disagreement. In fact, many of the toughest challenges in U.S.-China relations in recent years have been the result of unforeseen events, such as the accidental bombing of the Chinese embassy in Belgrade in May 1999 and the EP-3 reconnaissance plane collision in April 2001. Building trust and finding workable solutions to tough problems is the premise behind the Obama administrations foreign policy of smart power, as articulated by Secretary of State Clinton. Smart power is based on, as Secretary Clinton outlined in her confirmation hearing, the fundamental belief that “We must use ... the full range of tools at our disposal—diplomatic, economic, military, political and cultural—picking the right tool, or combination of tools, for each situation.”4 As the CSIS Commission on Smart Power noted in November 2007, “Smart Power is neither hard nor soft—it is the skillful combination of both\_\_\_It is an approach that underscores the necessity of a strong military, but also invests heavily in alliances, partnerships and institutions at all levels... ”5 As such, smart power necessarily mandates a major investment in a U.S.-China partnership on key issues. The concept enjoys broad support among the Chinese and American people and, by promoting the global good, it reaps concrete results around the world. There should be no expectation that Washington and Beijing will or should agree on all, or even most, questions. But the American and Chinese people should expect their leaders to come together on those vital issues that require their cooperation. U.S.-China partnership, though not inevitable, is indispensable.
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#### Engagement’s limited now because of opposition by protectionist lobbies

Gvosdev 12 (Nikolas, Member of U.S. Naval War College faculty and former Editor of the National Interest, "The Realist Prism: To Reset Latin America Policy, U.S. Must Think Big,” World Politics Review, 4/20/2012, http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/11867/the-realist-prism-to-reset-latin-america-policy-u-s-must-think-big)

U.S. policy toward the Western Hemisphere has suffered a series of setbacks over the past month. The first, the Washington summit earlier this month between Presidents Barack Obama and Dilma Rousseff of Brazil, was simply lackluster. The second, last weekend’s Summit of the Americas in Cartagena, Colombia, was an outright fiasco. Instead of laying out a common agenda for the hemisphere and rebuilding America’s leadership role in the region, the U.S. found itself isolated in a diplomatic corner over Cuba, to say nothing of the Secret Service prostitution scandal that soon overshadowed the proceedings. ¶ More generally, Obama’s Latin America policy is suffering from a lack of what George H.W. Bush famously called “the vision thing,” compounded by how the administration organizes the U.S. foreign policy apparatus. The president had an initial opening at his first Summit of the Americas in Trinidad, in 2009, to reset what had become a very problematic relationship between the United States and most of the rest of the hemisphere during the George W. Bush administration. Most regional leaders also made it clear they understood that, given the global financial crisis and the challenges of winding down America’s involvement in two Middle Eastern wars, Obama could not immediately pivot U.S. foreign policy to the region. ¶ But as I noted two years ago, “There was insufficient follow-up to take advantage of the momentum generated by the Trinidad meeting.” Just as candidate George W. Bush’s rhetoric about the importance of Latin America understandably evaporated after Sept. 11, the Obama administration, in continuing to react to a series of crises elsewhere in the world, has also put the Western Hemisphere on the back burner.¶ As a result, according to Sean Goforth, America’s relations with the region appear to be adrift. “Many countries want and deserve a serious partnership with Washington. But President Obama is an unconvincing partner. . . . He has stalled on trade treaties with Latin American countries that still want preferred access to the U.S. market, and he’s made it clear that his strategic priority is a ‘pivot’ toward Asia.”¶ Worse still, no senior official within the administration, starting with the president himself, has articulated a clear, compelling and convincing vision for what a Western Hemispheric partnership would look like, beyond the expected bromides about peace, democracy and prosperity. What is the desired end state? There is no lack of compelling possibilities to choose from: free circulation for people, goods and capital from the Yukon to Tierra del Fuego; a greater push for regional independence, in terms of manufactured goods, services and energy; an arrangement that mimics the pre-Maastricht European Community. ¶ Part of the problem is that important U.S. domestic lobbies are opposed to key pieces of what would be needed to promote greater regional integration -- from environmentalists concerned both about Canada’s oil sands and new pipeline projects that would transport more of Alberta’s hydrocarbons to U.S. refineries and markets to a formidable anti-immigration lobby that would be very hesitant to support a freer flow of labor between the countries of the Western Hemisphere. Add post-Sept. 11 security concerns and a prevailing view among many U.S. voters that free trade agreements usually come at the expense of the American worker, and it becomes more apparent why no U.S. politician has emerged as a strong advocate for a Community of the Americas.¶ And while domestic politics are always going to be intertwined with foreign policy, U.S. messaging, particularly in Cartagena, seemed to convey just how much a domestic U.S. agenda is driving interaction with the rest of the region. Whether intended or not, Washington’s continued emphasis on framing foreign engagement as a way to boost U.S. job numbers does not provide much incentive for other states to embrace the U.S. agenda, as Obama similarly discovered during visits to India and other states in Southeast Asia. Meanwhile, the unwillingness to alter the U.S. position on Cuba set the tone in Cartagena, reinforcing the perception that U.S. strategy toward the region is seen through the prism of domestic politics -- in this case Florida’s electoral votes.

#### Plan promotes free trade and inflames domestic protectionism

McGinnis 2K (John, Professor of Law at the Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law, Yeshiva University, "The World Trade Constitution", Harvard Law Review, December, 114 Harv. L. Rev. 511, Lexis)

It is true that free trade does not make everyone within a nation better off, atleast in the short term. Free trade displaces workers and owners in industries where the comparative advantage lies abroad, because it becomes cheaper for the nation to import the goods than to produce them domestically. Workers often cannot change industries easily because they have nontransferable skills. Owners’ capital, moreover, may not be mobile because the owners have invested it in industry-specific assets. As a result, workers and owners in industries that lack a comparative advantage stand to lose a significant portion of their income. In the long run, free trade may make many of these workers and owners better off, as open borders create higher-paying jobs and higher returns to capital. But the workers and owners may discount these hopeful prospects. A well-known feature of human psychology called the “matching principle” suggests that people have difficulty calculating the current value of future benefits. As a result, many people refuse to forgo a current benefit for future gain, even when the latter will be greater on a discounted basis. Thus, workers who fear the adverse effects of free trade may give scant consideration to the possibility of better jobs in the future, and owners scant consideration to the chance that they will increase their profits in another business. As a result of real monetary losses and the patterns of human psychology, then, workers and owners in industries adversely affected by free trade will try to persuade the government to erect protectionist barriers. The realities of interest group politics suggest that they will enjoy significant success. As concentrated groups, workers and owners can obtain substantial benefits from government action. Consequently, these groups have strong incentives to provide campaign contributions and electoral support in return for protectionist policies. In contrast, groups that benefit from free trade, such as consumers, are diffuse, and their gains, though large in the aggregate, tend to be small on an individual basis. These groups have comparatively few incentives to contribute time and money to lobby for free trade policies. Moreover, they face high agency costs in monitoring legislators to determine whether their representatives are yielding to interest groups at the expense of society as a whole. For these reasons, citizens may choose to remain “rationally ignorant” of almost all trade policy issues. So far, this account is the relatively familiar story of interest group politics. But protectionist groups enjoy an additional advantage: they can exploit nationalist sentiments. These sentiments, which are often deeply rooted in a country’s tradition and culture, can have a positive impact on politics by encouraging the production of public goods. For example, they facilitate the common defense and aid in rallying opposition to totalitarian oppression, as in Eastern Europe at the end of the Cold War. Unfortunately, these sentiments can also provide cover for a variety of protectionist measures, like “Buy American” and domestic-content laws, that are designed to benefit interest groups at the expense of the public.

#### Triggers collapse of China relations and war

Droke 10 (Clif Droke, editor of Momentum Strategies Report, Green Faucet, “America and the Next Major War,” 3-29-2010, http://www.greenfaucet.com/technical-analysis/america-and-the-next-major-war/79314)

In the current phase of relative peace and stability we now enjoy, **many are questioning when the next major war may occur** and speculation is rampant as to major participants involved. Our concern here is strictly of a financial nature, however, and a discussion of the geopolitical and military variables involved in the escalation of war is beyond the scope of this commentary. But **what we can divine from financial history is that "hot" wars** in a military sense **often** **emerge from trade wars**. As we shall see, the elements for what could prove to be a trade war of epic proportions are already in place and the key figures are easily identifiable. Last Wednesday the lead headline in the Wall Street Journal stated, "Business Sours on China." It seems, according to WSJ, that Beijing is "reassessing China's long-standing emphasis on opening its economy to foreign business....and tilting toward promoting dominant state companies." Then there is Internet search giant Google's threat to pull out of China over concerns of censorship of its Internet search results in that country. The trouble started a few weeks ago Google announced that it no longer supports China's censoring of searches that take place on the Google platform. China has defended its extensive censorship after Google threatened to withdraw from the country. Additionally, the Obama Administration announced that it backs Google's decision to protest China's censorship efforts. In a Reuters report, Obama responded to a question as to whether the issue would cloud U.S.-China relations by saying that the human rights would not be "carved out" for certain countries. This marks at least the second time this year that the White House has taken a stand against China (the first conflict occurring over tire imports). Adding yet further fuel to the controversy, the U.S. Treasury Department is expected to issue a report in April that may **formally label China as a "currency manipulator**," according to the latest issue of Barron's. This **would do nothing to ease tensions between the two nations and would probably lead** one step closer **to a trade war between China and the U.S.** Then there was last week's Wall Street Journal report concerning authorities in a wealthy province near Shanghai criticizing the quality of luxury clothing brands from the West, including Hermes, Tommy Hilfiger and Versace. This represents quite a change from years past when the long-standing complaint from the U.S. over the inferior quality of Chinese made merchandise. On Monday the WSJ ran an article under the headline, "American Firms Feel Shut Out In China." The paper observed that so far there's little evidence that American companies are pulling out of China but adds a growing number of multinational firms are "starting to rethink their strategy." According to a poll conducted by the American Chamber of Commerce in China, 38% of U.S. companies reported feeling unwelcome in China compared to 26% in 2009 and 23% in 2008. As if to add insult to injury, the high profile trial of four Rio Tinto executives in China is another example of the tables being turned on the West. The executives are by Chinese authorities of stealing trade secrets and taking bribes. There's a touch of irony to this charge considering that much of China's technology was stolen from Western manufacturing firms which set up shop in that country. It seems China is flexing its economic and political muscle against the West in a show of bravado. Yet one can't help thinking that this is exactly the sort of arrogance that typically precedes a major downfall. As the Bible states, "Pride goeth before destruction, and an haughty spirit before a fall." In his book, "Jubilee on Wall Street," author David Knox Barker devotes a chapter to how trade wars tend to be common occurrences in the long wave economic cycle of developed nations. Barker explains his belief that the industrial nations of Brazil, Russia, India and China will play a major role in pulling the world of the long wave deflationary decline as their domestic economies begin to develop and grow. "The are and will demand more foreign goods produced in the United States and other markets," he writes. Barker believes this will help the U.S. rebalance from an over weighted consumption-oriented economy to a high-end producer economy. Barker adds a caveat, however: **if protectionist policies are allowed to gain force in Washington, trade wars will almost certainly erupt** and. If this happens, says Barker, "**all bets are off**." He adds, "**The impact on global trade of increased protectionism and trade wars would be catastrophic, and what could prove to be a mild** long wave **[economic] winter** season this time around **could plunge into a global depression**." Barker also observes that the storm clouds of trade wars are already forming on the horizon as we have moved further into the long wave economic "winter season." Writes Barker, "**If trade wars** are allowed to **get under way** in these final years of a long wave winter, **this decline will be** **far deeper and darker** than necessary, just as the Great Depression was far deeper and lengthier than it should have been, due to growing international trade isolationism. He further cautions that protectionism in Washington will certainly bring retaliation from the nations that bear the brunt of punitive U.S. trade policies. He observes that the reaction from one nation against the protectionist policies of another is typically far worse than the original action. He cites as an example the restriction by the U.S. of $55 million worth of cotton blouses from China in the 1980s. China retaliated by cancelling $500 million worth of orders for American rain. "**As one nation blocks trade, the nation that is hurt will surely retaliate and the entire world will suffer**," writes Barker.

#### Impact is extinction

Johnson 1 (The Nation, “Time to Bring the Troops Home,” 5/14/01, http://www.thenation.com/article/time-bring-troops-home)

In East Asia, the United States maintains massive and expensive military forces poised to engage in everything from nuclear war to sabotage of governments that Washington finds inconvenient (for example, the government of former President Suharto in Indonesia, which in May 1998 the US government helped to bring down via troops its Special Forces had trained). At the beginning of the twenty-first century, the United States still deploys some 100,000 military personnel and close to an equal number of civilian workers and dependents in Japan and South Korea. These forces include the Third Marine Expeditionary Force in Okinawa and Japan; the Second Infantry Division in South Korea; numerous Air Force squadrons in both countries (Kadena Air Force Base in Okinawa is the largest US military installation outside the United States); the Seventh Fleet, with its headquarters in Yokosuka, Japan, patrolling the China coast and anywhere else that it wants to go; and innumerable submarine pens (for example, White Beach, Okinawa), support facilities, clandestine eavesdropping and intelligence-collecting units, Special Forces and staff and headquarters installations all over the Pacific.¶ From approximately 1950 to 1990, the US government invoked the cold war to justify these so-called forward deployments--actually, in less euphemistic language, imperialist outposts. During the late 1940s, when it became apparent that the Chinese Communist Party was going to win the Chinese civil war, the United States reversed its policy of attempting to democratize occupied Japan and devoted itself to making Japan Washington's leading satellite in East Asia. The United States entered into an informal economic bargain with Japan: In return for Japan's willingness to tolerate the indefinite deployment of US weapons and troops on its soil, the United States would give it preferential access to the American market and would tolerate its protectionism and mercantilism. These were advantages the United States did not extend to its European allies or Latin American neighbors in the cold war.¶ Oddly enough, this policy is still in effect some fifty-four years after it was first implemented. In return for hosting 40,000 US troops and an equal number of dependents in ninety-one US-controlled bases, Japan still has privileged access to the US economy and still maintains protectionist barriers against US sales and investment in the Japanese market. The overall results of this policy became apparent in the 1970s and led to acute problems for the US economy in the 1980s--namely, huge excess manufacturing capacity in Japan and the hollowing out of US manufacturing industries. The costs for the United States have been astronomical. During the year 2000 alone, it recorded its largest trade deficit ever, of which $81 billion was with Japan. During the mid-1980s, Japan became the world's largest creditor nation and the United States became the world's largest debtor nation, thereby turning upside down the original assumptions on which US economic policies toward Japan were based. But neither the United States nor Japan made any changes in its old trade-for-bases deal, despite occasional and futile protests by US business interests.¶ Meanwhile, from the point of view of US elites committed to maintaining hegemony on a global basis, the sudden and unpredicted collapse of the Soviet Union in the period 1989 to 1991 was a disaster. They had to find some new justifications for their overseas presence, particularly in East Asia, where Japan's inherent power and the emergence of a commercially oriented China offered implicit challenges to the old American order. Among these justifications, one of the cleverest was the so-called two-war strategy, which requires the US military establishment to be able to fight two large wars on opposite sides of the globe at the same time. The beauty of this formulation is that it avoids specifying which nations might conceivably want to go to war with the United States and ignores the historical fact that in America's most recent wars--Korea, Vietnam, the Persian Gulf and Yugoslavia--no second nation (on the other side of the globe or nearby) challenged it.¶ More concretely, Pentagon strategists have tried to find replacement enemies for the former USSR by demonizing North Korea and muttering ominously about China's successful transition from a Leninist command economy to a state-guided market system resembling the other successful capitalist countries of East Asia. Until June 2000, North Korea was routinely described as an extremely threatening "rogue state." Then, on the initiative of the South Korean president, the two Koreas began to negotiate their own reconciliation without asking for US permission. The possibility that North and South Korea might achieve some form of peaceful coexistence totally undercuts the main US rationale for a "national missile defense" and a "theater missile defense."¶ Regardless of which ventriloquist is in charge of him on any given day, George W. Bush shows no sign of comprehending these matters. In March, when South Korean President Kim Dae Jung, last year's winner of the Nobel Peace Prize, visited Washington to ask for help in pursuing his country's rapprochement with the North, the newly designated "leader of the free world" rudely brushed him off. Korea policy has become a plaything of Congressional Republican mastodons, and the Bush White House seems much more interested in pleasing them than in the situation in East Asia. It is easy for the United States to attempt to bully both the North and South Koreas; it has been doing so since 1945.¶ China is another matter. No sane figure in the Pentagon wants a war with China, and all serious US militarists know that China's minuscule nuclear capacity is not offensive but a deterrent against the overwhelming US power arrayed against it (twenty archaic Chinese warheads versus more than 7,000 US warheads). Taiwan, whose status constitutes the still incomplete last act of the Chinese civil war, remains the most dangerous place on earth. Much as the 1914 assassination of the Austrian crown prince in Sarajevo led to a war that no one wanted, a misstep in Taiwan by any side could bring the United States and China into a conflict that neither wants. Such a war would bankrupt the United States, deeply divide Japan and probably end in a Chinese victory, given that China is the world's most populous country and would be defending itself against a foreign aggressor. More seriously, it could easily escalate into a nuclear holocaust.
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#### 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.

### 1nc 4

#### Immigration reform is top of the docket and passage is likely but uncertain – Obama must avoid perception of over-reach

Talev & Dorning 10-16 (Margaret Talev and Mike Dorning, Bloomberg Businessweek, “Obama’s Debt Fight Win Won’t Secure Agenda Success,” 10-16-2013, http://www.businessweek.com/news/2013-10-16/obama-s-win-in-debt-fight-won-t-secure-success-for-future-agenda)

President Barack Obama’s victory in the fiscal standoff with Republicans won’t guarantee success in future talks with Republicans over his spending priorities and immigration proposals.¶ At the end of a weeks-long stalemate, Obama managed to stave off a direct assault on his health-care law by House Republicans and force them to allow an increase in the U.S. debt ceiling without conditions.¶ “It’s clearly a win for the president,” said Patrick Griffin, a congressional lobbyist in the administration of President Bill Clinton, who faced two government shutdowns and a combative Republican Congress. “Whether it’s a battle win or a war win for the president, we don’t know.”¶ The last-minute agreement doesn’t eliminate the core conflict in Congress over fiscal policy, and the temporary funding extension for the government expires on Jan. 15. Republicans still say they will refuse to raise taxes, while Democrats say they won’t cut entitlements such as Social Security and Medicare without more tax revenue.¶ House Republicans vowed to keep chipping away at the Affordable Care Act, the president’s signature achievement of his first term.¶ “We haven’t really resolved any of the big issues,” said Dan Meyer, who was chief of staff to former House Speaker Newt Gingrich when he was confronting Clinton. “He didn’t get more revenue. He didn’t get the sequester caps lifted. All those decisions were punted.”¶ Obama’s Agenda¶ The Senate voted yesterday 81-18 to approve the compromise to end the government shutdown and raise debt ceiling, followed by the House, 285 to 144.¶ Obama said he would sign the legislation immediately, and he next wanted Congress to pass a new immigration law, a farm bill and to work on a “sensible budget.”¶ “There is a lot of work ahead of us, including our need to earn back the trust of the American people that has been lost over the last few weeks,” Obama said at the White House after the Senate vote. He said he hoped that lessons of the stalemate “will be internalized” by lawmakers.¶ The partial government shutdown that resulted from the deadlock has taken at least $24 billion out of the U.S. economy so far, reducing fourth-quarter growth by at least 0.6 percentage points, according Standard & Poor’s.¶ Markets Steady¶ Investors were unfazed, though. Daily swings in the Standard & Poor’s 500 Index averaged less than 1 percent since the shutdown began on Oct. 1. After a deal was announced by Senate leaders, the benchmark climbed 1.4 percent to 1,721.54 at 4 p.m. in New York, rising to within 0.3 percent of its last closing record.¶ The political costs are less clear.¶ A Pew Research Center poll showed that the longer the shutdown went on, the more Americans blamed Republicans over Obama and other Democrats. Seventy-two percent of Americans surveyed Oct. 9-13 disapproved of the job Republican leaders in Congress were doing, while 51 percent disapproved of Obama’s performance.¶ Lawmakers have more than a year before they face voters again in midterm elections.¶ “I lived through it last time,” Meyer said of the shutdowns in 1995 and 1996, after which Republican maintained their congressional majorities. “There’s little historical evidence that standing a year before an election has much of an impact.”¶ Negotiating Partner¶ Obama still is without a Republican negotiating partner who can reliably make a deal and deliver opposition party support.¶ House Speaker John Boehner of Ohio has been unwilling to hold votes on measures opposed by Republicans in the Tea Party caucus. While Senator Republican Leader Mitch McConnell of Kentucky stepped in to steer the bipartisan resolution to avoid a debt default, he may be less inclined to take such a political risk other policy issues that could hurt his prospects in a primary election next year.¶ White House press secretary Jay Carney declined to say if Obama can use the Republican defeat to his advantage in budget negotiations early next year or as he tries again to win passage of a new immigration law.¶ “There are no winners here,” Carney said. “I can’t really say that we’re either encouraged or discouraged. We will just have to see.”¶ Debt Debates¶ David Plouffe, a former senior adviser to Obama, said the president is likely to emerge with a stronger hand in any case. The Tea Party faction in the House overplayed its hand, he said, and that probably enhances the position of the Senate, where Democrats have a majority, and of House Republicans who are willing to compromise with the administration.¶ The outcome of this standoff makes future confrontations over the debt limit less likely, Plouffe said.¶ “Hopefully, we have broken forever using the debt ceiling as a political weapon,” Plouffe said. “I’m not naïve but I think it’s unlikely the Republicans in Congress want to go through this anytime again soon.”¶ The biggest victory for the president was in cutting off the Republican attempt to scuttle the health-care law, Plouffe said. By the time the next round of fiscal negotiations occurs in January, coverage will have begun for Americans who signed up through the health insurance exchanges. That means Republicans who attack the law in the next budget fight would have to try to take away existing coverage from constituents.¶ Earlier Compromises¶ Whether Obama gets from Congress a new immigration law or changes he’s seeking in taxes and entitlement programs depends on how Republicans read the outcome of this fight, Plouffe said.¶ He recalled that following their political loss in the 1996 shutdown, House Republicans under Gingrich reached deals with Clinton on welfare reform and the minimum wage.¶ “There was a strategic necessity for them post-shutdown to show they could govern,” Plouffe said. Immigration law “would be the natural place” for Republicans to act, he said.¶ “But I don’t think we know the answer yet,” he said. “They may say, ’We don’t feel the need to do what Gingrich did.’”¶ Judd Gregg, chief executive officer of the Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association and a former Republican senator from New Hampshire, said both sides suffered by going through the shutdown.¶ “Clearly there’s significant damage to the Republican brand relative to our willingness to be a party of constructive governance committed to fiscal responsibility and reducing the deficit and the debt,” Gregg said. “The president’s done himself considerable harm by not negotiating on this.”¶ “I think that everybody has a fair amount of egg on their face,” he said.

#### Narrowing the agenda and focusing PC on immigration is key

Pickler 10-17 (Nedra Pickler, Associated Press, “Obama: Focus on budget, immigration, farm bill,” 10-17-2013, http://portal.truvista.net/news/read/category/political/article/ap-obama\_focus\_on\_budget\_immigration\_farm\_b-ap)

The government shutdown behind him, President Barack Obama focused Thursday on a new, trimmed down agenda by challenging Congress to overcome bitter partisan division and pass a budget and a farm bill and overhaul immigration.¶ The president said getting through those three priorities would help Washington move beyond "the cloud of crisis" created by the 16-day partial shuttering of government operations. But he acknowledged the political reality that even passing such a slimmed-down agenda by the end of the year will be tough.¶ "To all my friends in Congress, understand that how business is done in this town has to change because we've all got a lot of work to do on behalf of the American people, and that includes the hard work of regaining their trust," Obama said from the White House, the morning after signing a painfully forged bipartisan deal to reopen the government and avert a default.¶ Obama has slashed his wish list from earlier this year, when he called for legislation to address climate change, an increase in the minimum wage, gun control and the closure of the Guantanamo Bay prison. The reduced priorities underscore how difficult it has been to get legislation through Congress, the short legislative calendar left this year and Obama's limited political capital.¶ Prospects for passage of an immigration bill appear particularly dim. A bill passed by the Democratic-controlled Senate and backed by the White House includes billions for border security and a path to citizenship for those already living in the U.S. illegally, but most House Republicans have rejected the approach.

#### Plan saps PC

Harper, 10 (liz, Senior Editor @ US Institute for Peace, adjunct fellow at the Council on Hemispheric Affairs, americasquarterly.org contributing blogger based in Washington DC, 12/21, <http://americasquarterly.org/node/2058>)

It's not clear whether some sought to use the QFR to strong arm the State Department to articulate or take tougher positions, and thereby bolster Palmer's confirmation prospects and support on the heels of his "weak" hearing performance. Alternatively, perhaps the QFR was publicized to thwart his prospects entirely. Who knows; at this stage, it's irrelevant. What's very relevant are the unfolding consequences of the QFR mishandling. First and foremost, Palmer got rolled. A dedicated Foreign Service officer was not treated with due professionalism and respect. We will not know how great he would have been in Venezuela. Second, the State Department on this matter appears naive, indecisive and disorganized. Third, critics who never wanted ANY ambassador—and certainly NOT Palmer—in Caracas, succeeded. As did Chávez, for the short term. To take up the second point, the State Department appears to have different and confused messages on Venezuela. The ostensible example of this is the two messages of Larry Palmer's Senate testimony versus his answers to the QFR. What can be said publicly and on the record regarding Venezuela? Beyond talking with a low voice on the safest matters, it is not clear. Is such timidity to Chávez' bluster necessary? The next step will be to see whether the State Department will go bold and call Venezuelan Ambassador to the U.S. Bernardo Alvarez a persona non grata, or take a softer approach and cancel his visa. Alvarez had been back home, and over the weekend, it was said he was not planning to return to Washington DC—already one move ahead of the anticipated reciprocation to Palmer's rejection. It was in Chávez’s best interests to welcome Palmer, as he wanted to work with Venezuelans, and help ease the growing tensions between the two countries. But now, the State Department will have to rethink this, and find another person...most likely with a stronger track record on human rights and democracy. Perhaps we should accept that playing nice and fair with an irrational actor like Chávez is not likely to yield positive results. At the end of the day, we've been backed into a corner to put forward a tougher ambassador, and not Palmer, who was our first pick. Does this mean likewise that our policy of engagement must be altered? Are we acting in response to Venezuela's moves? In this context, Chávez, and some conservative critics here, are setting the terms of U.S. policy. This debacle also illustrates the express need for the State Department to complete its review of Venezuela policy and clarify its positions. The QFR mishandling is a symptom of the bigger issue: uniting our various agencies to craft a coherent message and policy on Venezuela. What are the "red lines" of what we'll tolerate from Venezuela? When one of our career diplomats goes on record saying that Venezuela's National Guard is involved in narcotrafficking, provides safe haven to terrorists like the FARC, imprisons judges for ruling against Chávez, why is the State Department not publicizing those concerns? Until now, the State Department had been keeping its profile too low for anyone's good. Ostensibly that of Ambassador Palmer. At this point, why is it a mistake to outline on record ways in which the Venezuelan government is breaking very basic standards of human rights and hemispheric security? Just some open and disquieting questions. At the least, the State Department needs to figure out what its basic message is, and then put it out there with a unified voice, loud and clear. This could go far to improve its public outreach and image. But while silence continues, it seems that the Venezuelans have settled the U.S. debate: this kind of "engagement" will not get us where we want to be. Chávez is antithetical to our democratic values and security concerns. He is moving full steam down the field, while we sit on the sidelines. Time to play.

#### Failure confirms global fears of terminal political dysfunction – collapses U.S. influence and turns their perception advantages

Hammond 10-17 (Andrew Hammond, Prospect Magazine, “Debt debacle sends global shockwaves,” 10-17-2013, http://www.prospectmagazine.co.uk/prospector/debt-debacle-sends-global-shockwaves/#.UmDegDfD\_ZY)

At the eleventh hour, Congress has agreed a short-term deal to raise the US debt ceiling. Although a worst-case scenario of debt default has therefore been dodged for at least a few more months, the troubling episode has nonetheless sent seismic shockwaves across the globe.¶ For some time, world leaders and senior US officials have warned that the impact of recent Washington political infighting has undermined the country’s reputation as a responsible international power, both in terms of domestic and foreign policy. As Secretary of State John Kerry has asserted, this episode has sent a message “of political silliness” that we “can’t get our own act together;” we need to “get back on a track the world will respect.”¶ Worrying, political gridlock in Washington may only intensify in the build-up to next year’s congressional elections. This threatens key domestic reforms on the horizon, including an immigration overhaul, which is of interest to many internationally.¶ The perception, in many foreign capitals, is that growing partisanship and polarisation is also infecting US foreign policy. And, this is feeding angst over the reliability of Washington as an international partner, has been vocalised recently by countries, including China, Japan and Mexico.¶ Already this month, Obama has lost the opportunity to advance the Trans-Pacific Partnership trade deal as a result of the cancellation of his trip to Asia. Meanwhile, US trade officials were forced to cancel second round negotiations with Brussels over the proposed Trans-Atlantic Trade and Investment Partnership.¶ The gravity of this reputational issue for foreign affairs was recently acknowledged by two former defence secretaries. Republican Donald Rumsfeld asserted that “lack of leadership is sending a signal around the world that the United States is in decline, that that we’re withdrawing, that we as a country are not going to behave in a rational manner”. Meanwhile, Democrat Leon Panetta bemoaned that by “governing by crisis after crisis after crisis…the world will view the United States as less able to back its word with power”.¶ The spectacle of what is perceived, internationally, as Washington’s growing political dysfunction is as bemusing as it is alarming. And, according to some data, this is a driver behind a decline in the country’s international reputation.¶ For instance, the 2012-2013 FutureBrand Country Index shows a continued fall in the international ranking of the United States compared to other states. Based on a sample of around 3,600 people in 18 countries, it concludes that the country is “in decline”, partly because of “successive fiscal crises.”¶ This builds on earlier studies by the organisation, including in 2011-12 which highlighted “intensified speculation about America’s long-term stability”, partly as a result of the downgrade by Standard & Poor’s of the country’s credit rating. This was prompted by the last near debt default of Washington in 2011.¶ These findings on the US’s reputation are echoed by the 2013 BBC Country Rating Survey, which interviewed around 26,000 people in 25 countries, and also the 2013 Pew Global Study based on a sample of about 37,600 in 39 countries. The BBC poll recorded a fall in positive views towards the United States for a second consecutive year, while the Pew survey found that pro-US sentiment is slipping, after a strong bounce following Obama’s election in 2008.¶ To be sure, the scale of reputational damage is not — yet — as serious as that which faced the country during the previous Bush administration. For much of that period, surveys indicated profound international concern with US foreign and military policies. Indeed, the country’s reputation fell to its lowest level since at least the Vietnam War.¶ Then, as now, however, the country retains attractive qualities for many foreigners, including its popular culture and economic innovation. And the fact remains that, in times of major urgency, Washington can sometimes transcend partisan divisions and work in the national interest.¶ This was demonstrated, for instance, during the 2008-9 financial crisis when Congress and the administration acted more swiftly and comprehensively than many other countries to counteract the worst economic turmoil since at least the 1930s. This has been key in enabling the country to recover more quickly from recession than some other areas of the world.¶ While current problems should therefore be put into context, the situation is nonetheless troubling. And this is not the first time this year that a Washington political impasse has threatened negative economic repercussions.¶ Only very close to the wire did Congress in January agree a deal to prevent the United States falling off the “fiscal cliff”. It is estimated that the automatic tax increases and spending cuts might well have taken the US economy back into recession.¶ At the core of the current troubles is not just growing polarisation between Democrats and Republicans, but significant intra-party divisions too. This is especially so between moderate and right-wing Republicans (and the Tea Party faction).¶ Thus, although House Speaker John Boehner, the Republican leader in the House of Representatives, had pledged that Washington would not default, his views were not shared by more conservative colleagues.¶ While the full impact of this latest debacle remains unclear, one sure thing is that it has genuinely shocked and alarmed many across the world. This will not just further undermine the US’s reputation as a responsible international power, but could potentially send it into freefall again.

#### Independently triggers global economic collapse

Williams 10-13 (Carol J. Williams, Los Angeles Times, “Political gridlock over U.S. debt not just America's problem,” 10-16-2013, http://www.latimes.com/world/worldnow/la-fg-wn-us-debt-default-global-consequences-20131016,0,5619804.story)

World financial leaders have been warning for weeks that the U.S. congressional gridlock over funding the government and raising the debt ceiling are imperiling economies worldwide and undermining confidence in the U.S. dollar.¶ Even the news Wednesday that the partisan battle was about to be suspended until early next year has done little to spare U.S. leaders damage to their reputation as responsible stewards of the No. 1 global economy, analysts warned.¶ China and Japan are the largest foreign holders of U.S. Treasury bills, with $1.3 trillion and $1.1 trillion, respectively, of Washington's outstanding debt, according to International Monetary Fund data. That makes them the most exposed in the event -- once considered unimaginable but nowadays less so -- that the U.S. Congress fails to raise the debt ceiling by Thursday, when U.S. obligations are expected to exceed the current $16.7-trillion limit.¶ But with U.S. dollar securities accounting for 62% of all foreign currency reserves in central banks around the world, the recurring threat of default is driving international investors to eye alternative currencies as safer financial havens.¶ Global markets have been relatively calm in the midst of the political standoff in Washington as investment managers have been "assigning a small probability" of default, writes Amadou Sy, the Brookings Institution's senior fellow for global economy and development. ¶ "But this is a very dangerous game as it has repercussions both within and outside the U.S.," Sy said, citing an erosion of confidence in Washington fiscal management and the stability of the dollar.¶ Even flirting with the idea of leaving the U.S. government with no means to borrow threatens an escalating global crisis, the Treasury Department warned this month. ¶ "Credit markets could freeze, the value of the dollar could plummet, and U.S. interest rates could skyrocket, potentially resulting in a financial crisis and recession that could echo the events of 2008 or worse," the department said in its Report on Macroeconomic Effect of Debt Ceiling Brinkmanship.¶ A similarly bruising battle in Congress over the debt ceiling two years ago led credit-rating agency Standard & Poor's to downgrade the U.S. government's AAA rating. The other two major U.S. credit-rating institutions, Moody's and Fitch, retained the government's outstanding rating, but later that year they revised their outlook to negative. On Tuesday, Fitch announced that it was considering a downgrade.¶ "The announcement reflects the urgency with which Congress should act to remove the threat of default hanging over the economy," China's official New China News Agency reported, quoting a Treasury spokesperson, on an issue that is of vital interest in Beijing because of China's exposure.¶ U.S. lawmakers' bitter standoff over funding the federal government and raising the amount the country can borrow was the subject of deep concern at last weekend's annual meeting of the World Bank and International Monetary Fund in Washington. IMF Managing Director Christine Lagarde warned of "massive disruption the world over" should the U.S. fail to extend its borrowing authority and put the country's creditworthiness in doubt.¶ Lagarde, in an address to Fortune magazine's Most Powerful Women Summit in Washington on Tuesday night, blasted the "stopgap" approach U.S. lawmakers have taken to resolving fundamental economic policy disputes with short-term delays and then "back to the drawing board once again."¶ That, the IMF chief said, would simply "reactivate the same sort of trepidation and anxiety and worry" that have followed the recurring bouts of debate and procrastination.¶ British economist Neil Mackinnon similarly criticized the "ongoing fiscal dysfunction" gripping Washington. Political discord and uncertainty over whether the U.S. government can pay its debts "undermines global confidence in the U.S. economy" and inflicts damage to the economies of other countries holding U.S. securities, Mackinnon told Russia Today in an interview carried Wednesday.

#### Causes nuclear wars << and turns multilat // 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**.**

### 1nc 5

#### China is continuing its political presence in a post-chavez era.

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China, 4-16 (Governmental organization in charge of cataloguing foreign affairs, “President Xi Jinping Congratulates Maduro on Presidential Election Win,” Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China, 2013, http://www.fmprc.gov.cn/eng/zxxx/t1032740.shtml)

On April 15, 2013, Chinese President Xi Jinping sent a congratulatory message to Nicolas Maduro on his winning the Venezuelan presidency. In his message, Xi said with the joint efforts of the leaders of both sides, China-Venezuela relations have been developing remarkably since the two countries forged strategic partnership of common development in 2001. "China and Venezuela have become good friends of mutual trust and good partners of close cooperation," he said. Xi stressed the great importance he attached to developing ties with Venezuela, adding China is willing to join hands with Venezuela to carry forward bilateral ties into the future and open up new prospects for the relations.

#### Aff turns them away from oil, coopts influence

Wallis 13 (Daniel Wallis, Senior Correspondent for Reuters. Daniel used to work for The Times newspaper and PA News agency in London before joining Reuters in 2003. Since then he has reported on political, general and economic news from across east Africa, Iraq and Latin America. “Venezuela's post-Chavez oil policy to focus on China, Russia” Reuters, Mar 15, 2013, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/03/15/venezuela-election-oil-idUSL1N0C69N220130315>)

Venezuela's post-Chavez oil policy will increasingly focus on deals with China and Russia if acting President Nicolas Maduro wins an April 14 election to continue his late boss's socialist programs. During his 14 years in power, Hugo Chavez nationalized most of the OPEC nation's oil industry with the aim of putting its crude reserves - the biggest in the world - at the service of his power base, Venezuela's poor majority. Turning away from the United States, the traditional top buyer of Venezuelan oil, Chavez also sharply increased fuel sales to China and turned Beijing into his government's biggest source of foreign funding. "We are not going to change one iota of the fundamental themes of President Chavez's policies," Energy Minister Rafael Ramirez said in a recent interview with a local TV station. "We have a very important strategic relationship with China, which we're going to continue deepening and cultivating. It's the same with our cooperation with Russia ... Chavez's policies are more alive than ever, and we will push ahead with them." Maduro, the late president's preferred successor, faces Henrique Capriles, governor of Miranda state, in the forthcoming election. The vote was called after Chavez's death last week following a two-year battle with cancer. If Maduro wins, he can be expected to increase oil sales to political allies at the expense of the United States, while taking on more debt from those partners. Venezuela is sending China about 430,000 barrels per day (bpd) of crude and products, up from just a few thousand bpd in 2005, in repayment of loans totaling $36 billion. The biggest Chinese energy company, China National Petroleum Corp (CNPC), is a key part of Venezuela's efforts to tap its enormous Orinoco extra heavy crude belt, one of the planet's largest hydrocarbon reserves. CNPC has joined with state oil company PDVSA in a joint venture in the Orinoco called Petrourica that is expected to begin producing within weeks. A PDVSA project with a Russian consortium, Petromiranda, began pumping there last year.

#### 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>)

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

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.

### 1ac treaty comp

#### No impact to econ collapse – relevant empirics

Robert Jervis 11, Professor in the Department of Political Science and School of International and Public Affairs at Columbia University, December 2011, “Force in Our Times,” Survival, Vol. 25, No. 4, p. 403-425

Even if war is still seen as evil, the security community could be dissolved if severe conflicts of interest were to arise. Could the more peaceful world generate new interests that would bring the members of the community into sharp disputes? 45 A zero-sum sense of status would be one example, perhaps linked to a steep rise in nationalism. More likely would be a worsening of the current economic difficulties, which could itself produce greater nationalism, undermine democracy and bring back old-fashioned beggar-my-neighbor economic policies. While these dangers are real, it is hard to believe that the conflicts could be great enough to lead the members of the community to contemplate fighting each other. It is not so much that economic interdependence has proceeded to the point where it could not be reversed – states that were more internally interdependent than anything seen internationally have fought bloody civil wars. Rather it is that even if the more extreme versions of free trade and economic liberalism become discredited, it is hard to see how without building on a preexisting high level of political conflict leaders and mass opinion would come to believe that their countries could prosper by impoverishing or even attacking others. Is it possible that problems will not only become severe, but that people will entertain the thought that they have to be solved by war? While a pessimist could note that this argument does not appear as outlandish as it did before the financial crisis, an optimist could reply (correctly, in my view) that the very fact that we have seen such a sharp economic down-turn without anyone suggesting that force of arms is the solution shows that even if bad times bring about greater economic conflict, it will not make war thinkable.

#### Countries turn inward – no fighting

Lloyd deMause, director of The Institute for Psychohistory, “Nuclear War as an Anti-Sexual Group Fantasy” Updated December 18th 2002, http://www.geocities.com/kidhistory/ja/nucsex.htm

The nation "turns inward" during this depressed phase of the cycle. Empirical studies have clearly demonstrated that major economic downswings are accompanied by "introverted" foreign policy moods, characterized by fewer armed expeditions, less interest in foreign affairs in the speeches of leaders, reduced military expenditures, etc. (Klingberg, 1952; Holmes, 1985). Just as depressed people experience little conscious rage--feeling "I deserve to be killed" rather than "I want to kill others" (Fenichel, 1945, p. 393)--interest in military adventures during the depressed phase wanes, arms expeditures decrease and peace treaties multiply.

**Economic institutions ensure bounce-back even if there is a total meltdown**

**Somerville, 08** (Glenn Somerville. "Paulson: Economy resilient but Fed move helpful." Reuters. 22 Jan. 2008. http://news.yahoo.com/s/nm/20080122/bs\_nm/usa\_economy\_paulson\_dc)

Treasury Secretary Henry Paulson said on Tuesday he was confident the U.S. and global economies were resilient but welcomed an emergency rate cut by the Federal Reserve as a helpful move. ADVERTISEMENT The U.S. central bank cut benchmark U.S. interest rates by a steep three-quarters of a percentage point while Paulson while still answering questions after addressing a Chamber of Commerce breakfast meeting. Paulson had earlier acknowledged the U.S. economy has slowed "materially" in recent weeks but, despite a meltdown in global stock prices, insisted that the global economy had "underlying resiliency" that would let it weather the storm. The U.S. Treasury chief initially looked surprised when a Chamber of Commerce official said the Fed had just cut rates in a relatively rare move between meetings of its policy-setting Federal Open Market Committee, but praised the action. "This is very constructive and I think it shows this country and the rest of the world that our central bank is nimble and can move quickly in response to market conditions," Paulson said. The U.S. Treasury chief, who headed Wall Street giant Goldman Sachs before taking over Treasury in 2006, said the $145-billion short-term stimulus package that President George W. Bush was asking Congress to work on was needed to minimize the impact of a U.S. economic slowdown. "We need to do something now, because short-term risks are clearly to the downside, and the potential benefits of quick action to support our economy have become clear," Paulson said. But early signs were that Bush's call for bipartisan action -- and a relatively positive Congressional response to it -- were not calming financial markets but might actually be fanning fears that the economy was at greater risk of toppling into recession than officially acknowledged. Stock markets around the world sank sharply on Monday, when U.S. markets were closed for the holiday in observance of slain civil rights leader Martin Luther King's birthday. Paulson tried to reassure that there was reason to feel confident in the U.S. economy's long-term prospects, notwithstanding severe problems in the housing sector and other credit-market strains. "The U.S. economy is resilient and diverse," he said. "It's been remarkably robust and it will be again." He added: "The unemployment rate remains low and job creation continues, albeit at a modest pace. The structure of our economy is sound and our long term economic fundamentals are healthy."

#### Confidence is resilient

Tymoigne, ’10 [7/30/10, Eric Tymoigne, Ph.D. is Assistant Professor of Economics at Lewis and Clark College and Research Associate at The Levy Economics Institute, “The CBO’s Misplaced Fear of a Looming Fiscal Crisis,” Wall Street Pit, <http://wallstreetpit.com/37891-the-cbos-misplaced-fear-of-a-looming-fiscal-crisis>]

A government with a sovereign currency (i.e. one that creates its own currency by fiat, only issues securities denominated in its own currency and does not promise to convert its currency into a foreign currency under any condition) does not face any liquidity or solvency constraints. All spending and debt servicing is done by [crediting](http://wallstreetpit.com/37891-the-cbos-misplaced-fear-of-a-looming-fiscal-crisis/) the accounts of the bond holders (be they foreign or domestic) and a monetarily-sovereign government can do that at will by simply pushing a computer button to mark up the size of the bond holder’s account (see Bernanke attesting to this [here](http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2009/03/bernanke_60_minutes.html)). In the US, financial market participants (forget about the hopelessly misguided international “credit ratings”) recognize this implicitly by not rating Treasuries and related government-entities bonds like Fannie and Freddie. They know that the US government will always pay because it faces no operational constraint when it comes to making payments denominated in a sovereign currency. It can, quite literally, afford to buy anything for sale in its own unit of account. This, of course, as many of us have already stated, does not mean that the government should spend without restraint. It only means that it is incorrect to state that government will “run of out money” or “burden our grandchildren” with debt (which, after all, allows us to earn interest on a very safe security), arguments that are commonly used by those who wish to reduce government services. These arguments are not wholly without merit. That is, there may well be things that the government is currently doing that the private economy could or should be doing. But that is not the case being made by the CBO, the pundits or the politicians. They are focused on questions of “affordability” and “sustainability,” which have no place in the debate over the proper size and role for government (a debate we would prefer to have). So let us get to that debate by recognizing that there is no operational constraint – ever – for a monetarily sovereign government. Any financial commitments, be they for Social Security, [Medicare](http://wallstreetpit.com/37891-the-cbos-misplaced-fear-of-a-looming-fiscal-crisis/), the war effort, etc., that come due today and into the infinite future can be made on time and in full. Of course, this means that there is no need for a lock box, a trust fund or any of other accounting gimmick, to help the government make payments in the future. We can simply recognize that every government payment is made through the general budget. Once this is understood, issues like Social Security, Medicare and other important problems can be analyzed properly: it is not a financial problem; it is a productivity/growth problem. Such an understanding would lead to very different policies than the one currently proposed by the CBO (see Randy’s post [here](http://neweconomicperspectives.blogspot.com/2010/03/tell-your-representative-to-leave.html)).

#### Economy collapse inevitable- debt is too massive for a recovery

**Williams 5/29** – Professor of economics at George Mason University (Walter E., “Our Nation’s Future” 5/29/12 <http://lewrockwell.com/williams-w/w-williams126.html>//AB)

Our nation is rapidly approaching a point from which there's little chance to avoid a financial collapse. The heart of our problem can be seen as a tragedy of the commons. That's a set of circumstances when something is commonly owned and individuals acting rationally in their own self-interest produce a set of results that's inimical to everyone's long-term interest. Let's look at an example of the tragedy of the commons phenomenon and then apply it to our national problem. Imagine there are 100 cattlemen all having an equal right to graze their herds on 1,000 acres of commonly owned grassland. The rational self-interested response of each cattleman is to have the largest herd that he can afford. Each cattleman pursing similar self-interests will produce results not in any of the cattlemen's long-term interest – overgrazing, soil erosion and destruction of the land's usefulness. Even if they all recognize the dangers, does it pay for any one cattleman to cut the size of his herd? The short answer is no because he would bear the cost of having a smaller herd while the other cattlemen gain at his expense. In the long term, they all lose because the land will be overgrazed and made useless. We can think of the federal budget as a commons to which each of our 535 congressmen and the president have access. Like the cattlemen, each congressman and the president want to get as much out of the federal budget as possible for their constituents. Political success depends upon "bringing home the bacon." Spending is popular, but taxes to finance the spending are not. The tendency is for spending to rise and its financing to be concealed through borrowing and inflation. Does it pay for an individual congressman to say, "This spending is unconstitutional and ruining our nation, and I'll have no part of it; I will refuse a $500 million federal grant to my congressional district"? The answer is no because he would gain little or nothing, plus the federal budget wouldn't be reduced by $500 million. Other congressmen would benefit by having $500 million more for their districts. What about the constituents of a principled congressman? If their congressman refuses unconstitutional spending, it doesn't mean that they pay lower federal income taxes. All that it means is constituents of some other congressmen get the money while the nation spirals toward financial ruin, and they wouldn't be spared from that ruin because their congressman refused to participate in unconstitutional spending. What we're witnessing in Greece, Italy, Ireland, Portugal and other parts of Europe is a direct result of their massive spending to accommodate the welfare state. A greater number of people are living off government welfare programs than are paying taxes. Government debt in Greece is 160 percent of gross domestic product. The other percentages of GDP are 120 in Italy, 104 in Ireland and 106 in Portugal. As a result of this debt and the improbability of their ever paying it, their credit ratings either have reached or are close to reaching junk bond status. Here's the question for us: Is the U.S. moving in a direction toward or away from the troubled EU nations? It turns out that our national debt, which was 35 percent of GDP during the 1970s, is now 106 percent of GDP, a level not seen since World War II's 122 percent. That debt, plus our more than $100 trillion in unfunded liabilities, has led Standard & Poor's to downgrade our credit rating from AAA to AA+, and the agency is keeping the outlook at "negative" as a result of its having little confidence that Congress will take on the politically sensitive job of tackling the same type of entitlement that has turned Europe into a basket case. I am all too afraid that Benjamin Franklin correctly saw our nation's destiny when he said, "When the people find that they can vote themselves money, that will herald the end of the republic."

### 1nc warming

#### Can’t solve warming without China

Chen et al 10Chen, Qian, Peridas, Qiu, Ho: Natural Resources Defense Council, Friedmann: Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Li, Wei: Institute of Rock and Soil Mechanics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Sung, Fowler: Clean Air Task Force, Seligsohn, Liu, Forbes: World Resources Institute, Zhang: China Tsinghua University, Zhao: Institute of Engineering Thermophysics, Chinese Academy of Sciences (Jason Chen, Jingjing Qian, George Peridas, Yueming Qiu, Bruce Ho, Julio Friedmann, Xiaochun Li, Ning Wei, S. Ming Sung, Mike Fowler, Deborah Seligsohn, Yue Liu, Sarah Forbes, Dongjie Zhang, Lifeng Zhao, December 2010, “Identifying Near-Term Opportunities For Carbon Capture and Sequestration (CCS) in China,” <http://docs.nrdc.org/international/files/int_10121001a.pdf)//DR>. H

As discussed at the beginning of this report, if China and the world are to avoid the worst consequences of climate change, then China’s rapid growth in total carbon dioxide emissions— though approaching only the world’s average level on a per capita basis—must be curtailed and begin to decrease within the next two decades. This process must happen in parallel with deep emissions reductions by industrialized countries, starting now, in order to save the world from dangerous climate change. Based on what the world currently knows and is capable of achieving, CCS will likely be a necessary strategy, in concert with other measures, to realize critically needed emissions abatement in China and other large fossil fuel consuming countries. Because CCS involves largescale systems engineering and geologic expertise, international collaboration will be indispensable for accelerating CCS development and deployment in the countries that need the technology. For China, which still faces daunting development needs and has relatively limited technological, financial and regulatory capacities in some areas, international collaboration and assistance are all the more critical.

#### Oceans are resilient

**Ridley, 10** (Matt, PhD, Zoology, visiting professor at Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory, June 15, 2010, “Threat From Ocean Acidification Greatly Exaggerated,” http://www.thegwpf.org/the-observatory/1106-matt-ridley-threat-from-ocean-acidification-greatly-exaggerated.html, Hensel)

Lest my critics still accuse me of cherry-picking studies, let me refer them also to the results of Hendrikset al. (2010, Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science 86:157). Far from being a cherry-picked study, this is a massive meta-analysis. The authors observed that ‘warnings that ocean acidification is a major threat to marine biodiversity are largely based on the analysis of predicted changes in ocean chemical fields’ rather than empirical data. So they constructed a database of 372 studies in which the responses of 44 different marine species to ocean acidification induced by equilibrating seawater with CO2-enriched air had been actually measured. They found that only a minority of studies demonstrated ‘significant responses to acidification’ and there was no significant mean effect even in these studies. They concluded that the world's marine biota are ‘more resistant to ocean acidification than suggested by pessimistic predictions identifying ocean acidification as a major threat to marine biodiversity’ and that ocean acidification ‘may not be the widespread problem conjured into the 21st century…Biological processes can provide homeostasis against changes in pH in bulk waters of the range predicted during the 21st century.’ This important paper alone contradicts Hoegh-Gudlberg’s assertion that ‘the vast bulk of scientific evidence shows that calcifiers… are being heavily impacted already’. In conclusion, I rest my case. My five critics have not only failed to contradict, but have explicitly confirmed the truth of every single one of my factual statements. We differ only in how we interpret the facts. It is hardly surprising that my opinion is not shared by five scientists whose research grants depend on funding agencies being persuaded that there will be a severe and rapid impact of carbon dioxide emissions on coral reefs in coming decades. I merely report accurately that the latest empirical and theoretical research suggests that the likely impact has been exaggerated.

#### Status quo solves – the data from the study should have spurred action – or it’s a terminal solvency takeout

1ac Science Daily 5/15**,** 5/15/13, “Scientific Consensus On Anthropogenic Climate Change,” http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2013/05/130515203048.htm)

¶ A comprehensive analysis of peer-reviewed articles on the topic of global warming and climate change has revealed an overwhelming consensus among scientists that recent warming is human-caused.¶ The study is the most comprehensive yet and identified 4000 summaries, otherwise known as abstracts, from papers published in the past 21 years that stated a position on the cause of recent global warming -- 97 per cent of these endorsed the consensus that we are seeing human-made, or anthropogenic, global warming (AGW)¶ Led by John Cook at the University of Queensland, the study has been published 16 May, in IOP Publishing's journal Environmental Research Letters.¶ The study went one step further, asking the authors of these papers to rate their entire paper using the same criteria. Over 2000 papers were rated and among those that discussed the cause of recent global warming, 97 per cent endorsed the consensus that it is caused by humans.¶ The findings are in stark contrast to the public's position on global warming; a 2012 poll\* revealed that more than half of Americans either disagree, or are unaware, that scientists overwhelmingly agree that Earth is warming because of human activity.¶ John Cook said: "Our findings prove that there is a strong scientific agreement about the cause of climate change, despite public perceptions to the contrary.¶ "There is a gaping chasm between the actual consensus and the public perception. It's staggering given the evidence for consensus that less than half of the general public think scientists agree that humans are causing global warming.¶ "This is significant because when people understand that scientists agree on global warming, they're more likely to support policies that take action on it."¶ In March 2012, the researchers used the ISI Web of Science database to search for peer-reviewed academic articles published between 1991 and 2011 using two topic searches: "global warming" and "global climate change."¶ After limiting the selection to peer-reviewed climate science, the study considered 11 994 papers written by 29 083 authors in 1980 different scientific journals.

#### Venezuela says no – competition – and detail debates terminally screw solvency – even the most multilat president proves

1ac Lee et al 10– Research Director, Energy, Environment and Resource Governance at Chatham House (Bernice, “The United States and climate change: from process to action,” 2-23, http://www.chathamhouse.org.uk/files/16489\_us0510\_lee\_grubb.pdf)

Despite the crucial importance of national and regional initiatives, the world ultimately cannot solve the climate problem without an effective multilateral approach. Ironically, the election of a more multilateralist US president and the events of 2009 culminating with the Copenhagen Accord have only served to increase debate around the form it might take and how inclusive it needs to be. In reality, any major deal is always built upon smaller coalitions of powerful actors. Many proposals have been made for a core of US leadership, bilateral or trilateral leadership by variants of the US–EU–China/Japan/Asia nexus, the G8, the G8+5, the G20, or the Major Economies Forum (MEF). Doubtless, action by most of these groupings is necessary, though it is also of interest that the MEF process did not reach any specific deal until the relationships fostered during the year were put under the pressure of the Copenhagen summit. Ultimately all such efforts face serious limitations if there is no recognition of the need for a truly multilateral framework. This is for three main reasons: scope, competitiveness and political legitimacy. First, carbon emissions are so widespread geographically that any subset of countries becomes increasingly unable to solve the problem unless others are involved. The dominance of US, EU and Chinese emissions today would be swamped by 2050 if these countries delivered steep reductions while others did not. And none of these are significant contributors to land-use emissions (such as deforestation), which involve a wholly different group of countries. Moreover, models which centre upon innovative solutions by a ‘critical mass’ of the private sector diffusing technology and investment globally without government incentives can founder – carbon capture and storage (CCS), which inevitably involves significant extra costs over and above coal plants without CCS, is a case in point. Second, a partial solution that encompassed the big emitters would not solve the perceived risks of loss of competitiveness in energy-intensive sectors vis-à- vis non-participants (to smaller economies such as Singapore, for example). Third, a deal between the big emitters only is unlikely to secure global legitimacy. In no legal or moral system can a solution be imposed by those inflicting the damage, without at some level engaging those that would most suffer the consequences of inadequate action.

#### Brazil solves south-south coop – and AFF doesn’t solve – South America talks key

1ac IAD 12the Inter-American Dialogue is the leading US center for policy analysis, exchange, and communication on issues in Western Hemisphere affairs(“Remaking the Relationship The United States and Latin America”, April 2012, http://www.thedialogue.org/PublicationFiles/IAD2012PolicyReportFINAL.pdf)

In addition to economic and financial matters, Brazil and other Latin American nations are assuming enhanced roles on an array of global political, environmental, and security issues . Several for which US and Latin American cooperation could become increasingly important include: ¶ As the world’s lone nuclear-weapons-free region, Latin America has the opportunity to participate more actively in non-proliferation efforts. Although US and Latin American interests do not always converge on non-proliferation questions, they align on some related goals. For example, the main proliferation challenges today are found in developing and unstable parts of the world, as well as in the leakage—or transfer of nuclear materials—to terrorists. In that context, south-south connections are crucial. Brazil could play a pivotal role.¶ Many countries in the region give priority to climate change challenges . This may position them as a voice in international debates on this topic . The importance of the Amazon basin to worldwide climate concerns gives Brazil and five other South American nations a special role to play. Mexico already has assumed a prominent position on climate change and is active in global policy debates. Brazil organized the first-ever global environmental meeting in 1992 and, this year, will host Rio+20 . Mexico hosted the second international meeting on climate change in Cancún in 2010 . The United States is handicapped by its inability to devise a climate change policy. Still, it should support coordination on the presumption of shared interests on a critical policy challenge. ¶ Latin Americans are taking more active leadership on drug policy in the hemisphere and could become increasingly influential in global discussions of drug strategies. Although the United States and Latin America are often at odds on drug policy, they have mutual interests and goals that should allow consultation and collaboration on a new, more effective approach to the problem.

#### Multiple other agencies solve tech investment – crowding out China turns sustainable dev

1ac Edwards 11– Brown University Research Fellow & co-founder of Intercambio Climatico [Guy, “Climate, energy to dominate US-Latin American relations”, 18 Jul, http://www.trust.org/item/?map=climate-energy-to-dominate-us-latin-american-relations]

¶ Since the former U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for the Western Hemisphere, Arturo Valenzuela, resigned via Twitter last Friday, commentators have been debating who should replace him and whether this change presents an opportunity to alter the Obama administration’s policies in the region.¶ With the challenges of climate change, clean energy, resource scarcity and green growth set to dominate U.S.-Latin American relations, Valenzuela’s successor should have experience in these areas. ¶ These issues are a priority for the Obama administration and present lucrative opportunities for the U.S. to improve trade and commercial relations with Latin America at a time when the region is a magnet for investment in clean energy.¶ In Chile, President Barack Obama spoke of the urgency of tackling climate change and embracing a more secure and sustainable energy future in the Americas. The Energy and Climate Partnership of the Americas, which aims to accelerate the deployment of clean energy and advance energy security, is an essential component of hemispheric relations.¶ Multiple U.S. agencies and departments are carrying out extensive work on climate change. The U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), which runs the Global Climate Change Initiative, argues that climate change is one of the century’s greatest challenges and will be a diplomatic and development priority.¶ The U.S. Special Envoy for Climate Change, Todd Stern, says that Latin America is a significant focus of funding with over $60 million spent in 2009-10 on climate-related bilateral assistance in the region. The U.S. military Southern Command co-hosted two events in Colombia and Peru focused on climate change concluding that the issue is a major security concern and as a result could be a powerful vehicle for U.S. military engagement in the region.¶ This year the Union of South American Nations’ (UNASUR) Defense Council (CDS) inaugurated the new Defense Strategic Studies Center (CEED), which will look at various challenges including the protection of strategic energy and food resources and adapting to climate change.¶ THE REGION’S RESOURCES¶ Latin America and the Caribbean boast incredible and highly coveted natural resources including 25 percent of the planet’s arable land, 22 percent of its forest area, 31 percent of its freshwater, 10 percent of its oil, 4.6 percent of its natural gas, 2 percent of coal reserves and 40 percent of its copper and silver reserves.¶ The International Energy Agency forecasts that in the future world consumers are going to become more dependent on the Americas to satisfy their demand for oil with Brazil, Colombia, the U.S. and Canada set to meet the demand.¶ Brazil will host the U.N. Conference on Sustainable Development in 2012 with the green economy theme topping the agenda. Peter Hakim, president emeritus of Inter-American Dialogue, argues that while U.S.-Brazilian relations are fraught, both countries need to work harder to improve cooperation.¶ Climate change, clean energy, resource scarcity and green growth are key potential areas for U.S.-Brazilian relations. The launch of a U.S.-Brazilian Strategic Energy Dialogue, focusing on cooperation on biofuels and renewable energy, among other areas, is a productive start.¶ Although Latin America and the Caribbean continue to be the largest U.S. export market, the U.S.’s share of the region’s imports and exports has dropped over the last few years. China is now the top destination for the exports of Argentina, Venezuela, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Peru and Uruguay. Latin American exports to China are concentrated in raw materials, which account for nearly 60 percent, while exports to the U.S. are more diversified.¶ THE RISE OF CHINA¶ Arturo Valenzuela says this makes Latin Americans better off trading with the U.S. because they can take advantage of greater technology in the value chain. However, crude oil remained the top export to the U.S. for Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico and Venezuela in the 2007-2009 time period.¶ The U.S. may assert it has a superior trade model to China, but the U.N.’s economic commission for the region argues there is a perceived lack of strategic vision by the U.S. in Latin America. Although the Energy and Climate Partnership of the Americas is the flagship U.S. initiative in the region and will be a key focus for President Obama at the 2012 Summit of the Americas, it is not yet comparable to past initiatives such as the 1960s-era Alliance for Progress.¶ This comes at a time when China’s twelfth Five Year Plan emphasizes technological innovation, improving environmental standards and various targets such as reducing energy consumption per unit of GDP by 16 percent. In 2010, China was the top installer of wind turbines and solar thermal systems, suggesting there are possible areas to collaborate between China and Latin America.¶ The U.S. was the largest investor in Latin America in 2010 with the majority of this investment being channeled into natural resources. But as the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) reports, Latin America saw the biggest increase in renewable energy investment among developing regions, presenting U.S. companies with great opportunities south of the border.¶ The State Department and USAID have announced a new partnership with the Private Finance Advisory Network to accelerate private finance in renewable energy projects in Central America. However, the Energy and Climate Partnership of the Americas, which aims to encourage investment in the deployment of clean energy, is yet to receive notable financial support from the private sector.¶ ENERGY HOTTEST INVESTMENT¶ Encouragingly, an American Chambers of Commerce Abroad recent membership poll listed “energy” as the hottest investment sector for members investing in Latin America. Recently, Cannon Power Group, a U.S. wind company, signed a 10-year joint-venture contract with the Spanish company, Gamesa, to harness wind energy in Mexico.¶ The threats of climate change and growing resource scarcity, combined with the opportunities presented by green growth, provide the impetus for increasing trade and investment in low carbon and high-tech industries.¶ Although the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative leads U.S. trade policy in the Western hemisphere, the State Department’s diplomats complement this work and Valenzuela’s successor can make a valuable contribution in this area with the relevant expertise.¶ As climate, clean energy, resource scarcity and green growth begin to define U.S.-Latin American relations, the U.S.’s top diplomat in the region should have the appropriate experience to ensure greater policy coherence among U.S. agencies and effective dialogue with Latin American governments, many of which are trailblazing in these areas.

# 2NC

## Case

### No War

#### No chance of war from economic decline---best and most recent data

Daniel W. Drezner 12, Professor, The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University, October 2012, “The Irony of Global Economic Governance: The System Worked,” <http://www.globaleconomicgovernance.org/wp-content/uploads/IR-Colloquium-MT12-Week-5_The-Irony-of-Global-Economic-Governance.pdf>

The final outcome addresses a dog that hasn’t barked: the effect of the Great Recession on cross-border conflict and violence. During the initial stages of the crisis, multiple analysts asserted that the financial crisis would lead states to increase their use of force as a tool for staying in power.37 Whether through greater internal repression, diversionary wars, arms races, or a ratcheting up of great power conflict, there were genuine concerns that the global economic downturn would lead to an increase in conflict. Violence in the Middle East, border disputes in the South China Sea, and even the disruptions of the Occupy movement fuel impressions of surge in global public disorder. ¶ The aggregate data suggests otherwise, however. The Institute for Economics and Peace has constructed a “Global Peace Index” annually since 2007. A key conclusion they draw from the 2012 report is that “The average level of peacefulness in 2012 is approximately the same as it was in 2007.”38 Interstate violence in particular has declined since the start of the financial crisis – as have military expenditures in most sampled countries. Other studies confirm that the Great Recession has not triggered any increase in violent conflict; the secular decline in violence that started with the end of the Cold War has not been reversed.39 Rogers Brubaker concludes, “the crisis has not to date generated the surge in protectionist nationalism or ethnic exclusion that might have been expected.”40¶ None of these data suggest that the global economy is operating swimmingly. Growth remains unbalanced and fragile, and has clearly slowed in 2012. Transnational capital flows remain depressed compared to pre-crisis levels, primarily due to a drying up of cross-border interbank lending in Europe. Currency volatility remains an ongoing concern. Compared to the aftermath of other postwar recessions, growth in output, investment, and employment in the developed world have all lagged behind. But the Great Recession is not like other postwar recessions in either scope or kind; expecting a standard “V”-shaped recovery was unreasonable. One financial analyst characterized the post-2008 global economy as in a state of “contained depression.”41 The key word is “contained,” however. Given the severity, reach and depth of the 2008 financial crisis, the proper comparison is with Great Depression. And by that standard, the outcome variables look impressive. As Carmen Reinhart and Kenneth Rogoff concluded in This Time is Different: “that its macroeconomic outcome has been only the most severe global recession since World War II – and not even worse – must be regarded as fortunate.”42

**Global economic governance institutions guarantee resiliency**

Daniel W. **Drezner 12**, Professor, The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University, October 2012, “The Irony of Global Economic Governance: The System Worked,” <http://www.globaleconomicgovernance.org/wp-content/uploads/IR-Colloquium-MT12-Week-5_The-Irony-of-Global-Economic-Governance.pdf>

Prior to 2008, numerous foreign policy analysts had predicted a looming crisis in global economic governance. Analysts only reinforced this perception since the financial crisis, declaring that we live in a “G-Zero” world. This paper takes a closer look at the global response to the financial crisis. It reveals a more optimistic picture. Despite initial shocks that were actually more severe than the 1929 financial crisis, global economic governance structures responded quickly and robustly. Whether one measures results by economic outcomes, policy outputs, or institutional flexibility, **g**lobal **e**conomic **g**overnance has displayed surprising resiliency since 2008. Multilateral economic institutions performed well in crisis situations to reinforce open economic policies, especially in contrast to the 1930s. While there are areas where governance has either faltered or failed, on the whole, the system has worked. Misperceptions about global economic governance persist because the Great Recession has disproportionately affected the core economies – and because the efficiency of past periods of global economic governance has been badly overestimated. Why the system has worked better than expected remains an open question. The rest of this paper explores the possible role that the distribution of power, the robustness of international regimes, and the resilience of economic ideas might have played.

## Warming

### No Impact

#### **Warming does not cause extinction – their models are flawed**

Stockwell 11 – David Stockwell 11, Researcher at the San Diego Supercomputer Center, Ph.D. in Ecosystem Dynamics from the Australian National University, developed the Genetic Algorithm for Rule-set Production system making contributions modeling of invasive species, epidemiology of human diseases, the discovery of new species, and effects on species of climate change, April 21, 2011, “Errors of Global Warming Effects Modeling,” online: <http://landshape.org/enm/errors-of-global-warming-effects-modeling/>

Predictions of massive species extinctions due to AGW came into prominence with a January 2004 paper in Nature called Extinction Risk from Climate Change by Chris Thomas et al.. They made the following predictions: ¶ “we predict, on the basis of mid-range climate-warming scenarios for 2050, that 15â€“37% of species in our sample of regions and taxa will be â€˜committed to extinctionâ€™.¶ Subsequently, three communications appeared in Nature in July 2004. Two raised technical problems, including one by the eminent ecologist Joan Roughgarden. Opinions raged from “Dangers of Crying Wolf over Risk of Extinctions” concerned with damage to conservationism by alarmism, through poorly written press releases by the scientists themselves, and Extinction risk [press] coverage is worth the inaccuracies stating “we believe the benefits of the wide release greatly outweighed the negative effects of errors in reporting”.¶ Among those believing gross scientific inaccuracies are not justified, and such attitudes diminish the standing of scientists, I was invited to a meeting of a multidisciplinary group of 19 scientists, including Dan Bodkin from UC Santa Barbara, mathematician Matt Sobel, Craig Loehle and others at the Copenhagen base of BjÃ¸rn Lomborg, author of The Skeptical Environmentalist. This resulted in Forecasting the Effects of Global Warming on Biodiversity published in 2007 BioScience. We were particularly concerned by the cavalier attitude to model validations in the Thomas paper, and the field in general: ¶ Of the modeling papers we have reviewed, only a few were validated. Commonly, these papers simply correlate present distribution of species with climate variables, then replot the climate for the future from a climate model and, finally, use one-to-one mapping to replot the future distribution of the species, without any validation using independent data. Although some are clear about some of their assumptions (mainly equilibrium assumptions), readers who are not experts in modeling can easily misinterpret the results as valid and validated. For example, Hitz and Smith (2004) discuss many possible effects of global warming on the basis of a review of modeling papers, and in this kind of analysis the unvalidated assumptions of models would most likely be ignored.¶ The paper observed that few mass extinctions have been seen over recent rapid climate changes, suggesting something must be wrong with the models to get such high rates of extinctions. They speculated that species may survive in refugia, suitable habitats below the spatial scale of the models.¶ Another example of an unvalidated assumptions that could bias results in the direction of extinctions, was described in chapter 7 of my book Niche Modeling.¶ When climate change shifts a species’ niche over a landscape (dashed to solid circle) the response of that species can be described in three ways: dispersing to the new range (migration), local extirpation (intersection), or expansion (union). Given the probability of extinction is correlated with range size, there will either be no change, an increase (intersection), or decrease (union) in extinctions depending on the dispersal type. Thomas et al. failed to consider range expansion (union), a behavior that predominates in many groups. Consequently, the methodology was inherently biased towards extinctions.¶ One of the many errors in this work was a failure to evaluate the impact of such assumptions.¶ The prevailing view now, according to Stephen Williams, coauthor of the Thomas paper and Director for the Center for Tropical Biodiversity and Climate Change, and author of such classics as “Climate change in Australian tropical rainforests: an impending environmental catastrophe”, may be here.¶ Many unknowns remain in projecting extinctions, and the values provided in Thomas et al. (2004) should not be taken as precise predictions. … Despite these uncertainties, Thomas et al. (2004) believe that the consistent overall conclusions across analyses establish that anthropogenic climate warming at least ranks alongside other recognized threats to global biodiversity. ¶ So how precise are the figures? Williams suggests we should just trust the beliefs of Thomas et al. — an approach referred to disparagingly in the forecasting literature as a judgmental forecast rather than a scientific forecast (Green & Armstrong 2007). These simple models gloss over numerous problems in validating extinction models, including the propensity of so-called extinct species quite often reappear. Usually they are small, hard to find and no-one is really looking for them.

#### mitigation and adaptation will solve

Robert O. Mendelsohn 9, the Edwin Weyerhaeuser Davis Professor, Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, Yale University, June 2009, “Climate Change and Economic Growth,” online: http://www.growthcommission.org/storage/cgdev/documents/gcwp060web.pdf

The heart of the debate about climate change comes from a number of warnings from scientists and others that give the impression that human-induced climate change is an immediate threat to society (IPCC 2007a,b; Stern 2006). Millions of people might be vulnerable to health effects (IPCC 2007b), crop production might fall in the low latitudes (IPCC 2007b), water supplies might dwindle (IPCC 2007b), precipitation might fall in arid regions (IPCC 2007b), extreme events will grow exponentially (Stern 2006), and between 20–30 percent of species will risk extinction (IPCC 2007b). Even worse, there may be catastrophic events such as the melting of Greenland or Antarctic ice sheets causing severe sea level rise, which would inundate hundreds of millions of people (Dasgupta et al. 2009). Proponents argue there is no time to waste. Unless greenhouse gases are cut dramatically today, economic growth and well‐being may be at risk (Stern 2006).¶ These statements are largely alarmist and misleading. Although climate change is a serious problem that deserves attention, society’s immediate behavior has an extremely low probability of leading to catastrophic consequences. The science and economics of climate change is quite clear that emissions over the next few decades will lead to only mild consequences. The severe impacts predicted by alarmists require a century (or two in the case of Stern 2006) of no mitigation. Many of the predicted impacts assume there will be no or little adaptation. The net economic impacts from climate change over the next 50 years will be small regardless. Most of the more severe impacts will take more than a century or even a millennium to unfold and many of these “potential” impacts will never occur because people will adapt. It is not at all apparent that immediate and dramatic policies need to be developed to thwart long‐range climate risks. What is needed are long‐run balanced responses.

#### No extinction from climate change – empirics

NIPCC 11 – the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change, an international panel of nongovernment scientists and scholars, March 8, 2011, “Surviving the Unprecedented Climate Change of the IPCC,” online: http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2011/mar/8mar2011a5.html

In a paper published in Systematics and Biodiversity, Willis et al. (2010) consider the IPCC (2007) "predicted climatic changes for the next century" -- i.e., their contentions that "global temperatures will increase by 2-4°C and possibly beyond, sea levels will rise (~1 m ± 0.5 m), and atmospheric CO2 will increase by up to 1000 ppm" -- noting that it is "widely suggested that the magnitude and rate of these changes will result in many plants and animals going extinct," citing studies that suggest that "within the next century, over 35% of some biota will have gone extinct (Thomas et al., 2004; Solomon et al., 2007) and there will be extensive die-back of the tropical rainforest due to climate change (e.g. Huntingford et al., 2008)."¶ On the other hand, they indicate that some biologists and climatologists have pointed out that "many of the predicted increases in climate have happened before, in terms of both magnitude and rate of change (e.g. Royer, 2008; Zachos et al., 2008), and yet biotic communities have remained remarkably resilient (Mayle and Power, 2008) and in some cases thrived (Svenning and Condit, 2008)." But they report that those who mention these things are often "placed in the 'climate-change denier' category," although the purpose for pointing out these facts is simply to present "a sound scientific basis for understanding biotic responses to the magnitudes and rates of climate change predicted for the future through using the vast data resource that we can exploit in fossil records."¶ Going on to do just that, Willis et al. focus on "intervals in time in the fossil record when atmospheric CO2 concentrations increased up to 1200 ppm, temperatures in mid- to high-latitudes increased by greater than 4°C within 60 years, and sea levels rose by up to 3 m higher than present," describing studies of past biotic responses that indicate "the scale and impact of the magnitude and rate of such climate changes on biodiversity." And what emerges from those studies, as they describe it, "is evidence for rapid community turnover, migrations, development of novel ecosystems and thresholds from one stable ecosystem state to another." And, most importantly in this regard, they report "there is very little evidence for broad-scale extinctions due to a warming world."¶ In concluding, the Norwegian, Swedish and UK researchers say that "based on such evidence we urge some caution in assuming broad-scale extinctions of species will occur due solely to climate changes of the magnitude and rate predicted for the next century," reiterating that "the fossil record indicates remarkable biotic resilience to wide amplitude fluctuations in climate."

## PTX

### 2nc impact o/v

#### I*mmigration* is the key signal of growth prospects – loss of faith triggers a chain reaction in global markets – overwhelms prior optimism and resilience << means their defense doesn’t apply >>

Klein 10-13 (Ezra Klein, Washington Post, “Is America a bubble?” 10-13-2013, http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2013/10/13/is-america-a-bubble/?referrer=newstrust)

The markets shuddered slightly as the debt ceiling neared. The yield on short-term Treasuries rose tenfold. Fidelity Investments sold off its short-term government debt.¶ But the shudder was slight -- and, on Friday, there was a relief rally in equities on the news that House Republicans might agree to suspend the debt ceiling for six weeks in order to spend more time with their shutdown.¶ The markets’ faith in the U.S. is long-standing and not easily dislodged. The dollar has been the world’s reserve currency for decades, with the foreigners who hoard our cash providing essentially interest-free loans to the U.S. Treasury. The global appetite for Treasury bills produces similar gains, with purchasers -- including foreign governments buying in bulk -- lending the U.S. government money at minimal, even effectively negative, rates. The result is a huge economic advantage for the United States.¶ All this comes from a deep confidence that the U.S. political system will make sound decisions -- a confidence, at this point, that few of the system’s participants share and one that’s hard to square with the evidence of the past few years. The simple fact is that Congress is getting worse at avoiding the traps it sets for itself.¶ In February 2011, the U.S. government almost shut down. In August 2011, it narrowly avoided breaching the debt ceiling, a precursor to financial crisis. In January 2012, it tumbled over the fiscal cliff (if only for a couple of hours). In March 2013, Republicans decided to “suspend” the debt ceiling for three months but enabled the indiscriminate budget cuts known as sequestration, which both parties had previously derided as unthinkable, to go into effect. This month, the federal government shut down while simultaneously veering toward a potentially cataclysmic, yet wholly voluntary, new crisis over the debt ceiling.¶ And those debt ceiling increases are becoming more tenuous. The 2011 agreement lifted the ceiling until 2013. The first 2013 agreement suspended the ceiling for only three months. It's likely that the next agreement will only hold for a matter of weeks.¶ Capitol Hill staffs freely admit that they don’t know how the debt limit will be routinely raised going forwards. Dispensing with his predecessor’s practice of radiating confidence amid chaos, Treasury Secretary Jack Lew has said that he’s “nervous” and “anxious” that the U.S. will breach the debt ceiling. President Obama was more blunt: “I think this time is different,” he told CNBC, adding that markets “should be concerned.”¶ 'It always gets solved at 11:59'¶ Why are markets not yet in a panic? “Markets are quite relaxed about all this, and for an unfortunate reason,” wrote Mohamed El-Erian, chief executive officer of Pacific Investment Management Co. “They have been conditioned to expect headline-grabbing political posturing, extreme rhetoric, and seemingly-endless drama from Capitol Hill.”¶ The brinkmanship is simply considered part of the grand show that is American politics. Like an episode of “CSI: Miami,” it’s tense in the middle, but it all works out in the end. “The markets have been conditioned to believe it always gets solved at 11:59,” said Rep. Jim Himes, a Connecticut Democrat.¶ But that's the nature of financial crises: Everything seems fine until -- quite suddenly -- it doesn’t. In the months before Greece revealed the true extent of its budget deficit, Greek bonds were trading at almost the same yield as German bonds. In the months before the subprime crisis cracked the global economy open, mortgage-backed securities remained a hot item on Wall Street. Every financial crisis is dismissed in real time, only to be deemed inevitable in retrospect.¶ Is the American political system the latest bubble? Is the markets’ faith inflated by bad historical analogies and a willful disregard of current facts?¶ The model many in the markets follow is best summed up by an old line, often attributed to Winston Churchill: “You can always trust America to do the right thing after it has exhausted all other options.” If that's right, then the markets are right to tune out the political bickering until 11:59 p.m. on the night before the crisis strikes. Everything that happens before then is just noise. It's America exhausting all the other options.¶ But the U.S. political system hasn't always been doing the right thing lately. That model doesn’t explain the failures of sequestration or the shutdown. And even market participants have noticed the chinks in it.¶ 'It’s a terrible way to go about this'¶ Standard & Poor’s downgraded the U.S. in 2011 on the grounds that “the effectiveness, stability, and predictability of American policymaking and political institutions have weakened at a time of ongoing fiscal and economic challenges.” That assessment looks pretty accurate today, reinforced by the procession of finance titans shuttling to Washington to emphasize the dangers of continuing dysfunction.¶ Indeed, many business leaders realize something is seriously awry. “It’s a terrible way to go about this,” Jamie Dimon, CEO of JPMorgan Chase, said of Washington’s game of debt-ceiling chicken.¶ A scary possibility is that the market price on the U.S. political system doesn’t reflect what market participants are coming to believe about it: that a once capable and reliable system is now dysfunctional and unpredictable. That raises the possibility that a pivotal event could move markets dramatically because traders are prepared to believe, and to begin trading on, a much more pessimistic assessment of America’s political system. If everyone were moved to act on that belief simultaneously -- by a debt-ceiling crisis, for example -- the results could be earthshaking.¶ Gary Gorton, an economist who specializes in financial crises, put it crisply: “Financial markets can be wrong and they can be wrong in a big way because they don’t understand the situation and it only becomes clear ex-post.”¶ It’s easy to imagine how a politically induced financial crisis would seem inevitable in retrospect. Signs of distress abound. Look at the highly respected measure of congressional polarization developed by political scientists Keith Poole and Howard Rosenthal. According to their analysis, the U.S.’s two major parties are more polarized now than at any point in history. A Gallup poll found that public confidence in Congress is at an all-time low. The Republican Party is less popular than at any time on record. Congressional records show that the two most recent Congresses produced less legislation than any since Congress began keeping records in the 1940s.¶ Given such telltales, a prominent display of political dysfunction can’t easily be dismissed as a one-off. Instead, it could be the trigger that leads global markets to construct a whole new narrative about the U.S. -- one that prices in the likelihood that an increasingly polarized, gridlocked Washington won’t always get it right and may increasingly get things wrong.¶ The case for pessimism can be overstated, of course. “The last thing you want to do if you want to preserve credibility is to appear to be an optimist on the American political system,” said Thomas Gallagher, a principal at Scowcroft Group Inc. “But so far the outcomes have been OK. We’ve been averting disaster.”¶ Perhaps foreigners who don’t follow every twist of congressional negotiations have an analytical advantage over Beltway denizens, who are surrounded by so much noise that they’ve lost track of the signal. “The process is ugly, and people in Washington are very focused on process,” Gallagher said.¶ 'A default would be unthinkable.'¶ Process, however, matters. These last few years have normalized debt-ceiling brinkmanship. So let’s assume that we have one or two debt-ceiling showdowns annually for the next decade. The chance that any particular conflict leads to a breach is quite low -- let’s say a mere 5 percent. Yet despite the low probability of a debt-ceiling breach in any given showdown, repetition makes the odds extraordinarily good that we will, ultimately, breach the debt ceiling at some point over the next decade.¶ In that case, the U.S. will, solely because of political dysfunction, default on some of its debt. Perhaps we will pay off bondholders and only default on commitments to the elderly. Perhaps the default will only last a few days, or a week. No matter how it unfolds, the safest and most predictable investment in the world -- U.S. government debt -- will have proved itself unpredictable.¶ And if we miss a payment -- even by accident, even just because our on-the-fly recoding of the government’s automatic payments systems failed -- the U.S. will have done something previously unthinkable. So unthinkable, in fact, that absolute faith in U.S. credit is embedded in the very way we borrow.¶ “There are very material differences between the United States and virtually every other country that borrows,” said Lee Buchheit, a specialist in sovereign-debt restructuring. “We borrow only in our own currency. We’ve had, for many years, the arrogance of issuing on the assumption that a default would be unthinkable.”¶ “When most sovereigns borrow from the international markets,” Buchheit continued, “the investors benefit from a range of contractual protections such as events of default (that permit acceleration of unmatured principal if something goes wrong), a promise by the debtor not to pledge its assets to secure another lender, waivers of sovereign immunity and so forth. These provisions are absent in U.S. Treasury bonds. What you get -- indeed, all you get -- is a promise to pay a certain amount of money on a certain date. The unspoken premise of U.S. government borrowing is that no investor will ever need contractual provisions that improve a creditor’s legal position in case of a default in payment. Why? Because there never could be, there never would be, a payment default on a U.S. government debt.”¶ But spectacular crises aren’t the only way a political system can fail. A Congress that can’t routinely legislate to address problems (such as aging infrastructure) and take opportunities (such as immigration reform) will, over time, meaningfully harm the country’s growth prospects. And it will do so in a way that’s hard to notice, and thus hard to fix: People don’t much miss the three-tenths of a percentage point worth of growth they didn’t have that quarter. But compounded over time, it’s a disaster. Crises can happen slowly, too.

#### Independently, recession is structurally inevitable without reform

Ozimek 13 (Adam, Forbes, “Does An Aging Population Hurt The Economy?”, 2-7-2013, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/modeledbehavior/2013/02/07/does-an-aging-population-hurt-the-economy/>, DOA: 2-12-13, ldg)

The economic benefit of immigration is in part about how big of a problem our aging population is. Immigrants are in general younger, and our best way to fight against a growing ratio of retirees to workers. But this raises the question of how big of a problem is this ratio and our aging population in general. While many are concerned about this, Dean Baker argues it is not a problem. He agrees that the ratio has increased and will continue to increase in the future as the population ages, but he argues that we haven’t seen any problems yet so we won’t see any later: We have already seen a sharp decline in the ratio of workers to retirees, yet even people who follow the economy and economic policy closely, like Klein, were apparently not even aware of this fact. Since this decline is never cited as factor causing our current economic problems, why would we think the comparatively mild decline in this ratio projected for future decades will be a large burden? Dean is wrong that the ratio of workers to retirees is not cited as a factor in the current economic problems. The most prominent example comes from newly appointed Council of Economic Advisors member James Stock and his co-author Mark Watson. In their paper “Disentangling the Channels of the 2007-2009 Recession” they specifically cite demographic trends as a cause of our slow recovery. The variable Stock and Watson ultimately cite is the decline in labor force participation, and they argue it is driven by the aging of the workforce and the overall distribution of workers by age. Dean may argue that this technically isn’t the dependency ratio, but that would be quibbling: changes in these two measures capture the same basic economic phenomenon of the aging population and a lower percentage of the population working. Not only has the aging population contributed to the slow recovery, Stock and Watson argue there is good reason to believe it will mean slow recoveries in the future too: The main conclusion from this demographic work is that, barring a new increase in female labor force participation or a significant increase in the growth rate of the population, these demographic factors point towards a further decline in trend growth of employment and hours in the coming decades. Applying this demographic view to recessions and recoveries suggests that the future recessions with historically typical cyclical behavior will have steeper declines and slower recoveries in output and employment. Furthermore, this is just the impact of the aging population on business cycles, there is also the very serious problem of how it will affect our finances. Dean knows that by increasing the workforce immigration improves Social Security’s finances. In 2006 he wrote that if future immigration was at 2001-2002 levels instead of at around 900,000 per year it would reduce the Social Security trust fund’s long-term shortfall by 12%. A shortfall means we will reduce benefits or pay for it in higher taxes, and either are going to result in lower welfare for someone.

#### Overcomes alt causes – ensures recovery

Farrell 12 (Chris, a contributing editor for Bloomberg Businessweek. From 1986-97, he was on the magazine's staff, as a corporate finance staff and department editor and then as an economics editor. Farrell wrote Right on the Money: Taking Control of Your Personal Finances and Deflation: What Happens When Prices Fall? Among Farrell's many awards are a National Magazine Award, two Loeb Awards, and the Edward R. Murrow Award. Farrell is a graduate of the London School of Economics and Stanford University. “Obama’s Next Act: Immigration Reform” 12/13/12, <http://www.businessweek.com/articles/2012-12-13/obamas-next-act-immigration-reform>)

Washington won’t get much of a reprieve from verbal pyrotechnics once the drama of the fiscal cliff is over. Up next: major immigration reform. President Obama has made it clear that a comprehensive overhaul of the nation’s badly frayed immigration system is a second-term priority. Many Republican lawmakers are convinced the big takeaway from the 2012 election results is that conservatives need to rethink their hard-line stance on immigration—including illegal immigrants. Here’s what Washington should do before tackling the tough job of rewriting the immigration laws: Create a quicksilver path to citizenship for the 11 million to 12 million undocumented workers in the U.S. (excluding the small number convicted of violent crimes or multiple felonies). The shift in status acknowledges that these foreign-born newcomers, like previous generations of immigrants, overcame significant obstacles to come to the U.S. to make a better life for their families. Illegal immigrants are neighbors heading off to work, sending their kids to school, and attending church. Their everyday lives would vastly improve by moving from the shadows of society into the mainstream. More important from a public-policy perspective, the change would give a boost to the economy’s underlying dynamism. “What you’re doing in the short run is making it easier for workers to move between jobs, a relatively small effect,” says Gordon Hanson, a professor of economics at the University of California at San Diego. “The larger effect from eliminating uncertainty for these immigrants is creating incentives for them to make long-term investments in careers, entrepreneurship, education, homes, and community.” Let’s state the obvious: A rapid transformation of illegal immigrants into legal immigrants isn’t in the cards. Amnesty—let alone citizenship—is an anathema to large parts of the electorate. Too bad, since the scholarly evidence is compelling that immigrants—documented or not, legal or illegal—are a boon to the net economy. “Competition fosters economic growth,” says Michael Clemens, senior fellow at the Center for Global Development in Washington. The economic return from attracting skilled immigrants to the U.S. is well known. Foreign-born newcomers account for some 13 percent of the population, yet they are responsible for one-third of U.S. patented innovations. The nation’s high-tech regions such as Silicon Valley, the Silicon Hills of Austin, Tex., and Boston’s Route 128 rely on immigrant scientists, engineers, entrepreneurs, and employees. Better yet, economist Enrico Moretti at the University of California at Berkeley calculates that a 1 percent increase in the share of college-educated immigrants in a city hikes productivity and wages for others in the city. Less appreciated is how much the economy gains from the efforts of less-skilled immigrants, including illegal workers. Throughout the country, foreign-born newcomers have revived beaten-down neighborhoods as immigrant entrepreneurs have opened small businesses and immigrant families have put down stakes. Immigrant workers have played a vital role keeping a number of industries competitive, such as agriculture and meatpacking. Cities with lots of immigrants have seen their per capita tax base go up, according to David Card, an economist at UC Berkeley. Despite the popular impression that a rising tide of immigrants is associated with higher crime rates, research by Robert Sampson of Harvard University and others offer a compelling case that it’s no coincidence that the growing ranks of immigrants tracks the reduction in crime in the U.S. But don’t newcomers—legal and illegal—drive down wages and job opportunities for American workers? Not really. A cottage industry of economic studies doesn’t find any negative effect on native-born wages and employment on the local level. On the national level the research shows the impact on native-born Americans doesn’t drift far from zero, either positively or negatively. “In both cases, immigrants are more likely to complement the job prospects of U.S.-born citizens than they are to compete for the same jobs as U.S.-born citizens,” Giovanni Peri, an economist at the University of California at Davis, writes in Rationalizing U.S. Immigration Policy: Reforms for Simplicity, Fairness, and Economic Growth. The counterintuitive results reflect a numbers of factors. Immigrants expand the size of the economic pie by creating new businesses, new jobs, and new consumers. Middle-class families find it easier to focus on careers with affordable immigrant labor offering gardening, child care, and other services. Many illegal immigrants aren’t fluent in English, so they don’t compete for the same jobs as native-born workers. Another factor behind the lack of direct competition is the higher educational level of native-born Americans. In 1960 about half of U.S.-born working-age adults hadn’t completed high school, while the comparable figure today is about 8 percent. The real downside concern is on the fiscal side of the immigrant ledger. Yes, more taxes would go into Social Security, Medicare, and the like with legalization, but more people would qualify for Medicaid, welfare, and other benefits. At the local level, many school districts are strained financially from educating immigrant children, legal and illegal. That said, the prospect of fiscal costs would diminish as newly legalized immigrant workers move freely around the country seeking jobs, entrepreneurs are comfortable expanding their payrolls, and immigrant parents push their children to live the American Dream. “Over time, as entrepreneurs emerge and families are better able to get their kids through high school and college, you’re reducing the long-run fiscal claim of the group,” says Hanson. There is no economic evidence that making roughly 6 percent of the workforce illegal will benefit the economy. Plenty of research supports the opposite case. A fast track to legality offers Washington a rare twofer: a just move that’s economically efficient.

#### << insert terminal impact // turns case modules >>

### --interdependence/trade/fdi

#### Reverses interdependence and proves the status quo solves all 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.

### --multilat

#### Turns their allies internal link – signals perception of weakness

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.**

### Link t case

#### Link alone turns case – undermines effectiveness and causes *functional* rollback

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.
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### 2nc will pass wall

#### Will pass – PC is high and focused on immigration – forces GOP to cave

Martosko 10-16 (David Martosko, U.S. Political Editor, Daily Mail, “Boehner and Cruz Cave In: Big defeat for the Republicans as Default Should Be Averted,” 10-16-2013, http://johnib.wordpress.com/2013/10/16/boehner-and-cruz-cave-in-big-defeat-for-the-republicans-as-default-should-be-averted/)

Crushing defeat for GOP and House Speaker John Boehner, who assured reporters that he will ‘absolutely’ get the Senate’s bill through the House¶ Boehner’s capitulation: Fight against Obamacare ‘will continue, but blocking the bipartisan agreement … will not be a tactic for us’¶ Two conservative groups are still threatening to punish Republicans who vote in favor of the Senate plan¶ Top lawmakers announced a compromise on the Senate floor at noon Wednesday, and it’s all over but the voting¶ Ted Cruz, who has been the face of tea party demands during the deadlock, said he will not block the Senate’s vote¶ Both houses of Congress are racing against time to beat a midnight deadline, when the U.S. risks defaulting on its debts¶ Bill will go to the Senate at 5:00 p.m. and then to the House later¶ The Dow Jones spiked 200 points on news of Wednesday’s deal, and yields fell on both short- and long-term bonds¶ The White House took a short victory lap and has already moved on to immigration reform, as its political leverage is at a high point¶ Republican House Speaker John Boehner and Texas Senator Ted Cruz have dramatically caved in to pressure, paving the way for a Democrat-led bill to pass and ensure the country doesn’t crash through its debt ceiling ahead of a midnight deadline.¶ The bill still needs to be navigated through the House and Senate, but observers on Capitol Hill expect it to sail through in a crushing defeat for Republicans.¶ Boehner and his House caucus have walked away with nothing but humiliation, after a month of brinkmanship in which the Republicans were accused by President Obama of holding the White House ransom over Obamacare and their desired spending cuts.¶ The speaker made his capitulation official after a closed-door meeting with his caucus Wednesday afternoon, saying he would ‘absolutely’ navigate the bill quickly through the House, even if he has to rely on Democrats to pass it.¶ Republicans’ fight against the Obamacare law ‘will continue,’ he said. ‘But blocking the bipartisan agreement reached today by members of the Senate will not be a tactic for us.’¶ News of a deal saw the Dow Jones Industrial Average spike nearly 200 points. U.S. Treasury bond yields, which rose through the morning, headed downward again after Senate Democratic Leader Harry Reid and his Republican counterpart Mitch McConnell announced their compromise, signaling at least a temporary relaxing of global market fears.¶ In Washington, though, the blame-game will begin before ink meets paper, with Boehner and Cruz, the maverick Texan, taking their places in the firing line.¶ Many Republicans are sniping that the pair carried the nation to the brink of disaster and extracted nothing from Washington, D.C. liberals that they can spin as a victory.¶ After losing such a high-stakes game of political poker, the GOP will now shoulder the burden of being blamed for the fiasco that led to serious fears of a fresh economic catastrophe and dragged America’s global reputation through the mud.¶ Capitol Hill staffers have sprung into action, meanwhile, with House and Senate managers working to push a result across the finish line by midnight.¶ ‘We are not putting odds on anything,’ said White House press secretary Jay Carney in his afternoon briefing, but he urged both houses of Congress to ‘act swiftly’ and ‘as soon as possible’ to avoid economic disaster.¶ Carney then took questions about President Obama’s plans to leverage his new-found political capital in a bid to reform America’s immigration system, a move he told the Spanish-language Univision network on Tuesday that he would undertake ‘the day after’ Congress solved the debt crisis.

#### PC will overcome opposition – Obama just has to maintain focus and keep pushing

Matthews 10-16 (Laura Matthews, U.S. politics writer for International Business Times, “2013 Immigration Reform Bill: 'I'm Going To Push To Call A Vote,' Says Obama,” 10/16/2013, http://www.ibtimes.com/2013-immigration-reform-bill-im-going-push-call-vote-says-obama-1429220)

When Congress finally passes a bipartisan bill that kicks the fiscal battles over to early next year, the spotlight could return to comprehensive immigration reform before 2013 ends.¶ At least that’s the hope of President Barack Obama and his fellow Chicagoan Rep. Luis Gutierrez, D-Ill., chairman of the Immigration Task Force of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus and one of the most vocal advocates for immigration reform in the House of Representatives.¶ “When we emerge from this crazy partisan eruption from the Republicans, there will be a huge incentive for sensible Republicans who want to repair some of the damage they have done to themselves,” Gutierrez said in a statement. “Immigration reform remains the one issue popular with both Democratic and Republican voters on which the two parties can work together to deliver real, substantive solutions in the Congress this year.”¶ Reforming the status quo has consistently been favored by a majority of Americans. Earlier this year, at least two-thirds of Americans supported several major steps to make the system work better, according to a Gallup poll. Those steps include implementing an E-verify system for employers to check electronically the immigration status of would-be employees (85 percent), a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants, (72 percent), an entry-exit check system to make sure people who enter the country then leave it (71 percent), more high-skilled visas (71 percent) and increased border security (68 percent). The Senate passed its version of a 2013 immigration reform bill in June that includes, but is not limited to, a pathway to citizenship for immigrants without documentation and doubling security on the southern border. But that measure has stalled in the House, where Republicans are adamant they will take a piecemeal approach.¶ The momentum that lawmakers showed for reform has been sapped by the stalemate that that has shut down the government for 16 days and brought the U.S. to the brink of default. The Senate has agreed on Wednesday to a bipartisan solution to break the gridlock.¶ When the shutdown and default threat is resolved (for a time), that’s when Obama will renew his push to get Congress to move on immigration reform. On Tuesday the president said reform will become his top priority.¶ “Once that’s done, you know, the day after, I’m going to be pushing to say, call a vote on immigration reform,” Obama told Univision affiliate KMEX-TV in Los Angeles. “And if I have to join with other advocates and continue to speak out on that, and keep pushing, I’m going to do so because I think it’s really important for the country. And now is the time to do it.”¶ The president pointed the finger at House Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, for not allowing the bill to be brought to the floor for a vote. Boehner had promised that the Senate’s bill would not be voted on unless a majority of the majority in the House supports it -- the same principle he was holding out for on the government shutdown before he gave in.¶ “We had a very strong Democratic and Republican vote in the Senate,” Obama said. “The only thing right now that’s holding it back is, again, Speaker Boehner not willing to call the bill on the floor of the House of Representatives. So we’re going to have to get through this crisis that was unnecessary, that was created because of the obsession of a small faction of the Republican Party on the Affordable Care Act.”¶ Republicans are opposing the Democratic view of immigration reform because of its inclusion of a 13-year path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants. They said this amounted to “amnesty.” Some Republicans prefer to give them legal resident status instead.¶ Immigration advocates have also been urging Obama to use his executive authority to halt the more than 1,000 deportations taking place daily. Like the activists, Gutierrez said the government shutdown didn’t do anything to slow the number of daily deportations.¶ Some Republicans who welcomed Sen. Ted Cruz’s filibuster over Obamacare because it shifted the focus from immigration.¶ “If Ted [didn’t] spin the filibuster, if we don’t make this the focus, we had already heard what was coming,” Rep. Louie Gohmert, R-Texas, told Fox News on Tuesday. “As soon as we got beyond this summer, we were going to have an amnesty bill come to the floor. That’s what we would have been talking about. And that’s where the pivot would have been if we had not focused America on Obamacare.”¶ Still, pro-immigration advocates are hopeful they can attain their goal soon. “With more prodding from the president and the American people,” Gutierrez said, “we can get immigration reform legislation passed in the House and signed into law.”

### --a2 piecemeal/citizenship/border security

#### Piecemeal legislation, path to citizenship, and border security will all get worked out in conference committee – but PC is key

Martosko 10-17 (David Martosko, U.S. Political Editor, Daily Mail, “Immigration battle threatens to dwarf debt-limit fight as many Republicans fear power of 17 MILLION newly legalized loyal Democrats,” 10-17-2013, http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2464112/Immigration-battle-threatens-dwarf-debt-limit-fight-Republicans-fear-power-17-MILLION-newly-legalized-loyal-Democrats.html)

Republicans' new worst fear isn't defaulting on America's debts. If an immigration policy favored by the White House and Senate Democrats should become law, 17.3 million newly legalized immigrant voters would emerge by 2036, eager to reward the party that gave them a path to citizenship.¶ The White House has shifted gears and put its policy team in immigration overdrive, zooming past the debt crisis that threatened to sink the republic and on to the task of normalizing the estimated 11 million U.S. residents who have no legal basis for being there.¶ The Democrat-dominated U.S. Senate passed a bill in June that would provide a citizenship path for those who have been in the U.S. since the end of 2011. But as with the early days of the debt crisis and the partial government shutdown, Republican leaders in the House of Representatives aren't eager to consider it.¶ The White House has avoided saying that it take advantage of a weak House and spend its political capital to push an immigration policy, but Republicans have reason to suspect the other shoe is about to drop.¶ The Center for Immigration Studies, a Washington, D.C. think-tank, projects that the Senate bill, S.744, would add 17.3 million new legal, voting-age U.S. residents to 14.9 million whom analysts already expect to appear without the proposed law.¶ 'To place these figures in perspective,' writes Steven Camarota, the group's director of research, 'the last four presidential elections were decided by 4.5 million votes on average.'¶ Converting illegal immigrants into citizens has long been a Democratic Party brass ring. And not only, as President Barack Obama told business leaders on Sept. 18, because 'we know ... that that can add potentially a trillion dollars to our economy, and that we will continue to attract the best and brightest talent around the world.'¶ Hispanics are the biggest ethnic group involved in U.S. immigration. In the 2012 elections, 77 per cent of those who voted supported Democratic candidates for Congress, according to the polling group Latino Decisions. Seventy-five per cent voted for Obama. ¶ Among Hispanic voters who weren't born in the U.S., Democratic congressional candidates picked up 81 per cent of the vote. Obama rated 80 per cent.¶ In fact, Republicans' share of Hispanic votes in presidential elections peaked in 2004, at 43 per cent before tumbling in the next two elections.¶ And the Pew Research Center has consistently found that large majorities Hispanic voters favor policies that produce governments with bigger footprints and more social programs.¶ 'There are things that we know will help strengthen our economy that we could get done before this year is out,' the president said Wednesday night as focus on the debt-limit fix bill moved from the Senate to the House.¶ 'A law to fix our broken immigration system' was first on his wish-list.¶ 'We had a very strong Democratic and Republican vote in the Senate,' Obama told the Los Angeles affiliate of the Spanish-language network Univision on Tuesday, comparing it to the debt battle. 'The only thing right now that’s holding it back is again, Speaker Boehner not willing to call the bill on the floor of the House of Representatives.'¶ 'So we’re going to have to get through this crisis that was unnecessary, that was created because of the obsession of a small faction of the Republican Party on the Affordable Care Act. Once that’s done – you know, the day after – I'm going to be pushing to say, "call a vote on immigration reform."'¶ Republicans in the House are less split on Obamacare than on immigration, with some arguing that rewarding lawbreakers sets a bad example and others pointing to economic advantages of a larger workforce willing to undertake manual labor, and a boom in fast-tracked visas for those with specialized skills.¶ But if Obama thinks he has the GOP on the ropes, an aide to a conservative House Republican lawmaker told MailOnline, he will be surprised by the party unity that will return as soon as someone breathes 'the "A"-word: "Amnesty".'¶ 'Everyone in the House Republican caucus wants to get rid of Obamacare,' the aide said, 'but not everyone agreed killing it was worth going to the mat.'¶ 'But we're talking about changing voting patterns for maybe 100 years and creating natural advantages for candidates who will run against our guys. It's like giving my boss 40 pounds of rocks to carry over his shoulder, and letting his challenger walk around with a fanny pack full of feathers.'¶ The debt-limit and shutdown fights, says Idaho GOP Rep. Raul Labrador, may have made immigration advocates' uphill climb even steeper, especially for Republicans who suspect President Obama of having an ulterior motive.¶ 'I think what he's done over the last two and half weeks [is] he’s trying to destroy the Republican Party,' Labrador said Wednesday at the monthly Conversations with Conservatives meeting organized by the Heritage Foundation.¶ 'And I think that anything we negotiate right now with the president on immigration will be with that same goal in mind, which is to destroy the Republican Party and not to get good policies.'¶ 'There are things that we are on the same page about,' Labrador said, 'and if he is unwilling to negotiate on those things I don’t see how he could in good faith negotiate with us on immigration.'¶ House Republicans' strategy so far has been to approach the Senate bill piecemeal, advancing parts of it – border security and more fences, for instance – that GOP leaders like. ¶ Speaker John Boehner has said Senate Democrats' more comprehensive approach won't reach the House floor, even though 14 Senate Republicans gave it 'yes' votes.¶ But the fight over the partial government shutdown that occupied half of October may have given Democrats insights into how to combat that strategy.¶ House Republicans offered a series of nearly a dozen one-off bills to fund government agencies and initiatives whose absence became a black eye, including the National Institutes of Health, the Department of Veterans Affairs and salary payments for active-duty military.¶ Obama found he could stave off the pressure to sign all but a few, insisting on an all-or-nothing approach – which he eventually got.¶ 'It's different, of course, because there's no economic catastrophe awaiting if Republicans sit on their hands with immigration,' a Democratic campaign strategist told MailOnline on Wednesday. ¶ 'But the White House has learned how stubborn some of the Republicans are willing to be. And more important, they've figured out which ones are worth trying to reason with.'¶ While some Republican moderates will be unwilling to cross the tea party caucus while the sting of the debt defeat is still in the air, others have already signaled their openness to meet Democrats halfway, mostly in one-off measures that carve out pet projects from the larger immigration issue.¶ California Rep. Nancy Pelosi, a long-time supporter of immigration reform, said this month that she will do 'whatever it takes' to find a bill that the House can bring to the Senate.¶ She's open to going to a House-Senate legislative conference with 'one bill, two bills, one at a time, singly, jointly, severally, whatever,' betting that whatever emerges from such a meeting would including 'comprehensive immigration reform that will lead to a pathway to citizenship.' ¶ Pelosi may find some help from a few Republicans.¶ The Associated Press reported on Sept. 30 that Rep. Bob Goodlatte, who chairs the House Judiciary Committee, has been openly discussing how to change the immigration status of the 11 million illegal immigrants in the U.S. without awarding them special status.¶ His idea is to allow illegal immigrants to have legal work status – a 'green card' – and then to allow them access to a list of existing routes to citizenship. They could be sponsored by a U.S. company, for instance, or by a relative who's already a citizen.¶ Goodlatte favors this more narrow approach to the Senate's catch-all bill, which has a companion bill in the House that no Republicans have been willing to endorse.¶ House Majority Leader Eric Cantor, another Virginia Republican, is also helping Goodlatte with a bill that would provide a path to citizenship for immigrants brought illegally to the U.S. as children.¶ Idaho Rep. Raul Labrador and Texas Rep. Ted Poe are trying to create a visa program that would target low-skilled workers for migration into the U.S. ¶ Several of these narrow proposals have already passed through House committees, and their Republican chairman are hoping they see action.¶ House Homeland Security Committee chairman Mike McCaul of Texas told the AP that he thinks a series of immigration bills 'would be the next agenda item in the queue after we're done with this [debt limit] mess.'¶ Cantor spokesman Doug Heye insists, however, that while 'moving immigration forward remains a priority ... right now there's no firm timetable.'¶ Goodlatte has said, though, that he wants to see some movement by the end of October on a bill that could give the Senate some basis to negotiate.¶ A senior aide to a southern Republican House member said that ultimately, some Republicans don't want their party to be 'on the wrong side of the new electoral math,' and 'if we can create our own grateful constituency, that's just good politics in addition to doing the right thing.'

#### PC resolves issues in conference

Silva 10-17 (Mark Silva, Bloomberg Political Capital, “Immigration Next: Old-Fashioned Way, Jeb Bush Recommends,” 10-17-2013, http://go.bloomberg.com/political-capital/2013-10-17/immigration-next-old-fashioned-way-jeb-bush-recommends/)

Next up: Immigration.¶ Jeb Bush, former Florida governor, brother of one president, son of another and the one serious-minded Republican who probably won’t run for the White House in 2016, says it’s time for Congress to get serious about immigration.¶ Bush is framing the urgency of the debate in economic terms.¶ “An economically driven immigration system –I think that’s a conservative idea,” Bush said this morning on MSNBC’s “Morning Joe.” It oughta be passed.”¶ His argument is that immigration has always been an economic engine, a source of entrepreneurial power that has fueled the nation’s growth — and that, as the “broken immigration system” stands, it is thwarting potential growth by keeping millions of undocumented immigrants in the dark and preventing professional talent educated either in the U.S. or abroad from putting their skills to work here.¶ President Barack Obama, who endorses the “comprehensive” approach that the Senate approved this year — offering a path to citizenship for the undocumented while cracking down on illegal immigration and expanding visas — has signaled that he will press the Republican-run House to start moving on its own measures now that the budget debacle has ended — or at least been pushed back to January and February. A bipartisan group of lawmakers in the House is working on their own comprehensive plan, while leaders take a piece by piece approach to bills.¶ They ought to get it done the old-fashioned way, Bush, co-author of the book, “Immigration Wars,” suggested today: Get a bill out of the House and take it to conference with the Senate, negotiate a solution in traditional legislative form rather than the crisis-oriented standoffs that have marked so much of the budgetary debate in recent years, and this week.¶ Sen. Chuck Schumer, a New York Democrat and one of the senators who crafted the bipartisan agreement on that side, said on the same show today that he holds hope of getting something through the House. Leaders such as House Budget Chairman Paul Ryan and Majority Leader Eric Cantor understand the need.¶ “I hope the leadership in the House brings it back and creates a conservative alternative that a majority of House members could support,” Bush said today. “Look our immigration system is broken, it doesn’t work, and we have a chance to fix it.”

#### (--) Obama open to piece by piece approach:

Reuters, 10/16/2013 (“Obama plans immigration push after fiscal crisis ends,” <http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/10/16/us-usa-obama-immigration-idUSBRE99F01Q20131016>, Accessed 10/16/2013, rwg)

In June, the Senate passed an immigration overhaul, but House of Representatives Republicans are divided over the granting of legal status to those in the country illegally, a step many see as rewarding lawbreakers.¶ Although the president had sought comprehensive reform, he said last month he would be open to the House taking a piece-by-piece approach if that would get the job done.

#### (--) Obama willing to accept piecemeal reform to get immigration reform passed:

Rick Moran, 10/16/2013 (staff writer, “Immigration reform on the front burner after debt and budget deal,” [http://www.americanthinker.com/blog/2013/10/immigratio n\_reform\_on\_the\_front\_burner\_after\_debt\_and\_budget\_deal.html](http://www.americanthinker.com/blog/2013/10/immigratio%20n_reform_on_the_front_burner_after_debt_and_budget_deal.html), Accessed 10/17/2013, rwg)

In June, the Senate passed an immigration overhaul, but House of Representatives Republicans are divided over the granting of legal status to those in the country illegally, a step many see as rewarding lawbreakers.¶ Although the president had sought comprehensive reform, he said last month he would be open to the House taking a piece-by-piece approach if that would get the job done.

#### (--) Obama willing to accept gradual reform:

Per Liljas, 10/16/2013 (staff writer, “Obama to Prioritize Immigration Reform Once Fiscal Crisis Resolved,” [http://nation.time.com/2013/10/16/obama-to-prioritize -immigration-reform-once-fiscal-crisis-resolved/](http://nation.time.com/2013/10/16/obama-to-prioritize%20-immigration-reform-once-fiscal-crisis-resolved/), Accessed 10/17/2013, rwg)

Once the fiscal crisis has been resolved, President Barack Obama is going to push for immigration reform, he told the Los Angeles affiliate of Spanish-language network Univision on Tuesday.¶ Obama, who largely managed to hold on to office on the backs of Hispanic voters, has long looked to easing the plight of the country’s 11 million illegal immigrants, but other issues have kept coming in the way during his second term.¶ Last month, the president stated that he would consider a gradual approach to reform if it meant he could win the support of House Republicans, many of whom are opposed to granting legal status to the paperless population without implementing stricter border protection.

### --a2 thumper

#### only the plan disrupts the current balance

Wilson & Eilperin 10-16 (Scott Wilson and Juliet Eilperin, “Obama plans to renew immigration, climate change efforts,” Washington Post, 10-16-2013, http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/obama-plans-to-renew-immigration-climate-change-efforts/2013/10/16/d0a96cbe-367b-11e3-be86-6aeaa439845b\_story.html)

President Obama, fresh off a trouncing of congressional Republicans over the government shutdown, plans to renew his push for immigration legislation in the House while also pressing ahead with climate change policies and efforts to fix problems plaguing his signature health-care program.¶ But White House officials also acknowledged that many Republicans, particularly in the House, remain ardently opposed to much of Obama’s agenda and may be unwilling to help him accomplish key legislative goals.¶ The assessment came as Obama and his aides welcomed the fiscal deal approved by Congress on Wednesday night, which will fund the government until the middle of January, lift the borrowing limit through Feb. 7 and establish negotiations over a long-term budget agreement.¶ The deal — which White House aides said Obama would have happily signed before the shutdown that began Oct. 1 — meets the president’s demand that his health-care law not be significantly modified in return for a functioning government.¶ Now administration officials say they hope to persuade a chastened Republican Party, battered in the polls, to support elements of Obama’s languishing agenda.¶ “There are things that we know will help strengthen our economy that we could get done before this year is out,” Obama said in a statement Wednesday night. “We still need to pass a law to fix our broken immigration system. We still need to pass a farm bill. And with the shutdown behind us and budget committees forming, we now have an opportunity to focus on a sensible budget that is responsible, that is fair, and that helps hardworking people all across this country.”¶ But the new fiscal deadlines, looming just months away, mean that much of Obama’s energy in the near term is likely to be consumed by budget talks. Democrats worry that the agreement may set in motion a process that runs out the clock on Obama’s ability to secure other policy gains before the 2014 midterm elections.¶ White House officials say Congress must take on more than one issue at a time given the problems facing the country. They cited the immigration bill, already passed by the Democratic-controlled Senate, as one that would provide political benefits for Republicans.¶ “The president believes that one of the consequences of this manufactured crisis is that time is taken away from the pursuit of other goals we have as a nation,” White House press secretary Jay Carney told reporters.¶ But, he added, “I don’t think that I can sort of place quantitative odds on the prospects of any of this. Congress is a difficult institution to make predictions about.”¶ Obama has argued throughout his time in office that government, especially during difficult economic times, is essential to improving the nation’s prospects and the lives of individuals. The premise has been severely tested by the 16-day government shutdown, which cost Obama support among independent voters who helped elect him, although congressional Republicans fared even worse.¶ As he seeks to make the case again, Obama will also be hampered by the problems facing the enrollment process of his signature health-care law. Millions of visitors to the Web site providing access to the insurance exchanges have overwhelmed the system, a failure of both coding and preparation.¶ Obama has been meeting daily with advisers responsible for fixing the problems, and officials say he will continue to insist that the work will go on round-the-clock. With the fiscal confrontation over, Republicans will turn more of their attention to those flaws, as may the public.¶ Even with federal workers returning to their jobs, the administration’s ability to execute policy is undermined by the fact that it still has dozens of posts in key agencies that remain unfilled. There are 183 executive nominations pending in the Senate. At the Department of Homeland Security, more than a dozen top officials — including the secretary — are acting rather than permanent.¶ New York University public service professor Paul C. Light is pessimistic that Obama can accomplish much in coming months. He said Obama is running out of time to get things done in the face of GOP resistance and the decline of influence that comes with a second term.¶ “I don’t think that he’ll get anything. His agenda is finished,” Light said. “It’s a political tragedy because he’s got more knowledge about the job and less juice to get it done.”¶ Keith Hennessey, who served as President George W. Bush’s top economic adviser, said people shouldn’t overstate the significance of Wednesday’s political accord.¶ “Substantively, the net result is they’ve pressed ‘pause.’ And that’s it,” said Hennessey, adding that while Obama “played defense successfully,” that does not mean he will now be able to go on offense.¶ Hennessey said it will be hard for the president and congressional Republicans to reconcile their competing fiscal goals — Obama wants to ease across-the-board budget cuts, known as the sequester, while the GOP wants broad entitlement reforms. In addition, he said, the way the White House will likely campaign for its priorities could deepen the partisan divide.¶ “If the president portrays this as this battle between light and dark, it’s hard for people to be simultaneously cooperating across party lines on other issues,” he said.¶ Obama sounded a conciliatory tone Wednesday night. “We could get all these things done even this year if everybody comes together in a spirit of how are we going to move this country forward and put the last three weeks behind us,” he said.¶ But the president’s greatest opportunities in coming months are likely to come in areas where he can act on his own, both domestically and in foreign affairs.¶ “His path to success is going to come through every single place that you can squeeze some authority which he has,” said John Podesta, who chairs the liberal think tank Center for American Progress. “That is where you’ve got to focus your attention and where you could spend your political capital.”¶ The administration’s effort to curb greenhouse gas emissions linked to climate change, for example, will continue without congressional input. The Environmental Protection Agency was hit hard by the shutdown — with 94 percent of its staff furloughed — but EPA Administrator Gina McCarthy said it did not have a significant effect on efforts to craft climate rules for new and existing power plants.¶ “We’re not going to lose any time,” McCarthy said. “We’re going to be able to deliver.”

### --a2 thumper – budget

#### Immigration is before budget – but even if they’re right, spending PC on the budget only boosts immigration via compromise – unlike the plan

Fournier 10-16 (Ron Fournier, National Journal, “Obama Wins! Big Whoop. Can He Lead?” 10-16-2013, http://www.nationaljournal.com/white-house/obama-wins-big-whoop-can-he-lead-20131016)

There is already a lack of seriousness in the air. On Tuesday, the president declared immigration reform to be his top priority after the fiscal crisis. It's a curious choice, given the magnitude of the debt and the durability of the size-of-government debate. Does Obama really think immigration is a more serious problem? Or is it merely the best political issue for Democrats?¶ It is tempting to assume that Obama has abandoned any hope of governing and is obsessed instead on Democrats seizing control of the House next year, an unlikely occurrence given the GOP's structural advantages. "We can't govern," a senior White House aide told me, "without the House." Obama's immigration message is modeled suspiciously on his fiscal-crisis talking points. Blaming House Speaker John Boehner for preventing immigration from coming up for a vote in the past, Obama said Tuesday, "The only thing right now that's holding it back is, again, Speaker Boehner not willing to call the bill on the floor of the House of Representatives."¶ It looks like Obama plans to walk Republicans into another box canyon, this one of his making.¶ A wiser course would be to humbly accept the GOP's terms of surrender and immediately leverage his advantage to end the budget fight that has polarized Washington. While Republicans are licking their wounds, Obama could announce an intense schedule of high-level budget meetings – daily, ideally. Rather than lecture lawmakers publicly, he could privately put his offer of modest entitlement cuts back on the table and declare his openness to do more. He could listen to Republicans – not for hours, but for days, if necessary.¶ If he listens closely, he might hear what GOP House leaders told me last spring. They were open to exchanging entitlement reform for new taxes – $250 billion to $300 billion, or approximately the amount that Republican Sen. Pat Toomey of Pennsylvania proposed raising over 10 years under the guise of "tax reform." That is a small price to pay for a Democratic president to enact entitlement cuts, shielding the GOP from a potent wedge issue. Of course, this would require Obama to actually sign entitlement cuts into law rather than just propose them, a step it's not clear he's willing to take.¶ The White House likes to conflate the GOP's public bargaining positions with their privately held ones. The president and his team may not understand the difference, which I doubt, or they're looking for excuses to avoid a budget deal. Pragmatic, good-governance Democrats harbor such doubts about their president.¶ "We can govern by either leadership or crisis," said Leon Panetta, a former Democratic congressman who served in Washington with nine presidents. "If leadership is not there, then we govern by crisis."¶ Washington Post columnist Ruth Marcus, who attended a breakfast meeting with Panetta and several other reporters Monday, reported that the former leader of the CIA and Pentagon under Obama was questioning his ex-boss' leadership. "You have to engage in the process," Panetta said. "This is a town where it's not enough to feel you have the right answers. You've got to roll up your sleeves and you've got to really engage in the process … that's what governing is all about."¶ A Democrat close to Panetta said the Californian was speaking generally about issues he has had with the president's lack of leadership inside Washington – most of them not yet aired publicly – rather than merely about this month's clash, which Panetta mostly lays at the feet of the GOP.¶ Another high ranking Democrat with ties to both the White House and Capitol Hill pointed to the first failed days of Obamacare. While Republicans look "insane," he said, Obama is making Democrats look "incompetent."¶ "It's all about winning with this White House," said the Democrat who spoke on condition of anonymity to avoid retribution from the White House. "It's not about governing. It's not about holding people accountable. It's not about solving big problems."¶ If Obama could finagle a budget deal out of the GOP, voters would almost certainly welcome the break from gridlock. His declining approval ratings might reverse. Higher ratings might help him rescue his stalled agenda (including immigration reform) and a wilting legacy. Obama was right to call the GOP's bluff: Bowing to their demands would have been poor politics for him and a poor precedent for future politics. But the country gained nothing beyond another short-term deal that punts the long-term problem. Now what?¶ Okay, we get it: Obama is a winning politician. What's in serious doubt is whether he will be remembered as a successful president.

### --a2 pc not key

#### Obama is threading the needle now – spending enough PC to swing moderates but not so much to alienate them – but the plan kills the window for agreement

McMorris 10-15 (Evan McMorris-Santoro, BuzzFeed Staff, “Obama Has Already Won The Shutdown Fight And He’s Coming For Immigration Next,” BuzzFeed, 10-15-2013, http://www.buzzfeed.com/evanmcsan/obama-has-already-won-the-shutdown-fight-and-hes-coming-for)

Immigration reform advocates plan an aggressive campaign to bring the issue back — and the White House has signaled it’s on board. Can Obama emerge from the fiscal crisis with enough momentum to win the immigration fight? ¶ As the fiscal fight roiling Washington nears its end, the White House is already signaling that it plans to use the political momentum it has gained during the shutdown fight to charge back into the immigration debate. And this time, Democratic pollsters and advocates say, they could actually win.¶ The final chapter of the current crisis hasn’t been written yet, but Democrats in Washington are privately confident that they’ll emerge with the upper hand over the conservatives in Congress who forced a government shutdown. And sources say the administration plans to use its victory to resurrect an issue that was always intended to be a top priority of Obama’s second-term agenda.¶ Advocates argue the post-fiscal crisis political reality could thaw debate on the issue in the House, which froze in earlier this year after the Senate passed a bipartisan immigration bill that was led by Republican Sen. Marco Rubio and Democratic Sen. Chuck Schumer.¶ “It’s at least possible with sinking poll numbers for the Republicans, with a [GOP] brand that is badly damaged as the party that can’t govern responsibly and is reckless that they’re going to say, ‘All right, what can we do that will be in our political interest and also do tough things?’” said Frank Sharry, executive director of the immigration reform group America’s Voice. “That’s where immigration could fill the bill.”¶ The White House and Democrats are “ready” to jump back into the immigration fray when the fiscal crises ends, Sharry said. And advocates are already drawing up their plans to put immigration back on the agenda — plans they’ll likely initiate the morning after a fiscal deal is struck.¶ “We’re talking about it. We want to be next up and we’re going to position ourselves that way,” Sharry said. “There are different people doing different things, and our movement will be increasingly confrontational with Republicans, including civil disobedience. A lot of people are going to say, ‘We’re not going to wait.’”¶ The White House isn’t ready to talk about the world after the debt limit fight yet, but officials have signaled strongly they want to put immigration back on the agenda.¶ Asked about future strategic plans after the shutdown Monday, a senior White House official said, “That’s a conversation for when the government opens and we haven’t defaulted.” But on Tuesday, Press Secretary Jay Carney specifically mentioned immigration when asked “how the White House proceeds” after the current fracas is history.¶ “Just like we wish for the country, for deficit reduction, for our economy, that the House would follow the Senate’s lead and pass comprehensive immigration reform with a big bipartisan vote,” he said. “That might be good for the Republican Party. Analysts say so; Republicans say so. We hope they do it.”¶ The president set immigration as his next priority in an interview with Univision Tuesday.¶ “Once that’s done, you know, the day after, I’m going to be pushing to say, call a vote on immigration reform,” Obama said. He also set up another fight with the House GOP on the issue.¶ “We had a very strong Democratic and Republican vote in the Senate,” Obama said. “The only thing right now that’s holding it back is, again, Speaker Boehner not willing to call the bill on the floor of the House of Representatives.”¶ Don’t expect the White House effort to include barnstorming across the country on behalf of immigration reform in the days after the fiscal crisis ends, reform proponents predict. Advocates said the White House has tried hard to help immigration reform along, and in the current climate that means trying to thread the needle with Republicans who support reform but have also reflexively opposed every one of Obama’s major policy proposals.¶ Democrats and advocates seem to hope the GOP comes back to immigration on its own, albeit with a boost from Democrats eager to join them. Polls show Republicans have taken on more of the blame from the fiscal battle of the past couple of weeks. But Tom Jensen, a pollster with the Democratic firm Public Policy Polling, said moving to pass immigration reform could be just what the doctor ordered to get the public back on the side of the Republicans.¶ “We’ve consistently found that a sizable chunk of Republican voters support immigration reform, and obviously a decent number of Republican politicians do too,” Jensen said. “After this huge partisan impasse, they may want to focus on something that’s not quite as polarized, and immigration would certainly fit the bill since we see voters across party lines calling for reform.”¶ In a political environment where the best-laid plans often amount to nothing, though, the White House may not be able to leverage momentum or even hang onto it for very long. While Republicans have suffered the brunt of the blame for the shutdown, Obama’s approval ratings have also steeply declined in recent weeks and months.¶ What’s more, a short-term deal on reopening the government and raising the debt ceiling could mean the current fiscal arguments will roll on at a significantly toned-down level. Continuing bad news coming from the implementation of Obamacare could take center stage, giving the Republicans a chance to rebuild their brand while the White House plays defense.¶ But immigration reform is something virtually all Democrats want to see back on in the spotlight ahead of the 2014 midterm elections. At this point, the fight is really another debate between the White House and the conservative wing of the House GOP caucus, a situation that could equal déjà vu for political observers. Conservatives have lined up against a Senate-passed immigration bill, and House Speaker Boehner has refused to move the the Senate bill, despite its bipartisan Senate support.

#### Enough republicans are on board now – but picking an unnecessary fight derails compromise

Krikorian 10-16 (Mark Krikorian, National Review, “What Effect Will Fiscal Fallout Have on Immigration Fight?” 10-16-2013, http://www.nationalreview.com/corner/361384/what-effect-will-fiscal-fallout-have-immigration-fight-mark-krikorian)

President Obama told the L.A. Univison affiliate yesterday that “Once that’s done [the fiscal fight], you know, the day after, I’m going to be pushing to say, call a vote on immigration reform.” Or, as a BuzzFeed headline crows, “Obama Has Already Won The Shutdown Fight And He’s Coming For Immigration Next”.¶ The Republican leadership is on board with Obama’s agenda. House Homeland Security chairman Mike McCaul said a couple weeks ago, “I would think that would be the next agenda item in the queue after we’re done with this mess.” Judiciary chairman Bob Goodlatte has met with Democrats Luis Gutierrez and Henry Cuellar, who were “encouraged by his apparent enthusiasm for advancing immigration reform,” in one reporter’s description. And George Soros’s National Immigration Forum is staging a conservative “fly-in” later this month to pressure Republican House members to pass Obama’s top second-term priority. The “conservatives” making Obama’s amnesty/doubling immigration case to the House GOP will include the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Billionaires for Open Borders founder Michael Bloomberg, Facebook’s Mark Zuckerberg, and others.¶ So the question is what effect will the government-shutdown fight have on the politics of amnesty in the House? It seems like it could go one of two ways. On the one hand, it could be that conservatives are weakened and demoralized by the unsatisfactory result of the fiscal fight, and the leadership will want to show that it can work constructively with the Democrats, increasing chances of passing something to take to conference with the Senate, thus ensuring passage of what will amount to the Schumer-Rubio bill, with a few meaningless tweaks.¶ On the other hand, as Conn Carroll at the Examiner tweeted recently, “hey – ya know when a great time to bring up the very divisive issue of amnesty? right after a bloody GOP civil war.” Carroll suggests even moderate Republicans, otherwise amenable to amnesty, might want to avoid poking a conservative hornets’ nest. That suggests perhaps the passage of some targeted immigration measures (like a GOP version of the DREAM Act, a farmworker bill, McCaul’s ineffectual-border security bill, etc.) but no conference with the Senate unless it also passes comparable targeted measures, rather than the gargantuan, Obamacare-style monstrosity that is Schumer-Rubio.¶ I know what I’m hoping for, but that doesn’t mean it’ll happen. I’m open to thoughts on how the fiscal-fight fallout will impact the immigration debate.

#### Even if PC isn’t key and winners win – there isn’t enough *time* to win the fight on the plan AND immigration – pushes it too close to the midterms and dooms passage

Pabst 10-14 (Georgia Pabst, Journal Sentinel, “Immigration reform gets overshadowed by world, national events,” 10-14-2013, http://www.jsonline.com/news/statepolitics/despite-prayer-rallies-immigration-reform-not-getting-attention-b99118126z1-227726021.html)

At a march in Washington last week, thousands of people rallied — and 200 were arrested — making the case for comprehensive immigration reform. On Saturday, 300 small groups from evangelical organizations in 30 states began nine days of prayer for immigration reform.¶ But here's the reality: In the House, 26 Republicans have been identified as supporting immigration reform, including U.S. Rep. Paul Ryan of Janesville. Ask Ryan's office for comment, and spokeman Kevin Siefert will say the influential congressman "remains hopeful" the House will consider reforms.¶ But right now? "Congressman Ryan is currently focused on getting a budget agreement."¶ After months of being on the front burner, a host of issues — Syria, the government shutdown and the debt ceiling debate — have taken center stage and dimmed the chances of passing legislation on immigration reform by the end of the year.¶ Although the Senate has passed a bipartisan immigration bill that would include a path to citizenship for the nation's 11 million immigrants without papers who pay fines and meet other requirements, the House has yet to take up the measure.¶ And the clock is ticking.¶ "The biggest issue is the calendar," said Darryl Morin, Midwest vice president for the League of United Latin American Citizens. "It's important for everyone to keep up the pressure on Congress and for everyone to remain engaged, but we're running out of time. We're not giving up, but if it doesn't happen in the fall, it could happen in the spring."¶ Lynn Tramonte, deputy director of America's Voice, a national advocacy group for immigration reform, said she was encouraged last week by the statement of U.S. Rep. Cathy McMorris Rodgers, a Republican from Washington and chair of the House Republican Conference.¶ McMorris Rodgers said during an interview on Spanish-language Univision that immigration reform "is a priority." She said there's still time to take up the issue, and that Republican leaders are still discussing when to bring bills to the House floor.¶ "What they haven't done is put any proposals out there that address the 11 million without papers," Tramonte said. Republicans need to deliver on immigration to improve their poll and electoral numbers with Latinos, she said.¶ Marquette University law professor Ed Fallone, who specializes in immigration law, said he's becoming more pessimistic.¶ "These legislative overhauls, especially big bills, need a sense of momentum behind them," he said. "And any bill that will require bipartisanship has to happen at the right time on the calendar, so that it's not too close to the next election cycle. I do think we're starting to get close to the end of that window."

#### Even if capital only works at the margins it’s still key

Lebo and O’Geen 11 Matthew is an Associate Professor in the Department of Political Science @ Stony Brook University. Andrew is an Assistant Professor of Political Science @ Davidson College. “The President’s Role in the Partisan Congressional Arena,” The Journal of Politics, Vol 73, No 3, July, http://ms.cc.sunysb.edu/~mlebo/The%20Presidents%20Role%20in%20the%20Partisan%20Congressional%20Arena.pdf

Presidential Success¶ The seminal work of Neustadt (1960) provides the foundation for most empirical examinations of presidential inﬂuence in Congress. Writing about power in political ofﬁce, Neustadt was interested in understanding both the sources of power for a president and the mechanisms by which that power could be maintained and used. While the conclusions are based primarily on carefully selected examples that often cannot be generalized to other situations (Bond and Fleisher 1980; Edwards 1980), they do provide a theoretical starting point for the literature on presidential success. Of what is presidential power made? For Neustadt, it is the power to inﬂuence and to persuade. On the domestic front, it is the power to effectively control both the legislative agenda and process and to turn electoral mandates into national policy. So, one way to view presidential power vis a`vis the legislature is through the president’s ability to get legislation that he favors through Congress.¶ One aspect of Neustadt’s (1960) argument in particular—the link between popular approval and success—attracted a lot of attention. The idea that ‘‘political capital’’ comes from presidential popularity and can be spent in the legislative arena is a persistent one. For Neustadt, the public prestige of the president was a key factor in his legislative success. He did temper this with the warning that prestige is a ‘‘factor operating mostly in the background as a conditioner’’ (1960, 87) and that it ‘‘may not decide the outcome in a given case but can affect the likelihoods in every case and therefore is strategically important to his power’’ (93).¶ Early work sought to empirically investigate some of Neustadt’s claims. First, it was necessary to evaluate whether the relationship between success and approval existed at all. In a series of work, Edwards (1976, 1980) looks at correlations between presidential approval and success across multiple scenarios. This research is notable in that it represents one of the ﬁrst attempts to rigorously examine the relationships identiﬁed as important by Neustadt. Edwards’ results in these studies are mixed, however. For example, the correlations between approval and support overall are very high, but much of the evidence of this relationship disappears when partisanship is introduced.¶ Building on the work of Edwards, scholars sought to evaluate the relationship between approval and success in more methodologically advanced ways. This research sought to both build on Edwards’ ﬁndings as well as move beyond some of the limitations of relying on correlations to make causal inferences. Much of this line of research concluded that the tenuous link identiﬁed by Edwards was much stronger than previously thought (Bond and Fleisher 1984; Ostrom and Simon 1985; Rivers and Rose 1985).¶ Later research challenged the strength of the relationship between approval and success and found it to be marginal or nonexistent (Collier and Sullivan 1995). Separating by issue areas, Fleisher et al. (2000) ﬁnd that public support of neither domestic nor foreign policy issues have much bearing on success and that partisan factors are more determinative of roll-call results.¶ Still, the intuitive appeal of the hypothesis— ceteris paribus a president should have higher success if his popularity is higher—has led to multiple attempts to rescue it. Peterson states simply that a ‘‘ . . . lack of popularity with the American people diminishes a president’s policy-making stature’’ (1990, 136) and ﬁnds some support when using probit analyses for data collected at the bill level. Cohen et al. (2000) look at state-level approval and conclude that there is no relationship between it and the behavior of individual Senators towards the president’s legislative agenda. Canes-Wrone and de Marchi (2002) investigate the success of individual roll calls on which the president has taken a position and ﬁnd the impact of approval to be indirect and conditional on other bill-speciﬁc factors such as salience. Bond, Fleisher, and Wood (2003) investigate the interactive and time-varying nature of approval and ﬁnd evidence that its inﬂuence changes over time. Rudalevige (2002, 131) points out that even if popularity has a marginal effect on success, this might be key since policy is made at the margins.¶ In his most recent book, The Strategic President, George Edwards asserts that the power of the president is not the power to persuade. Presidents may exploit opportunities of high approval but, for the most part, ‘‘presidential legislative leadership operates in an environment largely beyond the president’s control’’ (2009, 150). Edwards holds out a marginal role for the president’s popularity: ‘‘Presidents must largely play the hands that the public deals them through its voting in presidential and congressional elections and its evaluations of the chief executive’s job performance’’ (152).¶ This is representative of the shift away from Neustadt’s focus on ‘‘what the president does and how well he does it’’ (Bond and Fleisher 1990, 12) to a perspective based more on the environment within Congress. For one, Cooper and Brady (1981) see the institutional context as more important than the personal leadership skills of the president. A thorough treatment of this viewpoint can be found in Bond and Fleisher (1990), who see success as dependent upon what they call ‘‘linkage agents’’ which provide the bridge through which the partisan and ideological makeup of Congress can inﬂuence presidential success. Similarly, Peterson (1990) sees the partisan make-up of Congress as critical to presidential success, and Rudalevige (2002) argues parties and ideology are where most studies of presidential success are centered.¶ Most of the recent work deals with the president’s ability to impact the legislative process not in any overt or direct way, but at the margins. For example, Wood (2009) looks at the president’s ability to shape economic policy through rhetoric and others look at the president’s use of the media and his ability to ‘‘go public’’ on important issues (for example, Barrett 2004; Canes-Wrone 2001). Also, recent work examines the president’s ability to lobby and build coalitions in Congress as a means of inﬂuencing outcomes (Beckmann 2008). However, as the quotes from Emmanuel and DeMint suggest, the impact of bargaining, coalition building, and public statements by the president can be felt long after the congressional agenda has been set. Indeed, presidential success may have an important effect on the very structure of representation in future Congresses. This leads us from an investigation of the causes of success to an interest in its consequences.

### --a2 w/w

#### Post-shutdown win is unique – other issues like the plan aren’t – and Obama won’t capitalize on them anyway

Tobin 10-17 (Jonathan S. Tobin, Commentary, “Can the Obama Revival Succeed?” 10-17-2013, http://www.commentarymagazine.com/2013/10/17/can-the-obama-revival-succeed-shutdown/)

Give the architects of the Republican attempt to use the threat of a shutdown to stop ObamaCare funding some credit. They have done what few of us thought was possible only a couple of months ago. In August, even liberals were discussing President Obama’s slide into irrelevancy as he morphed from a re-elected president to a scandal-plagued lame duck. Yet after several months of a weak economy, failed legislative initiatives, domestic scandals and foreign humiliations, the president was able to emerge today and rightly claim victory over conservatives in the shutdown and debt ceiling crisis. In the best humble brag fashion, he claimed no one had won in the shutdown but having worked hard to bring just such a confrontation about for the past two years, it’s obvious that he has emerged as the strongest player in the capital from the political chaos that has just concluded.¶ It bears repeating that had Senators Ted Cruz and Mike Lee and their friends in the House of Representatives not coaxed House Speaker John Boehner into going along with a strategy that had no chance of succeeding, conservatives could have used the last two weeks highlighting the disastrous ObamaCare rollout. But instead of focusing the country on this classic illustration about the perils of big government, Obama was able to stand before the country today and extol the virtues of government in a way that would have been difficult had not conservatives played right into his hands.¶ But now that the GOP is picking itself off the floor after their humiliating surrender yesterday, the question remains as to whether the president has regained enough momentum to score some other victories over them in the coming months. It is difficult to gauge exactly how much political capital the president has gotten out of his tough guy approach to the shutdown. But even if we concede that he is certainly a lot stronger than he was two months ago, he is not likely to enjoy another such moment of triumph again. That is, provided that Boehner and the rest of the Republican Party don’t let Cruz anywhere near the driver’s wheel again.¶ It needs to be remembered that one aspect of the president’s victory speech today was true. There were no true winners in the shutdown because, as the polls consistently showed, everyone in Washington has suffered a decline in popularity including the president and the Democrats. Republicans are, of course, in a worse position than the Democrats as surveys showed that anywhere from 10 to 20 percentage points more people though the GOP deserved more of the blame for the shutdown than the Democrats. But every poll has also showed negative favorability ratings for the President and his party too. Any other president who got only a 37 percent favorable rating (as was the case in one AP poll last week) would be considered to be in a free fall as was the case the last time it happened during George W. Bush’s second term.¶ The next big fight will be in the budget negotiations that will soon start as Congress begins the slow motion prelude to the next threat of a shutdown or debt ceiling expiration. The president’s “no negotiations” stance during the shutdown was irresponsible and helped precipitate the crisis but it also strengthened his standing with his supporters. After that performance, it is not likely that Republicans can be persuaded to think that he will blink the next time the two parties go to the brink.¶ But if the GOP can avoid be tagged with threats of shutdowns and defaults, they will remember that talks about reforming entitlements and cutting spending are their strong points. The acceptance of the sequester — which may not be ideal but has illustrated that cutting spending is possible — has shown that they’ve largely won the argument about the need to reduce expenditures and the debt. So long as Cruz and Lee are not allowed to steer the GOP into another ditch, Boehner and Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell stand a good chance of gaining a far more favorable resolution of the next budget crisis.¶ Nor can the president assume he will win on other issues, such as his desire for a comprehensive farm bill boondoggle or even on immigration reform, where he can count on the support of many Republicans. As his failed effort to get gun control legislation through Congress earlier this year showed, the president has no talent for building coalitions or persuading people to compromise. That’s because he is personally allergic to the concept and openly contemptuous of his political foes in a way that makes it impossible for him to win them over even when it might be in their interests to join with him.¶ Once he lost control of both houses of Congress in 2010 after the public punished the Democrats for the stimulus and ObamaCare, we found out this is a president who can only win when the GOP hands him a victory on a silver platter. Without such aid, he will always falter due to his lack of leadership and decisiveness. And he will continue to be dogged by the ongoing failure of ObamaCare whose negative impact on the economy will soon overshadow the talk about the damage down by the shutdown. Those factors should weigh more heavily in voters’ minds next November than Cruz’s antics, leaving the president even weaker in his final two years in office.¶ This is a good day for the president and he would be a fool not to try and use it as the launching point for a political counter-offensive aimed at making us forget how miserable the first nine months of 2013 were for him. But unless the Republicans blow themselves up again without much Democratic assistance, this may be as good as it gets until it’s time to pack up and go home.

#### 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.

#### 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

#### Ideology doesn’t outweigh – presidential success dictates votes

Lebo, 2010 (Matthew J. Lebo, Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, Stony Brook University, and Andrew O'Geen, PhD Candidate, Department of Political Science, Stony Brook University, Journal of Politics, “The President’s Role in the Partisan Congressional Arena” forthcoming, google)

Keeping this centrality in mind, we use established theories of congressional parties to model the president’s role as an actor within the constraints of the partisan environment of Congress. We also find a role for the president's approval level, a variable of some controversy in the presidential success literature. Further, we are interested in both the causes and consequences of success. We develop a theory that views the president’s record as a key component of the party politics that are so important to both the passage of legislation and the electoral outcomes that follow. Specifically, theories of partisan politics in Congress argue that cross-pressured legislators will side with their parties in order to enhance the collective reputation of their party (Cox and McCubbins 1993, 2005), but no empirical research has answered the question: "of what are collective reputations made?" We demonstrate that it is the success of the president – not parties in Congress – that predicts rewards and punishments to parties in Congress. This allows us to neatly fit the president into existing theories of party competition in Congress while our analyses on presidential success enable us to fit existing theories of party politics into the literature on the presidency.

#### Prefer our studies – examines both presidential and congressional influence – their studies don’t.

Lebo 10. [Matthew J., Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, Stony Brook University, and Andrew O'Geen, PhD Candidate, Department of Political Science, Stony Brook University, “The President’s Role in the Partisan Congressional Arena” Journal of Politics -- online]

A similar perspective on the importance of legislative victories is shared by White House Chief of Staff Rahm Emanuel. His observation that ‘‘When a party fails to govern, it fails electorally,’’ is indicative of a view in Washington that electoral fortunes are closely tied to legislative outcomes. This view is echoed in theories of political parties in Congress (e.g., Cox and McCubbins 1993, 2005; Lebo, McGlynn, and Koger 2007). But the consequences of presidential failure to members of his party are largely unexplored in empirical research. Also, while the fairly deep literature on the causes of presidential success has focused a lot on the partisan environment within which the president’s legislative battles are won and lost, it pays less attention to theories of congressional parties. Our attempt to combine these theories with a view of the president as the central actor in the partisan wars is meant to integrate the literatures on the two institutions. Even as the study of parties in Congress continues to deepen our understanding of that branch, the role of the president is usually left out or marginalized. At the same time, research that centers on the president’s success has developed with little crossover. The result is that well-developed theories of parties in Congress exist but we know much less about how parties connect the two branches. For example, between models of conditional party government (Aldrich and Rohde 2001; Rohde 1991), Cartel Theory (Cox and McCubbins 1993, 2005), and others (e.g., Patty 2008), we have an advanced understanding of how parties are important in Congress, but little knowledge of where the president ﬁts. As the head of his party, the president’s role in the partisan politics of Congress should be central.

**Obama is the Velcro president – all agency action links.**

Nicholas and Hook 10. (Peter and Janet, Staff Writers – LA Times, “Obama the Velcro president”, LA Times, 7-30, <http://articles.latimes.com/2010/jul/30/nation/la-na-velcro-presidency-20100730/3>)

If Ronald Reagan was the classic Teflon president, Barack Obama is made of Velcro. Through two terms, Reagan eluded much of the responsibility for recession and foreign policy scandal. In less than two years, Obama has become ensnared in blame. Hoping to better insulate Obama, White House aides have sought to give other Cabinet officials a higher profile and additional public exposure. They are also crafting new ways to explain the president's policies to a skeptical public. But Obama remains the colossus of his administration — to a point where trouble anywhere in the world is often his to solve. The president is on the hook to repair the Gulf Coast oil spill disaster, stabilize Afghanistan, help fix Greece's ailing economy and do right by Shirley Sherrod, the Agriculture Department official fired as a result of a misleading fragment of videotape. What's not sticking to Obama is a legislative track record that his recent predecessors might envy. Political dividends from passage of a healthcare overhaul or a financial regulatory bill have been fleeting. Instead, voters are measuring his presidency by a more immediate yardstick: Is he creating enough jobs? So far the verdict is no, and that has taken a toll on Obama's approval ratings. Only 46% approve of Obama's job performance, compared with 47% who disapprove, according to Gallup's daily tracking poll. "I think the accomplishments are very significant, but I think most people would look at this and say, 'What was the plan for jobs?' " said Sen. Byron L. Dorgan (D-N.D.). "The agenda he's pushed here has been a very important agenda, but it hasn't translated into dinner table conversations." Reagan was able to glide past controversies with his popularity largely intact. He maintained his affable persona as a small-government advocate while seeming above the fray in his own administration. Reagan was untarnished by such calamities as the 1983 terrorist bombing of the Marines stationed in Beirut and scandals involving members of his administration. In the 1986 Iran-Contra affair, most of the blame fell on lieutenants. Obama lately has tried to rip off the Velcro veneer. In a revealing moment during the oil spill crisis, he reminded Americans that his powers aren't "limitless." He told residents in Grand Isle, La., that he is a flesh-and-blood president, not a comic-book superhero able to dive to the bottom of the sea and plug the hole. "I can't suck it up with a straw," he said. But as a candidate in 2008, he set sky-high expectations about what he could achieve and what government could accomplish. Clinching the Democratic nomination two years ago, Obama described the moment as an epic breakthrough when "we began to provide care for the sick and good jobs to the jobless" and "when the rise of the oceans began to slow and our planet began to heal." Those towering goals remain a long way off. And most people would have preferred to see Obama focus more narrowly on the "good jobs" part of the promise. A recent Gallup poll showed that 53% of the population rated unemployment and the economy as the nation's most important problem. By contrast, only 7% cited healthcare — a single-minded focus of the White House for a full year. At every turn, Obama makes the argument that he has improved lives in concrete ways. Without the steps he took, he says, the economy would be in worse shape and more people would be out of work. There's evidence to support that. Two economists, Mark Zandi and Alan Blinder, reported recently that without the stimulus and other measures, gross domestic product would be about 6.5% lower. Yet, Americans aren't apt to cheer when something bad doesn't materialize. Unemployment has been rising — from 7.7% when Obama took office, to 9.5%. Last month, more than 2 million homes in the U.S. were in various stages of foreclosure — up from 1.7 million when Obama was sworn in. "Folks just aren't in a mood to hand out gold stars when unemployment is hovering around 10%," said Paul Begala, a Democratic pundit. Insulating the president from bad news has proved impossible. Other White Houses have tried doing so with more success. Reagan's Cabinet officials often took the blame, shielding the boss. But the Obama administration is about one man. Obama is the White House's chief spokesman, policy pitchman, fundraiser and negotiator. No Cabinet secretary has emerged as an adequate surrogate. Treasury Secretary Timothy F. Geithner is seen as a tepid public speaker; Energy Secretary Steven Chu is prone to long, wonky digressions and has rarely gone before the cameras during an oil spill crisis that he is working to end. So, more falls to Obama, reinforcing the Velcro effect: Everything sticks to him. He has opined on virtually everything in the hundreds of public statements he has made: nuclear arms treaties, basketball star LeBron James' career plans; Chelsea Clinton's wedding. Few audiences are off-limits. On Wednesday, he taped a spot on ABC's "The View," drawing a rebuke from Democratic Pennsylvania Gov. Edward G. Rendell, who deemed the appearance unworthy of the presidency during tough times. "Stylistically he creates some of those problems," Eddie Mahe, a Republican political strategist, said in an interview. "His favorite pronoun is 'I.' When you position yourself as being all things to all people, the ultimate controller and decision maker with the capacity to fix anything, you set yourself up to be blamed when it doesn't get fixed or things happen." A new White House strategy is to forgo talk of big policy changes that are easy to ridicule. Instead, aides want to market policies as more digestible pieces. So, rather than tout the healthcare package as a whole, advisors will talk about smaller parts that may be more appealing and understandable — such as barring insurers from denying coverage based on preexisting conditions. But at this stage, it may be late in the game to downsize either the president or his agenda. Sen. Richard J. Durbin (D-Ill.) said: "The man came in promising change. He has a higher profile than some presidents because of his youth, his race and the way he came to the White House with the message he brought in. It's naive to believe he can step back and have some Cabinet secretary be the face of the oil spill. The buck stops with his office."