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### AT: PSG Turn

Military will run out of cash—means zero new platforms or programs

**Spring 11,** research fellow in national security – Heritage, 12/21/’11

(Baker, “An Unacceptable Squeeze on Defense Modernization”)

Following the enactment of the Budget Control Act earlier this year, the budget for the core defense program is already operating under stringent spending caps. At the same time, per capita expenditures for paying military personnel and operating the force are high and growing rapidly. Under these circumstances, funding for the procurement of new weapons and equipment and for research and development on new defense technologies will be squeezed to a dangerous degree. A Looming Disaster for the Military and U.S. Security Both the Obama Administration and Congress will be tempted to leave the defense spending caps in place—if not to go to even lower caps—now that the sequestration process could be applied to the defense budget under the Budget Control Act. This is a result of the failure of the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction (“super committee”) to agree on an alternative deficit-reduction plan and adopt a policy of “people over platforms” in slicing up the defense budget pie. Given the uncertainties in the application of the sequestration process, it is impossible to calculate precisely how much more the modernization accounts will be squeezed if that process kicks in. Suffice it to say that the problem is likely to become dramatically worse. The implications of the coming squeeze on defense modernization under the existing spending caps should cause great alarm for all concerned, particularly since it comes on the heels of the “procurement holiday” of the 1990s. The result will be a military that lacks the modern weapons and equipment it needs, loses its technological edge over future enemies, and finds itself dependent on a seriously eroded defense industrial base. Congress will have to take two essential steps to avoid a disastrous outcome for the military and U.S. security. First, it will have to increase the existing caps on spending for the core defense program and find savings elsewhere in the federal budget to offset this change, in accordance with Heritage’s December 5 recommendations.[1] Second, it will have to take steps to constrain per capita growth in the cost of compensating military personnel. The Sources of the Modernization Squeeze There are two sources of the squeeze on military modernization. First, the Budget Control Act has established caps on spending for national security and discretionary spending over the next 10 years that translate into inadequate defense budgets under any circumstance. These caps will constitute top-down pressure on the modernization accounts (procurement and research and development) within the defense budget. This top-down pressure will be accompanied by significant pressure from underneath by growth in both the overall and per capita costs of compensating military personnel. These increasing costs are largely driven by the array of defined benefits offered by the Department of Defense to military service members and their dependents, which fall mostly in the areas of military retirement and health care. These would be more effective and efficient if they were converted to defined-contribution plans. According to the Department of Defense (DOD), its overall military manpower costs will rise from roughly $148 billion today to more than $160 billion in fiscal year (FY) 2016. This increase will come in spite of proposed reductions in the number of people serving in the active-duty military. Although the number of active-duty military personnel is projected to drop by about 5 percent from FY 2012 through FY 2016, military personnel spending will rise, thanks to growing per capita compensation costs. Per capita compensation for active-duty personnel is projected to rise by more than 13 percent during the same five-year period. The reduction in the number of active-duty military personnel, as currently projected by the Obama Administration, will create a force that is too small to defend the vital interests of the United States. The Heritage Foundation has recommended that this reduction not be imposed. Accordingly, DOD’s projection of total military manpower costs is well below what is prudent. It is also appropriate to point out that while, according to the Congressional Budget Office, the overall per capita costs for operation and maintenance will come down with the withdrawal of U.S. forces from Iraq and Afghanistan, the per capita costs for operations and maintenance within the core defense program will continue to rise as well. The Scope of the Modernization Squeeze As a result of the twin pressures of the estimated spending caps on the core defense program derived from the Budget Control Act—which still excludes the more stringent caps that would result from the imposition of a partial or full sequestration under the Act—and the rising cost of military compensation, the level of funding for military modernization will necessarily fall to unacceptably low levels. (See chart.) Under this scenario, funding for defense modernization within the core defense program (defined as the sum of DOD’s procurement account and research, development, test, and evaluation account) could fall to roughly $145 billion in current dollars in FY 2016. By way of comparison, $188.4 billion was to go to these accounts under President Obama’s original budget request for FY 2012. Thus, the level of modernization funding is estimated to decline by about $43 billion in current dollars, or 23 percent, over the four-year period. In terms of inflation-adjusted dollars, the decline will be roughly $54 billion (in FY 2012 dollars), or about 29 percent. In other words, President Obama’s original request for the core DOD budget would have devoted roughly 34 percent of that budget to modernization. By 2016, modernization funding could fall to about 26 percent of total DOD funding for its core program. When these comparisons are expanded to provide a broader perspective, the situation becomes even more alarming. For example, the Department of Defense spent more than $226 billion on modernization in FY 1985 (in FY 2012 dollars). This was 39 percent of the total DOD budget. That means DOD could be on a path to cutting modernization’s share of its total budget to little more than one-half of what it was in FY 1985.

### AT: WTO Turn

#### WTO won’t be revived now – lack of cooperation and leadership

Reuters 6/22/13 – (“WTO credibility at risk, warns US trade negotiator”, Reuters, http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/06/22/trade-wto-doha-idUSLDE75L1RN20110622)

EU plan to freeze tariffs under fire by India, Brazil (Reuters) - Deadlocked negotiations for a global trade treaty are threatening the credibility of the World Trade Organization, the U.S. ambassador to the trade body said on Wednesday. Negotiators meeting to discuss the long-stalled Doha round moved no closer to agreeing even a scaled-back treaty that would focus on the needs of poor states, agreeing only to keep negotiating for another month and then consider their options. "What's at risk is the WTO being seen as an effective forum for negotiating trade liberalisation," U.S. ambassador Michael Punke said in a telephone interview following a morning of deliberations at the WTO. Ten years of negotiations in the 153-member WTO have failed to seal an accord that could generate billions of dollars and alleviate poverty by freeing up trade in goods and services. A stop-gap deal proposed by WTO chief Pascal Lamy last month required that rich countries make good on promises made in 2005 to trim cotton subsidies, import most goods duty-free from least-developed countries and simplify sourcing rules for exporters in poor countries. Originally that stop-gap was to take effect while negotiators try and address more divisive market-opening issues. But trading countries led by the United States want to expand the slimmed-down agreement in a way that will distribute the burden of commitments to poor states. A potential expanded agreement could include issues from a reform of fisheries subsidies to tariff cuts for environmental goods and harmonisation of border controls -- sensitive issues whose inclusion further trims chances of agreement by the time trade ministers gather in Geneva in December. An idea floated by the European Union to freeze tariffs while negotiations continue was welcomed by the United States and Australia during Wednesday's meeting, but opposed by developing countries such as India and Brazil.

#### Mexican inclusion in the TTIP revives the WTO and improves trade liberalization

Hills 4/24/13 – Chief Executive Officer of Hills & Company International Consultants, U.S. Trade Representative from 1989 to 1993, B.A. degree from Stanford University, studied at Oxford University, She earned her LL.B. degree from Yale Law School (Carla, “A Trans-Atlantic Trade Pact for the World”, New York Times, http://www.nytimes.com/2013/04/25/opinion/global/a-trans-atlantic-trade-pact-for-the-world.html)

The opening of global markets — starting in 1947 with the first round of trade negotiations among 23 nations and the creation of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), through the creation of the World Trade Organization in 1995 — caused international trade to explode and standards of living for nations rich and poor to soar. Economic studies show that the opening of global markets since the end of World War II has added about $9,000 of additional wealth for the average American household. Developing nations have also gained from global trade. On average, poor countries that opened their markets to trade and investment have grown more than three times faster than those that kept their markets closed. No country has prospered by sealing itself off from global economy. The Doha Round of multilateral trade negotiations was launched in 2001, two months after the 9/11 terrorist attacks in the United States. It sought to boost economic growth through trade liberalization for all nations, but particularly for developing nations. The security dimension was real, because in addition to the projected economic benefits, past experience showed that as governments liberalized their trade regimes, they generally liberalized their political regimes. Adherence to an agreed set of trade rules and support for the W.T.O. dispute settlement mechanism encourages nondiscrimination, transparency and rule of law, which contribute to increased stability. The Doha negotiations broke down in 2005 and have made little progress since. Trade commentators are declaring Doha dead and multilateral negotiations obsolete as governments increasingly have turned to negotiating bilateral and regional trade agreements that create conflicting rules and distort trade by creating trade preferences for the signatories at the expense of those that do not participate. There is legitimate concern that the proliferation of bilateral and regional trade agreements could render the W.T.O. irrelevant and destroy the enormous benefits we derive from our multilateral trading system. What could bring the 159 W.T.O. members back to the table? Ironically, history demonstrates that the successful negotiation of a major regional trade agreement of high quality can provide the necessary catalyst. In 1990, the Uruguay Round collapsed in Brussels. In June 1991 the United States, Mexico and Canada launched the negotiations of a North American Free Trade Agreement (Nafta). Fourteen months later negotiations were concluded. President George H.W. Bush signed the agreement in December 1992; President Clinton secured congressional approval of the agreement the following year. By joining the economies of Canada, Mexico and the U.S., Nafta created a regional market of over 400 million people. It was the first comprehensive free trade agreement to join developed and developing nations, and it achieved broader and deeper trade liberalization than any prior trade agreement. The world’s reaction was broad, deep and fast. In just a few months following the passage of the Nafta, trade negotiators returned to the bargaining table, completed the Uruguay Round, and created the W.T.O. to the enormous benefit of the global economy. If we are to repeat the success of two decades ago, we will require an even greater catalyst: a regional trade agreement of such quality and scope that the rest of the world is galvanized. The Trans-Atlantic Trade and Investment Partnership recently announced by the EuropeUan nion and the United States could be that catalyst. That negotiation would involve roughly half the global economy. The negotiation need not be protracted. The E.U. and the U.S. each recently concluded free trade agreements with South Korea that could serve as a template upon which to build. The proposed Trans-Atlantic Partnership could have even more heft if Canada and Mexico were added — which makes sense, since Mexico already has a free trade agreement with the E.U., and Canada is in the final stages of negotiating one. Including them would avoid having different rules covering trade involving our two largest trading partners. The global reaction to Nafta 20 years ago shows that “competitive liberalization” can be a powerful catalyst. When governments see others taking economic action that generates growth and stability, they do not want to be left out. A broad, gold-standard trade agreement across the Atlantic could be such a catalyst for reigniting support for multilateral trade liberalization, bringing W.T.O. members back to the table to finish the Doha Round, which would give a real boost to the global economy. It was done before with the Nafta, and it could be done again with the successful conclusion of the Trans-Atlantic Trade and Investment Partnership.

### AT: Air force hurts heg

#### Single instances of action do not change perceptions of us

**Fettweis**, **08** (Christopher – professor of political science at Tulane, Credibility and the War on Terror, Political Science Quarterly, Winter)

Since Vietnam, scholars have been generally unable to identify cases in which high credibility helped the United States achieve its goals. The shortterm aftermath of the Cuban Missile Crisis, for example, did not include a string of Soviet reversals, or the kind of benign bandwagoning with the West that deterrence theorists would have expected. In fact, the perceived reversal in Cuba seemed to harden Soviet resolve. As the crisis was drawing to a close, Soviet diplomat Vasily Kuznetsov angrily told his counterpart, "You Americans will never be able to do this to us again."37 Kissinger commented in his memoirs that "the Soviet Union thereupon launched itself on a determined, systematic, and long-term program of expanding all categories of its military power .... The 1962 Cuban crisis was thus a historic turning point-but not for the reason some Americans complacently supposed."38 The reassertion of the credibility of the United States, which was done at the brink of nuclear war, had few long-lasting benefits. The Soviets seemed to learn the wrong lesson. There is actually scant evidence that other states ever learn the right lessons. Cold War history contains little reason to believe that the credibility of the superpowers had very much effect on their ability to influence others. Over the last decade, a series of major scholarly studies have cast further doubt upon the fundamental assumption of interdependence across foreign policy actions. Employing methods borrowed from social psychology rather than the economics-based models commonly employed by deterrence theorists, Jonathan Mercer argued that threats are far more independent than is commonly believed and, therefore, that reputations are not likely to be formed on the basis of individual actions.39 While policymakers may feel that their decisions send messages about their basic dispositions to others, most of the evidence from social psychology suggests otherwise. Groups tend to interpret the actions of their rivals as situational, dependent upon the constraints of place and time. Therefore, they are not likely to form lasting impressions of irresolution from single, independent events. Mercer argued that the interdependence assumption had been accepted on faith, and rarely put to a coherent test; when it was, it almost inevitably failed.40

### AT: Indo Pak air force turn

#### Deterrence checks

**Khan 12** (Ikram Ullah, analyst for the South Asian Strategic Stability Institute, “Nuclear Pakistan: Defence Vs Energy Development,” 7/26, http://www.eurasiareview.com/26072012-nuclear-pakistan-defence-vs-energy-development-oped/)

We must be clear that nuclear weapons are here to maintain peace and stability between Pakistan and India. Pakistan was forced to run its nuclear weapon program due to India’s nuclear weapon program and its hegemonic ambition. Pakistan has long said that its nuclear weapon program is security driven. While on other hand Indian nuclear weapon program is not security driven, rather it is based on its regional and global aspirations.¶ The security threats still exist for Pakistan, but due to its credible nuclear deterrence Pakistan is capable of crushing such threats or plans. In the recent past, the tragedy, which many historians remember as the “Fall of Dhaka”, carries some lessons for us to be learnt. If India could intervene at that time, then it is quite possible it could intervene in Baloachistan. Now the nuclear capability of Pakistan deters India from perusing any kind of intervention because of the fear of perceived consequences.¶ It is Pakistan’s credible nuclear deterrence capability that effectively neutralizes any ill intent of its opponent against its integrity and sovereignty. It is evident that after the December 13, 2001 terrorists attack on Indian Parliament, India mobilized its armed forces to attack on Pakistan, but refrained from doing so as it realized that any such irrational action would lead to a nuclear war. The same was the case after Mumbai attacks on November 26, 2008 – the nuclear deterrence prevailed and it prevented the likelihood of an all out nuclear war in South Asia.

**AT: Air power causes terror**

**Air power is critical to an effective war on terrorism**

**RAND 3** (Project Air Force Annual Report, http://www.rand.org/pubs/annual\_reports/2005/AR7089.pdf)

Counterterrorism Will Require a Mix of Air Force Capabilities and Long-Term, Sustained Effort The war on terrorism is more likely to be a long-term effort in which the use of force, at least by U.S. military personnel, is only sporadic and successful military operations will resemble counterinsurgency operations. The primary role of U.S. military forces will often be indirect and supportive. U.S. forces will be called upon to train, equip, advise, and assist host-country forces in rooting out terrorist groups; forge strong relationships with host-country personnel; show great discretion in their conduct of operations; and maintain a low profile in the host country. They will be able to react swiftly and effectively when promising targets arise. The Air Force, then, should expect sustained heavy demand to provide important capabilities, assets, and skill sets to support counterterrorism operations abroad. Chief contributions will include surveillance platforms, operators, and analysts; language-qualified personnel to help train and advise host-country forces and to analyze humyn intelligence; security police and other force protection assets; base operating support personnel and equipment to provide communications, housing, and transportation; heliborne insertion and extraction capabilities; and humynitarian relief assets. In some cases, U.S. airpower may be called upon to strike terrorists in base camps, hideouts, vehicles, and other locations.

## 2ac – t-diplomatic engagement – (short)

#### The aff is negotiations over trade – we meet

#### The aff increases investment in Mexico’s manufacturing system – we meet

#### “Engagement” requires direct talks with the target government

Crocker 9 – Chester Crocker, Professor of Strategic Studies at the Walsh School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University, Former Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, “Terms of Engagement”, New York Times, 9-13, http://www.nytimes.com/2009/09/14/opinion/14crocker.html?\_r=0

PRESIDENT OBAMA will have a hard time achieving his foreign policy goals until he masters some key terms and better manages the expectations they convey. Given the furor that will surround the news of America’s readiness to hold talks with Iran, he could start with “engagement” — one of the trickiest terms in the policy lexicon.

The Obama administration has used this term to contrast its approach with its predecessor’s resistance to talking with adversaries and troublemakers. His critics show that they misunderstand the concept of engagement when they ridicule it as making nice with nasty or hostile regimes.

Let’s get a few things straight. Engagement in statecraft is not about sweet talk. Nor is it based on the illusion that our problems with rogue regimes can be solved if only we would talk to them. Engagement is not normalization, and its goal is not improved relations. It is not akin to détente, working for rapprochement, or appeasement.

So how do you define an engagement strategy? It does require direct talks. There is simply no better way to convey authoritative statements of position or to hear responses. But establishing talks is just a first step. The goal of engagement is to change the other country’s perception of its own interests and realistic options and, hence, to modify its policies and its behavior.

#### The US negotiates with Mexico over a current trade agreement – the US is already in talks with Mexico the plan keeps their best interests – we meet

#### The plan negotiates with Mexico over an economic issue – we meet

#### Engagement directed to a third party but about a target country meets “toward”

Taylor 6 – CJ Taylor, Supreme Court Justice on the Supreme Court of Michigan, “Supreme Court of Michigan. Grievance Administrator, Petitioner-Appellant, v. Geoffrey N. Fieger, Respondent-Appellee”, 7-31, http://faculty.law.wayne.edu/henning/ProfResp/Grievance%20Administrator%20v%20Fieger.pdf

Mr. Fieger next asserts that MRPC 3.5(c) and MRPC 6.5(a) only apply to comments within a courtroom or its immediate environs. We disagree.

MRPC 3.5(c) provides that a lawyer shall not "engage in undignified or discourteous conduct toward the tribunal." (Emphasis added.) We note that the rule does not provide a definition of the word "toward." HN17It is well established that if a term in a court rule is not defined, we interpret the term in accordance with its everyday, plain meaning. See, e.g., People v Petit, 466 Mich. 624, 627; 648 N.W.2d 193 (2002). Random House Webster's [\*251] College Dictionary (1997) lists several definitions of the preposition "toward," including "in the direction of" and "with respect to; as regards."

In light of this definition, we disagree with Mr. Fieger's argument that the rule is inapplicable to his statements because those statements were directed toward an audience and outside a courtroom, and, therefore, not toward a tribunal. Mr. Fieger made remarks about (a) the three judges (b) who comprised the panel (c) that ruled against his client (d) with regard to the [\*\*\*27] content and value of that judgment, (e) which remarks aired on a public broadcast. Even though made outside a courtroom, Mr. Fieger's statements attacked the judges in their capacity as judges and in a forum designed to reach both the public and these judges (who were included among the members of the community who could receive this broadcast). Because such comments were "in the direction of" and "with respect to" these judges, they were necessarily comments made "toward the tribunal."

There is nothing in this phrase "toward the tribunal" that limits the applicability of the rule only to remarks made in a courtroom. 18 Mr. Fieger's construction of the rule would effectively insert the requirement that the [\*252] conduct "actually disrupt the proceeding." Yet this language, which is in the American Bar Association version of this rule, is absent from our rule. Further, if MRPC 3.5(c) applies only when an attorney is in a courtroom, the rule would be largely superfluous, and of little practical utility, given that a court's contempt power, enforceable by fine or incarceration pursuant to MCL 600.1711(1), is always available to restore or maintain order when the [\*\*\*28] offending conduct or remarks occur before the judge in the courtroom.

#### Choice of “toward” is intentional --- reject their unpredictable interpretation

Ector 1879 – P.J. Ector, Judge in the Court of Appeals of Texas, “H. H. Hudson v. The State”, 6 Tex. Ct. App. 565; 1879 Tex. Crim. App. LEXIS 143, Lexis

Mr. Webster, in his Unabridged Dictionary, gives "toward," when used as a preposition, the following meaning, to wit: "Toward--1. In the direction to. 2. With direction to; in a moral sense, with regard to, regarding. [\*576] 3. With ideal tendency to. 4. Nearly." If the Legislature had intended that such insulting words must be used by the deceased to or in the presence of the female, in order to reduce the killing to mynslaughter, [\*\*18] some other word than "towards," and one that would have better expressed the idea, would have been used in the statute. It appears clear to us that, on the plainest principles of justice and reason, it could make no difference, so far as the provocation is concerned in this instance, whether the deceased told the wife of the defendant that she was a prostitute, or her husband that he had married a prostitute. The extent of the transport of passion, to extenuate the guilt of the homicide, would be as great in the one case as in the other. And in every case when such a defence is relied on to reduce the killing to mynslaughter, the jury must be at liberty to determine whether, under all the circumstances, the insulting words were the real cause which provoked the killing. The court did not err in overruling defendant's motion in arrest of judgment.

#### Prefer our interpretation

#### Our interpretation is more predictable – it is about US engagement their interpretation is about foreign policy

#### Intent to define – only defines engagement their interpretation defines foreign policy and investment

#### Inclusive and exclusive – sets a clear brightline for predictable debates

#### They overlimit – only allow for removing embargo affs – every aff requires discussions over the issue of economics

#### Effects T is inevitable – each aff involves a process

#### Default to reasonability – don’t vote negative if we don’t make the debate impossible – hard debate isn’t impossible

## Politics

### Uniqueness – No Pass – Republicans

#### No pass – Republicans won’t budge

Knowlton and Peters 9/29/13 – (Brian and Jeremy, “Time Is Short, but G.O.P. Leaders Say Shutdown Can Be Avoided”, New York Times, <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/09/30/us/politics/time-short-but-gop-leaders-say-shutdown-can-be-avoided.html?_r=0>)

Many veteran Republicans, including the party’s 2008 presidential nominee, Senator John McCain of Arizona, have cautioned that the party would suffer if the government were shut down. But in the House, Speaker John A. Boehner’s move on Saturday to include provisions in the House budget that appeased the most conservative Republicans was seen as a sign that he was again allowing newer and more right-leaning members to control the agenda. Many rank-and-file Republicans remain convinced that the public will not blame them for a shutdown. They cited several reasons the equation had changed since 1996, when a government shutdown helped reverse their party’s fortunes. Part of this confidence comes from the belief that the unpopularity of the Affordable Care Act, which will go into wider effect on Tuesday when people can begin signing up for insurance plans under the law, makes it easier to demand that it be delayed and defunded. They claim a mandate from the public — one that runs far stronger in conservative districts than it does elsewhere. Democrats counter that the program will gain popularity as it begins to take effect, is better understood, and provides real benefits.

### Impact Defense – Government Shutdown

#### No shutdown – House will convene to fund the government

Knowlton and Peters 9/29/13 – (Brian and Jeremy, “Time Is Short, but G.O.P. Leaders Say Shutdown Can Be Avoided”, New York Times, <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/09/30/us/politics/time-short-but-gop-leaders-say-shutdown-can-be-avoided.html?_r=0>)

WASHINGTON — House Republican leaders said on Sunday that they still believed a government shutdown beginning on Tuesday could be averted if Democrats would accept at least some of their demands to scale back President Obama’s health care law. The House's votes all but assured that large parts of the government would be shuttered as of 12:01 a.m. on Tuesday. “I think the House will get back together, in enough time, send another provision not to shut the government down but to fund it, and it will have a few other options in there for the Senate to look at,” Representative Kevin McCarthy, the House Republican whip, said on “Fox News Sunday.” Specifically, Mr. McCarthy mentioned a tax on medical devices that pays for a part of the health care law. The House voted in the early hours of Sunday to rescind the tax and delay the health care law by a year as conditions for financing government operations and avoiding a shutdown. Those measures will be considered by the Senate when it convenes at 2 p.m. on Monday, just 10 hours before a stopgap measure to finance much of the government is set to expire. Senator Harry Reid, the Democratic leader, has said that any bill that alters the president’s signature health care program would be dead on arrival in the upper chamber, although the device tax has critics in both parties and is seen as a possible subject of compromise.

### Bill Bun dling

#### Bill bundling decks any passage- wont be separated

Schreiner 9/17/13

“In Budget Faceoff, Obama Warns of 'Economic Chaos'” Associated Press writer Bruce Schreiner, The Associated Press Sep 17th 2013, http://www.dailyfinance.com/2013/09/17/federal-budget-faceoff-obama-warns-gop-economic-chaos/

Conservative Republicans, on the other hand, say the health care law, which has yet to take full effect, will place a burden on businesses and the public and will damage the economy. As a result, they insist that it be starved of taxpayer money or at least delayed.¶ Chances are fading for a complicated GOP leadership plan that would allow the House to also vote to "defund Obamacare" but automatically separate the measures when delivering them to the Senate to ease the way for quick passage of a "clean" funding measure for delivery to Obama.¶ The next steps aren't clear, but one option under consideration is to accede to conservatives' demands to deliver to the Democratic Senate a combined bill that pays for government and defunds the health care law. The Senate would be virtually certain to strip away the attack on the health care law and bounce the funding measure right back to the House.

### PC Not Key

#### GOP obstructionism makes spillover arguments literally irrelevant

Greg Sargent, Washington Post, 9/17/13, The big story this fall will be the divisions within the GOP, www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/plum-line/wp/2013/09/17/the-big-story-this-fall-will-be-the-divisions-within-the-gop/

Syria will have precisely zero effect on domestic fights over the budget and the debt ceiling. The whole idea is preposterous, and I think everyone knows it. The Republican gridlock freight train has been on track for months and it hasn’t budged an inch since spring. Syria hasn’t had the slightest impact on this.¶ Well, yes, but “everyone” does not “know this.” High profile pundits such as Albert Hunt and Stuart Rothenberg have both suggested Obama’s standing is taking such a hit from the Syria crisis that it could impair his ability to handle domestic politics. Ruth Marcus claims Obama is so diminished that it could have repercussions in the debt limit and government shutdown fights.¶ The only way to sustain this belief is to ignore the reality of what’s happened for the last five years. The notion that Obama’s “standing” will impact the GOP posture towards him is just deeply strange. How could Republicans be any more intransigent towards Obama than they already have been, short of pursuing impeachment?¶ Even a casual glance at what’s happening right now among Republicans — see Jonathan Strong and Robert Costa for good inside views — should be enough to remind anyone that the only thing that will really matter to the outcomes this fall is whether Republicans can resolve their deep internal differences, chiefly over how aggressively to confront Obamacare. Right now, GOP leaders themselves want to pass a measure funding the government — and plainly want to raise the debt ceiling as well. But they can’t see any way to getting that done, even at current austerity levels, solely because conservatives are insisting that they use these things to stage an Apocalyptic confrontation to defund Obamacare. Obama’s standing is utterly irrelevant to any of that.¶ This isn’t to say Obama’s approval rating doesn’t matter at all, or that Obama’s handling of Syria hasn’t been problematic in many ways. It has. But the notion that this will impact his ability to wrest a deal funding the government or raising the debt limit from Republicans seems like an outgrowth of a larger inability — widely shared among commentators — to reckon with the ways in which the current political situation is highly unconventional. GOP obstructionism of Obama’s agenda has in many ways been unprecedented, and the party’s conservative wing is both asymmetrically radical while wielding outsized control over the party, thanks in part to GOP lawmakers’ fear of primary challenges and other structural factors. The main storyline this fall will turn on whether GOP leaders can figure out a way to overcome this, now that it has veered out of their control. Not much else matters.¶ It’s conceivable that if Obama’s approval rating drops it could embolden conservatives in Congress to argue even more vehemently that GOP leaders mustn’t cave to his demands in the government shutdown and debt limit fights. But come on — conservatives are currently demanding that the GOP leadership threaten to unleash economic chaos to force Obama to unilaterally agree to unwind his signature domestic accomplishment, after trying but failing to repeal it dozens of times. To imagine that this could get any worse requires ignoring what’s currently happening all around us. The big story that will shape our overarching political situation in the near future remains the GOP’s internal differences — and the question of whether Republicans will figure out how to resolve them.

### No Impact

#### Err aff---their authors exaggerate

Tom Raum 11, AP, “Record $14 trillion-plus debt weighs on Congress”, Jan 15, <http://www.mercurynews.com/news/ci_17108333?source=rss&nclick_check=1>

Democrats have use doomsday rhetoric about a looming government shutdown and comparing the U.S. plight to financial crises in Greece and Portugal. It's all a bit of a stretch. "We can't do as the Gingrich crowd did a few years ago, close the government," said Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.), referring to government shutdowns in 1995 when Georgia Republican Newt Gingrich was House speaker. But those shutdowns had nothing to do with the debt limit. They were caused by failure of Congress to appropriate funds to keep federal agencies running. And there are many temporary ways around the debt limit. Hitting it does not automatically mean a default on existing debt. It only stops the government from new borrowing, forcing it to rely on other ways to finance its activities. In a 1995 debt-limit crisis, Treasury Secretary Robert Rubin borrowed $60 billion from federal pension funds to keep the government going. It wasn't popular, but it helped get the job done. A decade earlier, James Baker, President Ronald Reagan's treasury secretary, delayed payments to the Civil Service and Social Security trust funds and used other bookkeeping tricks to keep money in the federal till. Baker and Rubin "found money in pockets no one knew existed before," said former congressional budget analyst Stanley Collender. Collender, author of "Guide to the Federal Budget," cites a slew of other things the government can do to delay a crisis. They include leasing out government-owned properties, "the federal equivalent of renting out a room in your home," or slowing down payments to government contractors. Now partner-director of Qorvis Communications, a Washington consulting firm, Collender said such stopgap measures buy the White House time to resist GOP pressure for concessions. "My guess is they can go months after the debt ceiling is not raised and still be able to come up with the cash they need. But at some point, it will catch up," and raising the debt limit will become an imperative, he suggested.

#### Treasury fills in – causing debt to decline now

Lefkin 13

[Peter, Senior Vice President of Government and External Affairs for Allianz of North America, “Round 2 of the Debt-Ceiling Debate,” Allianz Global, 5/21, <http://us.allianzgi.com/Commentary/MarketInsights/Pages/5QuestionswithPeterLefkin.aspx>]

The May 19 debt-ceiling deadline wasn’t all that eventful because, true to form, Congress once again kicked the can down the road. We’re probably not going to see any movement until after the summer. For now, the national debt is declining: The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that the deficit this year will be $642 billion, more than $200 billion less than it expected three months ago. With higher revenue, the United States will be able to take steps to stave off the $16.4 trillion debt limit until September, and maybe even later if Freddie Mac and Fannie Mae continue to make money and bring the Treasury additional revenue. The Treasury Department is using some of the traditional tools in its arsenal to meet liabilities such as postponing pension-reserve payments, suspending government bond sales and deploying an array of accounting gimmicks It’s also tapping. Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac bailout reimbursements. There’s new revenue coming in from higher taxes, Fannie and Freddie and the spending cuts triggered by the sequester. But it isn’t that much money in the grand scheme of things. Half of the $85 billion under sequestration was never going to be spent. And the $60 billion in tax revenue from upper-income individuals under the fiscal-cliff legislation was equal to the amount earmarked for Superstorm Sandy relief efforts. It’s relatively insignificant in the context of the bigger deficit problem.

### 2ac – link non-unique

#### Link has been triggered – Obama announced the plan

Feldmyn 8/9/13 – (Elliot, “United States: TPP, TTIP, And Congress: The Elephant In The Room”, Mondaq, http://www.mondaq.com/unitedstates/x/257058/international+trade+investment/TPP+TTIP+And+Congress+The+Elephant+In+The+Room)

The Washington trade policy community is buzzing over the two largest international trade negotiations since the effective collapse of the Doha multilateral trade round. The buzz may be even louder in foreign capitals. The Obama Administration, in mid-July, was still promising to complete the Trans Pacific Partnership ("TPP") negotiations by year-end, while starting up the Trans-Atlantic Trade and Investment Partnership ("TTIP") negotiations with similar speedy objectives. For both deals there is engagement and enthusiasm. Inside U.S. Trade, the trade community's weekly Bible, devoted over thirty pages, all but one article in a recent edition, to these negotiations.

### 2ac – no link – TTIP

#### No link – trade doesn’t face opposition

Llana 7/8/13 – (Sara Miller, “Will US-EU trade talks spur growth - or show globalization's limits?”, CSM, http://www.csmonitor.com/World/Europe/2013/0708/Will-US-EU-trade-talks-spur-growth-or-show-globalization-s-limits)//javi

So far TTIP has not generated widespread controversy in the US. That might be because it’s still early days. But it’s also because of the nature of the deal, says Charles Kupchan, a transatlantic expert at the Council on Foreign Relations in Washington. “Since trade is relatively free and since [the US] and the EU are at similar stages of development, this is not a deal that is going to cause major dislocation,” he says. “This is an easier sell politically.” Opposition might be stronger on the European side. Already the French sought to invoke the so-called “cultural exception” in the talks, as a way to protect its movie industry from an incursion from Hollywood. France ultimately agreed to allow media to be included in talks so that they could officially launch, but it will be among the most difficult issues to negotiate.

### 2ac – Link Turn – Bipart

#### The plan is bipartisan- no backlash and different from other trade agreements

Schott and Cimino 13- Jeffrey J. is a senior fellow at the Peterson Institute for International Economics, joined the Institute in 1983. Cathleen Cimino has been research analyst at the Peterson Institute for International Economics since 2012

To be sure, disagreements over these issues have confounded transatlantic officials for almost two decades. One of the reasons for past failures has been that negotiators tried to break down barriers in a piecemeal fashion. Attempts to achieve limited “mutual recognition” deals on specific products or sectors foundered because of strong resistance from independent regulatory agencies pressing their own agendas in response to political pressures. Trying to reach a more comprehensive deal offers the oportunity to garner sufficient political support to off set those political obstacles. Indeed, Max Baucus, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, emphasized this point in a recent Financial Times op-ed, noting that “any bilateral trade and investment agreement must be comprehensive and address the full range of barriers to US goods and services if it is to receive broad, bipartisan congressional support.” 4 One way to avoid past mistakes and indeed to overcome the understandable skepticism of many would be for the two sides to learn from the success of several recent comprehensive bilateral free trade agreements (FTAs)—most notably the accords that the European Union and the United States each have with South Korea. These two agreements successfully liberalized trade and investment in goods and services in a manner that shows a path to success for the TTIP, which as we discuss below, is essentially what the HLWG has recommended. If the United States and the European Union follow this path, they could achieve a transatlantic accord in the next few years that both contributes to stronger economic growth and establishes a 21st century rulebook for trade that can provide a benchmark for new regional and multilateral trade agreements.

### Hirsch

#### Political capital theory not true—and if the plan causes a fight it means Obama will get to pass more legislation—winning wins

Hirsh, 2013

[Michael, national journal chief correspondent, There’s No Such Thing as Political Capital, 3-30-13, http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207] /Wyo-MB

But the abrupt emergence of the immigration and gun-control issues illustrates how suddenly shifts in mood can occur and how political interests can align in new ways just as suddenly. Indeed, the pseudo-concept of political capital masks a larger truth about Washington that is kindergarten simple: You just don’t know what you can do until you try. Or as Ornstein himself once wrote years ago, “Winning wins.” In theory, and in practice, depending on Obama’s handling of any particular issue, even in a polarized time, he could still deliver on a lot of his second-term goals, depending on his skill and the breaks. Unforeseen catalysts can appear, like Newtown. Epiphanies can dawn, such as when many Republican Party leaders suddenly woke up in panic to the huge disparity in the Hispanic vote.¶ Some political scientists who study the elusive calculus of how to pass legislation and run successful presidencies say that political capital is, at best, an empty concept, and that almost nothing in the academic literature successfully quantifies or even defines it. “It can refer to a very abstract thing, like a president’s popularity, but there’s no mechanism there. That makes it kind of useless,” says Richard Bensel, a government professor at Cornell University. Even Ornstein concedes that the calculus is far more complex than the term suggests. Winning on one issue often changes the calculation for the next issue; there is never any known amount of capital. “The idea here is, if an issue comes up where the conventional wisdom is that president is not going to get what he wants, and he gets it, then each time that happens, it changes the calculus of the other actors” Ornstein says. “If they think he’s going to win, they may change positions to get on the winning side. It’s a bandwagon effect.”

## Counterplan

#### Perm do both

### 2ac – biotech

#### Trade catalyzes biotech innovation — that spreads globally and establishes an international model

SDD 7 — San Diego Dialogue, a division of University of California San Diego Extension, contributing to the advancement of research, relationships and solutions to the San Diego-Baja California crossborder region's long-term challenges in innovation, economy, health and education. As a part of the University of California, San Diego (UCSD), Division of Extended Studies and Public Programs, the Dialogue is an entirely self-funded public policy organization (San Diego Dialogue, *Crossborder Group Inc.*, June 2007, “Borderless Biotech & Mexico’s Emerging Life Sciences Industry”, <http://www.sandiegodialogue.org/pdfs/Borderless_Biotech.pdf>, Accessed 07-26-2013 | AK)

This document is yet another part of a continuing effort to describe Mexico’s evolution in technology and science. Clearly, certain intriguing crossborder opportunities appear to exist in the case of life sciences – whether in ag-biotech, biocontrols, genomics research, pharmaceutical manufacturing, medical devices, or clinical trials. While all of Mexico cannot expect to immediately become a world-leader in all areas of this sector, its history already shows examples of regional genius and connections with California’s biotech and pharmaceutical industries. The question remains: can this history be expanded upon - and will it include San Diego? Given that San Diego has the largest concentration of US-based biotechnology firms along the US-Mexico border and one of the largest in the United States, there is a strong case and a unique opportunity to work with the dynamic regions that make up Mexico’s emerging life sciences industry. Direct flights from both San Diego’s or Tijuana’s airports to these regions provides access that few other locations in the United States can take advantage of. The broad use of English by many of Mexico’s technology leaders eliminates yet another barrier to increased interaction, scientific collaboration, and possibly investment. Such an opportunity, first discussed in Borderless Innovation, can help act as a catalyst for both increasing multi-regional competitiveness in life science companies, as well as accelerate Mexico’s growth in this sector. Just as the strength of a helix is based on the connections between its components, so too the potential for San Diego to become both a portal and a partner for Mexico's emerging life sciences regions creates opportunities for each side of the crossborder region. Joining together the talent and capabilities of San Diego, Guanajuato, Jalisco, Morelos, Nuevo León, and Baja California in the development of a life sciences partnership may create a unique, international model that goes beyond borders. Ultimately, such a partnership might also extend to many other regions – in the US, Mexico, Canada, Europe and Asia – supporting new job growth, new discoveries, and a world of borderless biotech.

#### Biotech is dual-use--deters nuclear and biological warfare

Carafano and Gudgel 7

(James Jay, Ph.D., is Assistant Director of the Kathryn and Shelby Cullom Davis Institute for International Studies and Senior Research Fellow for National Security. Andrew, freelance writer. “

Many of biotechnology's benefits are dual-use, increasing the possibility that knowledge, skills, and equipment could be adapted for use as biological weap­ons. As the global biotechnology industry expands, the U.S. government should therefore increase its capacity to exploit biotech advances for national security. The challenge of exploiting cutting-edge biotech­nology will be different from the way the Pentagon harnessed science and technology for national security during the Cold War. Rather than driving the biotech­nology revolution, the federal government will need to figure out how best to utilize and adapt the prod­ucts developed by a multibillion-dollar transnational industry that already has the money and capacity for research and development. To keep up, the federal government must adopt legislative, policy, and organizational innovations. These should include promoting international liability protection for developing and deploying new national security goods and services, promoting scientific travel and exchanges, and assigning a lead agency to coordinate biotechnology exploitation for national security. From There to Here Biotechnology refers to any technological appli­cation that uses living organisms to make or modify products for explicit use, specifically through DNA recombination and tissue culture. Gregor Mendel first described the role of genes through his research on "dominant and recessive factors" in the 1860s. By the 1940s, scientists were aware of DNA, and James Watson, Francis Crick, and Rosalind Frank­lin modeled its structure in the 1950s. In 1970, the discovery of enzymes, which break apart and connect snippets of DNA, allowed for the creation of genetically modified organisms. This bore fruit by the early 1980s, when scientists myn­aged to genetically modify bacteria to produce humyn insulin, which is now the principal source of insulin for diabetics.[1] Recently, major advances in information technol­ogies have led to the development of bioinformat­ics.[2] Bioinformatics focused initially on creating and storing biological and genetic information, most notably in the Humyn Genome Project. Scientists are now combining this information into a compre­hensive picture, enabling researchers to study how different diseases alter these activities. Combining advances in genomics and information technology has significantly enhanced the industry's capability to bring new products to the marketplace. Many of the advancements in biotechnology are dual-use. The technology that may revolution­ize medical care by providing faster-acting and more effective drugs could also be used to field more lethal biological weapons. Thus, federal agen­cies have a clear imperative not only to exploit the advantages of new developments, but also to anticipate and prepare countermeasures for how potential adversaries might exploit these medical advances. Current Research Much of the current biotech research focuses on agent detection, vaccines, and treatment. Scientists are studying the immune systems of primitive organ­isms, such as jawless fish, to garner greater under­standing of the humyn immune system and to develop new antibody therapies.[3] They are also studying how diseases infect and affect humyn cells. For example, recent research indicates that the fam­ily of bacteria that includes bubonic plague blocks immune system responses using a protein related to one naturally found in humyns.[4] Scientists are also investigating ways to create vaccines that work against whole classes of disease-causing organisms and to boost the humyn immune system in general.[5] Research is also underway to counter the rise of multidrug-resistant bacteria. Scientists are investi­gating the use of bacteriophages, which are viruses that prey on bacteria, as a means to fight infectious disease. Ironically, research on bacteriophages began in the early 20th century but declined after the discovery of antibiotics. In the summer of 2006, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration approved the use of a bacteriophage preparation on meat as an anti-microbial agent against Lysteria bacteria.[6] Better vaccines and treatments could provide permynent immunity to all "classic" biological agents or at least reduce their lethality to a consid­erable degree. In October 2006, the Institute for Soldier Nanotechnologies at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology announced the develop­ment of microscopic pumps that would allow rapid testing of blood and other fluids by pumping them into a "lab on a chip," which would detect biological or chemical agents.[7] Argonne National Laboratory is also developing its own biochip detection technology.[8] This "lab on a chip" research points to the feasibility of rapid bio­logical agent detection, allowing individuals to know whether they have been exposed within minutes rather than days. It may even be possible to develop implantable biosensor chips that would continu­ously monitor for exposure to biological agents.[9] The Future of Biotechnology Future advances in biotechnology will continue to improve the protection of both the general public and military personnel from deadly biological agents. The creation of broad-spectrum vaccines may give the public health community the ability to vaccinate the country's entire population against both endemic diseases and biological weapons. A bioweapon inoculation may someday be as com­mon as other childhood vaccinations. Besides disease detection and vaccines, biotech­nology has numerous other potential applications. The military is exploring the use of biomimicry, which uses natural biological systems or material as an inspiration for solving engineering problems. For example: In 2002, scientists discovered how geckos stick themselves to smooth surfaces using van der Waal's forces-the weak natural attraction between atoms-and were then able to re-create the surface of a gecko's foot artificially.[10] The Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency is researching devices that mimic geckos' use of van der Waals force to enable soldiers to climb buildings without ropes or ladders.[11] Scientists are also researching spider silk and abalone shell to create stronger, lighter armor for personnel and vehicles. Other projects include developing organic solar cells and a new generation of sensors and optics derived from biological and silicon-based systems.[12] The next great step in biotechnology is proteom­ics: the direct mynipulation and construction of proteins. While DNA instructs cellular mechanisms in how to operate, proteins do the actual work inside and outside of cells. Proteins are found in everything from papayas to snake venom. Because protein structure and composition is much more complex than DNA, protein analysis is much more difficult and time-consuming. However, under­standing how proteins are constructed and how they behave promises to be as great an advance in biological science as understanding DNA was in the 20th century. If advances in biotechnology continue, con­structing a completely artificial organism from the "ground up"-creating synthetic DNA and proteins from raw materials and then combining them to form living cells-may be possible in the not too distant future. National Security and Biotechnology The challenge for the federal government is to figure out how to leverage cutting-edge biotechnol­ogy for national security purposes. Before 2001, the Department of Defense (DOD) was the primary arm of the federal government in funding biological defense and research related to national security. The DOD research program focused primarily on the battlefield uses of biotechnology. The events of 9/11 and the post-9/11 anthrax let­ters shifted the focus to the American people's vul­nerability to biological threats. In many respects, the DOD research was not directly applicable to other biodefense national security needs. For exam­ple, DOD immunization programs assume that the individuals to be immunized will be generally healthy and young. On the other hand, immuniza­tions for a general population in the event of biolog­ical weapons attack would have to consider the effects of vaccines on old and young people and on individuals with medical conditions who might have weakened or compromised immune systems and react very differently to a vaccine developed by the military. To apply research to broader national security concerns, the National Institutes of Health (NIH) under the Department of Health and Humyn Ser­vices (HHS) received the bulk of increased funding for developing biodefense measures.[13] In recent years, in addition to HHS and DOD, many other fed­eral agencies have initiated biotechnology research related to national security, including the recently established Department of Homeland Security (DHS). While much of the research in DOD, HHS, and other federal entities involves detecting, protect­ing against, and mitigating biological attacks and pandemics, it also involves other products related to national security, including humyn performynce enhancement (such as reducing the effects of stress and fatigue) and battlefield medical treatment. There is a plethora of ongoing programs. The Pentagon has considerable experience and capacity for medical research and development of products related to national security, but this is vir­tually a new mission for the NIH, which historically has focused on basic scientific research.[14] The U.S. Army Medical Research Institute for Infectious Dis­eases has unique research facilities and expertise in biowarfare defense. On the other hand, the DOD's record with respect to developing and producing vaccines has engendered significant controversy. The post-9/11 expansion of the government application of biotechnology to national security has not been matched by organizational innova­tions to manage and integrate programs more effec­tively. DOD, DHS, and NIH research programs are not routinely coordinated, and NIH policies pro­hibit funding other federal institutions. Thus, NIH programs cannot utilize DOD scientists who may have valuable knowledge and experience relevant to NIH national security research. In some cases, government-sponsored research duplicates other programs, and opportunities for complementary research programs are missed.[15] Enlisting the Private Sector Harnessing the vast capabilities of the private sector has proven similarly challenging. Compared to potential commercial buyers, the government is a modest-sized customer for biotech firms. There are also other issues. After 9/11, insurance skyrocketed for technologies developed for homeland security. While the demand for new security technologies has swelled, companies must weigh the pressure to rush new products to the marketplace against their liability risks. In 2002, Congress enacted the Support Anti-Terrorism by Fostering Effective Technologies (SAFETY) Act[16] to encourage companies to con­tinue researching and developing biotechnologies vital to homeland security. The act protects compa­nies from litigation if their products fail during a ter­rorist attack or are harmfully employed by terrorists. The DHS has shown some success in implementing the legislation and granting SAFETY Act protections to goods and services that are employed to prevent or respond to terrorist threats. However, companies do not enjoy similar protec­tions from other countries when the technologies are deployed outside the United States or adopted by U.S. friends and allies. The government also has a mixed record in encouraging the private sector to develop new national security capabilities. In 2004, the President announced the implementation of Project Bioshield to accelerate research on and development, pur­chase, and availability of effective medical counter­measures against biological, chemical, radiological, and nuclear agents. The program provided $6 bil­lion over the next 10 years to private companies for research and development of next-generation coun­termeasures against anthrax, smallpox, and other infectious agents and antidotes against chemical and radiological threats. To date, the effort has yielded meager results.[17] The response to 9/11 has introduced another dif­ficulty in advancing biotechnology research in the United States. After the terrorist attacks on New York and Washington, the United States imposed a number of additional requirements on visa issuance and monitoring to thwart travel by terrorists. These measures included more rigorous registration and monitoring of foreign graduate students, myndatory interviews of all overseas visa applicants, and requiring visa holders to return to their countries of origin to renew their visas. These measures have had unintended conse­quences, including deterring top graduate students from coming to the United States, making scientific exchanges more difficult, and even prompting com­panies and academic and scientific associations to move meetings, conferences, and research facilities outside of the United States. As a result, the United States has become less competitive in many key sci­entific areas, including biotechnology.[18] Moving Forward The United States has no room for complacency. Without better policies, programs, and manage­ment, it risks losing its competitive advantage in exploiting biotechnology for national security. Con­gress and the Administration should act to set the right conditions for the government to adopt com­mercial biotechnology developments. Specifically, they should: Restructure national security biotechnology programs. While increased funding has trans­formed it into the leading federal agency in bio­security research, the NIH is inexperienced and unproven in its ability to develop products. Like­wise, the DHS has yet to demonstrate that it can produce cutting-edge biotechnology advances. Conversely, the DOD has significant experience and skills in developing biodefense countermeasures. To the maximum extent possible, research pro­grams should be consolidated under a single agency. Where consolidation is not practical, a more effective management structure is needed to leverage the advice and expertise in different agencies in support of NIH programs.[19] Encourage other countries to adopt SAFETY Act protections. While the SAFETY Act has been successfully implemented in the United States, it does not protect companies from litiga­tion abroad. Consequently, companies that oper­ate outside of the United States have shied away from contributing to biosecurity because of the potential risks. The Administration should develop a strategy to encourage other countries to adapt similar pro­tections. The U.S. strategy should take a regional approach, beginning with the European Union and Japan. Reform visa issuance and management. U.S. national security and competitiveness rely heavily on people's ability to travel to the United States, but the current visa system is unnecessarily depriving the United States of many of the world's best and brightest scientists, students, and entre­preneurs. Long wait times for personal interviews are among the most frequently cited factors that make travel to the United States difficult. Congress should remove the requirement for per­sonal interviews of virtually all non-immigration visa applicants and restore the Secretary of State's ability to waive personal interview requirements. The U.S. should begin using electronic visa appli­cations to reduce applicants' travel expenses and should reduce processing times to 30 days or less. All of these reforms can be implemented in a mynner that makes international travel both more convenient and more secure.[20] Making the Nation Safer Dual-use biotechnologies developed in the pri­vate sector offer powerful tools to protect Americans from biological threats and to increase the military's operational capabilities. Congress and the Adminis­tration should not only be aware of this growing field, but also act to ensure that the private sector- which is making the largest investment in basic research and product development-remains com­petitive. Specifically, the U.S. government should streamline the federal government's capability to fund and adapt new technologies, work to expand litigation protection beyond the country's borders, and further reform U.S. visa issuance and monitor­ing programs.

### 2ac – cybersecurity add-on

#### Plan is key to cyber security cooperation and upgrades

Ukraine General Newswire, 13 – (8-31, “U.S., Baltic states reaffirm commitment to Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership talks” nexis)djm

The U.S., Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania reaffirmed their commitment to strengthening their relations by jointly expanding trade ties "in pursuit of economic prosperity, enhancing strategic cooperation to address global security challenges, and advancing democracy and humyn rights around the world." "Recognizing the benefits and risks of our increasing dependence on information technology and cyberspace, we will strengthen our engagement on cyber issues regionally and globally. We will seek to advance the cybersecurity of critical infrastructure in the region through public/private cooperation," it says. "We will continue to cooperate in the investigation and prosecution of cybercrimes. We will strive to advance our shared vision of internet freedom by engaging with other countries, international organizations, civil society, and the private sector. Our efforts support a common goal: an open, interoperable, secure, and reliable Internet that protects privacy and civil liberties, enables the free flow of information and ideas, and promotes the innovation essential to modern economies," the statement says.

#### Retaliation to cyber-attack escalates to global nuclear war

Lawson 9 (Sean - assistant professor in the Department of Communication at the University of Utah, Cross-Domain Response to Cyber Attacks and the Threat of Conflict, , 5/13/2009, http://www.seanlawson.net/?p=477 )

At a time when it seems impossible to avoid the seemingly growing hysteria over the threat of cyber war,[1] network security expert Marcus Ranum delivered a refreshing talk recently, “The Problem with Cyber War,” that took a critical look at a number of the assumptions underlying contemporary cybersecurity discourse in the United States. He addressed one issue in partiuclar that I would like to riff on here, the issue of conflict escalation–i.e. the possibility that offensive use of cyber attacks could escalate to the use of physical force. As I will show, his concerns are entirely legitimate as current U.S. military cyber doctrine assumes the possibility of what I call “cross-domain responses” to cyberattacks. Backing Your Adversary (Mentally) into a Corner Based on the premise that completely blinding a potential adversary is a good indicator to that adversary that an attack is iminent, Ranum has argued that “The best thing that you could possibly do if you want to start World War III is launch a cyber attack. [...] When people talk about cyber war like it’s a practical thing, what they’re really doing is messing with the OK button for starting World War III. We need to get them to sit the f-k down and shut the f-k up.” [2] He is making a point similar to one that I have made in the past: Taking away an adversary’s ability to make rational decisions could backfire. [3] For example, Gregory Witol cautions that “attacking the decision maker’s ability to perform rational calculations may cause more problems than it hopes to resolveÃ¢â‚¬Â¦ Removing the capacity for rational action may result in completely unforeseen consequences, including longer and bloodier battles than may otherwise have been.” [4] Ã¯Â»Â¿Cross-Domain Response So, from a theoretical standpoint, I think his concerns are well founded. But the current state of U.S. policy may be cause for even greater concern. It’s not just worrisome that a hypothetical blinding attack via cyberspace could send a signal of imminent attack and therefore trigger an irrational response from the adversary. What is also cause for concern is that current U.S. policy indicates that “kinetic attacks” (i.e. physical use of force) are seen as potentially legitimate responses to cyber attacks. Most worrisome is that current U.S. policy implies that a nuclear response is possible, something that policy makers have not denied in recent press reports. The reason, in part, is that the U.S. defense community has increasingly come to see cyberspace as a “domain of warfare” equivalent to air, land, sea, and space. The definition of cyberspace as its own domain of warfare helps in its own right to blur the online/offline, physical-space/cyberspace boundary. But thinking logically about the potential consequences of this framing leads to some disconcerting conclusions. If cyberspace is a domain of warfare, then it becomes possible to define “cyber attacks” (whatever those may be said to entail) as acts of war. But what happens if the U.S. is attacked in any of the other domains? It retaliates. But it usually does not respond only within the domain in which it was attacked. Rather, responses are typically “cross-domain responses”–i.e. a massive bombing on U.S. soil or vital U.S. interests abroad (e.g. think 9/11 or Pearl Harbor) might lead to air strikes against the attacker. Even more likely given a U.S. military “way of warfare” that emphasizes multidimensional, “joint” operations is a massive conventional (i.e. non-nuclear) response against the attacker in all domains (air, land, sea, space), simultaneously. The possibility of “kinetic action” in response to cyber attack, or as part of offensive U.S. cyber operations, is part of the current (2006) National Military Strategy for Cyberspace Operations [5]: (U) Kinetic Actions. DOD will conduct kinetic missions to preserve freedom of action and strategic advantage in cyberspace. Kinetic actions can be either offensive or defensive and used in conjunction with other mission areas to achieve optimal military effects. Of course, the possibility that a cyber attack on the U.S. could lead to a U.S. nuclear reply constitutes possibly the ultimate in “cross-domain response.” And while this may seem far fetched, it has not been ruled out by U.S. defense policy makers and is, in fact, implied in current U.S. defense policy documents. From the National Military Strategy of the United States (2004): “The term WMD/E relates to a broad range of adversary capabilities that pose potentially devastating impacts. WMD/E includes chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, and enhanced high explosive weapons as well as other, more asymmetrical ‘weapons’. They may rely more on disruptive impact than destructive kinetic effects. For example, cyber attacks on US commercial information systems or attacks against transportation networks may have a greater economic or psychological effect than a relatively small release of a lethal agent.” [6] The authors of a 2009 National Academies of Science report on cyberwarfare respond to this by saying, “Coupled with the declaratory policy on nuclear weapons described earlier, this statement implies that the United States will regard certain kinds of cyberattacks against the United States as being in the same category as nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons, and thus that a nuclear response to certain kinds of cyberattacks (namely, cyberattacks with devastating impacts) may be possible. It also sets a relevant scale–a cyberattack that has an impact larger than that associated with a relatively small release of a lethal agent is regarded with the same or greater seriousness.” [7]

### 2ac- Space

#### Plan is key to Florida Econ

McGurgan 9/25- Kevin, Tampa Bay Times, (“Column: Free trade's boost for Florida”, September 25, 2013 http://www.tampabay.com/opinion/columns/column-free-trades-boost-for-florida/2143880\\CLans)

Realizing this, the United States and the European Union, the group of trading nations of which the United Kingdom is a leading member, have negotiated a deal to reduce or remove as many barriers as possible. The first round of negotiations has already taken place, and we hope to reach agreement within the next 18 months. We are calling it the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership, or TTIP for short. The United States and the EU are the two largest economies in the world, with a combined value of around $30 trillion. U.S.-EU trade is worth $2.5 billion every day, one third of all world trade, and it's increasing all the time. A million jobs in the United States depend on trade with Britain alone. They tend to be good, well-paid jobs, with salaries above the U.S. average. So we always knew that the boost to our economies from freeing up trade was going to be large. What we didn't know, until recently, was how each individual state would benefit. Now the results are in. A September 2013 study by the British Embassy in Washington, Bertelsmann Foundation and the Atlantic Council finds that TTIP could add more than 740,000 jobs to the U.S. economy as a whole — that's the equivalent of the entire working population of West Virginia. The average American household would stand to gain around $865 every year as a result of lower prices and higher average wages. You can find the study, which was just released, online at www.gov.uk and tinyurl.com/tbtimes-UK. But what does this mean for Florida, already one of the most pro-free trade states in the union? Florida already exports $6.1 billion worth of goods and $9.3 billion worth of services to the EU. The predictions are good. The study projects that a U.S.-EU trade deal could add as many as 47,540 jobs to the Florida job market and boost Florida's exports to Europe by 26.9 percent. Many of those export gains will be realized in aerospace, transportation and chemicals, while the largest job increases should be seen in business and financial services. I believe that's good news for the Tampa Bay area and Florida as a whole. Tampa is already home to major British companies such as BAE Systems, British Airways World Cargo and the medical device company of Smith and Nephew. The strategic investments you are making in ports, infrastructure, workforce and research at quality universities such as the University of South Florida, aligned with this trade deal, will continue to make Tampa Bay an attractive and competitive place to invest in and do business with. Beyond the economics, the study also represents a key strategic opportunity for the United States and the EU. As a diplomat who has spent one-third of his career living in the United States, I believe that an ambitious game-changing agreement has the potential to send a powerful message to the rest of the world regarding the trans-Atlantic commitment to global rules and standards in international trade. These numbers show that free trade is not just an idea. It has real benefits, both for business and for hard-working people. And that's why Floridians, and all Americans, should be excited about this deal.

#### That’s key to effective space missions

Kinsey 12- Troy, Report for WCTV News Agency (“Florida's Space Industry Struggles to Survive” http://www.wctv.tv/news/headlines/Floridas\_Space\_Industry\_Struggles\_to\_Survive\_149179995.html\\CLans)

For 50 years, it's been a critical part of Florida's economy. But now our space industry is struggling to survive. The retirement of the shuttle program has left thousands of workers jobless. And, it's also called into question whether Florida's days as America's pre-eminent space state are over. After 30 years and more than 130 missions, the space shuttle program has disappeared into history. And now the talent, technology and patriotism that helped drive it may be in jeopardy of disappearing, too. Tim pickens works at dynetics, a NASA contractor in Huntsville, Alabama. He's committed to reviving Florida's space industry, not least because his company depends on it. Now that manned missions launching from Cape Canaveral are no more...He says it'll be up to a handful of private space flight companies to help inspire a national movement. "People are going to say, 'NASA, what's the vision? Where are we going?' and then, they need to be looking at air breathing technology, you know, hypersonics, and you know, 'how do i get my ride from New York to LA In 15 minutes?' Pickens says only the government can pioneer that kind of technology, and if enough people ask for it, Washington will pay for it. But, there's no guarantee manned launches will return to Florida. That's why Farrukh Alvi spearheads a research hub aimed at using space technology in other ways. "I suspect that Florida will not be the only one that's going to be launching things - Texas, New Mexico and others. But, you need to have a more diverse economy, so even if it's very successful, you do not want to just invest in there - you need to diversify." Areas like green energy and biotech - they could be a big part of america's economic future. And, in the end, blasting off from Texas and New Mexico may not be possible...Because of Florida.

#### Extinction is inevitable – laundry list – deep-space exploration key to solve

**Poston, 12**\*Ph.D. in Nuclear Engineering from the University of Michigan, leader of the Space Fission Power Team at Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL)\*

[David Poston, . 16 continuous years of experience in the field of space nuclear power and is currently the nuclear design lead for all LANL space reactor projects. Dr. Poston received a BS in Mechanical Engineering the University of Michigan, an MS in Mechanical Engineering from Stanford University, an MS in Nuclear Engineering from the University of California at Berkeley, and a“Space Nuclear Power: Fission Reactors”, <http://spacenuke.blogspot.com/2012/02/space-fission-power-post-1-we-need-to.html>’]

Viability and Preservation.¶The all-or-nothing benefit of space exploration is the long-term survivalof the human race; although the extended timeframe of this benefit makes it very hard to quantify.We know that our life on Earth is finite, but the preservation benefit of sustained civilization outside of the Earth could range from enormous to miniscule depending on whether viability of human life on Earth ends in <1 thousand years or >1 billion years. There is a long list of potential calamities that could end human civilization, including asteroid/comet, super-virus, excess volcanism, socioeconomic collapse,environmental changes, weapons of mass destruction, ormaybe something we’ve never envisioned. Some of these initiating events can be mitigated or prevented as a result ofspace exploration; most notablythe ability to deflect or destroy a potential extinction causing asteroid or comet. The ability to deflect an asteroid could actually be developed within a decadeusing existing technology, the question is would we have enough warning time to successfully develop and deploy it. Space exploration could also uncover currentlyunknown threats, such as looming changes in the behavior of the sun, or maybe astronomical threats such as nearby black holes,supernovae, darkmatter, orsomething our current understanding of physics is not aware of.¶The ultimate defense against human extinctionwould be to establish permanent, self-sustaining colonies of humans beyond the Earth. The path to this type of existence does not require a huge leap in science and technology; most engineers agree that abundant, reliable energy (probably nuclear) isthe key to expanding into space. In the near term (decades) exploration could focus on where and how to develop sustainable communities away from the earth, includingquasi-sustainable outposts on the moon and Mars. In the mid-term (centuries) sustainable outposts could be created on Mars, Titan, asteroids, etc. that could beconsidered planetary lifeboats, as a safeguard against major calamities that could end human civilization. In the long term (millennia), the concept of the “planetary lifeboat” could transform to a “celestial Mayflower”, taking us to new worlds outside of our solar system. The benefits of this scenario are not limited to merely saving the human race.Even if humanity continues to thrive on Earth, there would be the possibility for a nearly unlimited number of humans to experience existence (in addition to the increased population that Earth could support by importing resources) and expand the extent of human condition (e.g. well-being, knowledge, and enlightenment). If new opportunities and experiences emerge, people will migrate to them, just as they did to the New World ~500 years ago.¶

### 2ac – US Civil War

**Mexican instability spills over to the US, sparking civil war.**

Steven **David 99**, professor of political science at Johns Hopkins University, January/February, Foreign Affairs, p. lexis

CONFLICTS FOUGHT within the borders of a single state send shock waves far beyond their frontiers. To begin with, internal wars risk destroying assets the United States needs. Were the Persian Gulf oil fields destroyed in a Saudi civil war, the American economy (and those of the rest of the developed world) would suffer severely. Internal wars can also unleash threats that stable governments formerly held in check. As central governments weaken and fall, weapons of mass destruction may fall into the hands of rogue leaders or anti-American factions. More directly, internal wars endanger American citizens living and traveling abroad. Liberia will not be the last place America sends helicopters to rescue its stranded citizens. Finally, internal wars, when they erupt on U.S. borders, threaten to destabilize America itself. U.S. intervention in Haiti was spurred, in large part, by fear of the flood of refugees poised to enter the United States. All of these dangers are grave enough to warrant consideration; what makes them even more serious is the fact that their impact on America is largely unintended. Being unintended, the spill-off effects of civil wars are not easily deterred, which creates unique challenges to American interests. U.S. policymakers have traditionally tried to sway foreign leaders through a simple formula: ensure that the benefits of defying America are outweighed by the punishment that the United States will inflict if defied. That calculus, however, no longer applies when there is no single, rational government in place to deter. This raises the cost to America; if the United States (or any country) cannot deter a threat, it must turn to actual self-defense or preemption instead. Unlike deterrence, these strategies are enormously difficult to carry out and in some cases (such as preventing the destruction of the Saudi oil fields) would be impossible. Without deterrence as a policy option, Washington loses its most effective means of safeguarding its interests. Where are these new threats likely to crop up? And which should the United States be concerned with? Two criteria must guide policymakers in answering these questions. First is the actual likelihood of civil war in any particular state. American interests would be endangered by a war in Canada, but the prospect is so improbable it can safely be ignored. Second is the impact of a civil war on the United States; would it threaten vital American security and economic concerns? Future conflict in Sierra Leone may be plausible, but it would have such a negligible impact on the United States that it does not justify much attention. Only three countries, in fact, meet both criteria: Mexico, Saudi Arabia, and Russia. Civil conflict in Mexico would produce waves of disorder that would spill into the United States, endangering the lives of hundreds of thousands of Americans, destroying a valuable export market, and sending a torrent of refugees northward. A rebe8llion in Saudi Arabia could destroy its ability to export oil, the oil on which the industrialized world depends. And internal war in Russia could devastate Europe and trigger the use of nuclear weapons. Of course, civil war in a cluster of other states could seriously harm American interests. These countries include Indonesia, Venezuela, the Philippines, Egypt, Turkey, Israel, and China. In none, however, are the stakes as high or the threat of war as imminent. BREAKING MEXICO'S HABIT MEXICO TODAY faces a future more uncertain than at any other point in its modern history. Pervasive corruption financed by drug traffickers, the end of one-party rule, armed revolt, and economic disaster have all surfaced over the past few years. In response, the Mexican army has begun to question its decades-old record of non-interference in politics. Should Mexico collapse into chaos, even for a short period of time, vital American interests will be endangered. This, in turn, raises the specter of U.S. intervention. The growing influence of drug money is the greatest single source of Mexican instability. The narcotics industry has worked its way into the fabric of Mexican society, to the extent that it is now Mexico's largest hard currency source (estimated at $ 30 billion per year) and is probably the country's largest employer. As in Colombia, drug dealers threaten to take control of the state. More worrying, senior Mexican officials -- including those in charge of the antidrug effort -- are routinely found to be working for drug cartels. Major drug traffickers have assembled their own private armies and operate without fear of prosecution. Crime, much of it drug financed, runs rampant throughout the country, particularly in Mexico City. In 1995, then-CIA director John Deutch signaled his concern for the impact of drugs on Mexico by making that country a strategic intelligence priority for the first time. It may, however, already be too late for help from Washington. The control of Mexico by drug traffickers will be hard to reverse, especially since, given the central role the drug lords play in Mexican life, doing so might further destabilize the country. The Mexican economy provides a second source of civil conflict. The country still has not recovered from its 1994 economic crisis, when the devaluation of the peso sparked fear of total financial collapse. Disaster was averted by the extraordinary intervention of the United States and the International Monetary Fund, which provided a $ 50 billion bailout. Despite this assistance, inflation climbed to 52 percent (up from 7 percent the year before), real earnings dropped by as much as 12 percent, the GDP shrank 6 percent, and over 25 percent of Mexicans fell seriously behind in debt repayment. Though conditions have improved slightly in the years since, the basic problems that caused the devaluation in the first place remain -- such as reliance on foreign investment to finance growth. These problems, combined with crushing Mexican poverty (85 percent of Mexicans are either unemployed or not earning a living wage), falling oil prices, and the widening gap between the prosperous north and the impoverished south, together form the basis for future unrest. Ironically, the advent of true democracy has further threatened Mexican stability. For 70 years, the Institutional Revolutionary Party ruled the nominally democratic country as a private fiefdom. The PRI made all key decisions and chose all important officials (including the president) while suppressing meaningful dissent. The monopoly ended in 1997, however, when the PRI lost its majority in the lower house of parliament to two competing political parties. The Conservative Party (PAN) now threatens the PRI in the more prosperous north while the leftist Party of the Democratic Revolution (PRD) has gained support among poor southerners, students, and intellectuals, and has won the key post of mayor of Mexico City. The fall of the PRI may enhance stability in the long term, as oppressed groups see their demands addressed for the first time. But the transition itself will be dangerous; states in the process of democratizing are far more vulnerable to civil conflict than are mature democracies or authoritarian regimes. As opposition parties declare their intent to expose the PRI's corrupt and criminal history, the order which Mexico has enjoyed for 70 years will be the first casualty of the new freedom. As if to illustrate the potential for disorder, major armed uprisings have once again erupted. Mexico has suffered a long tradition of regional warfare, dating back to its earliest days of independence. After decades of peace, this threat reemerged in the mid-1990s, and now endangers the stability of the state. In January 1994, some 4,000 "Zapatista" rebels, fearful of losing their land, seized seven towns in the southern state of Chiapas. Though they were poorly armed, the support they received throughout Mexico and the army's inability to quell their revolt starkly demonstrated the weakness of the Mexican government. That weakness grew even more pronounced when it was revealed that the government had turned to paramilitary groups to suppress the rebels. One such group massacred 45 civilians in December 1997, sparking widespread protest and investigations of government complicity. Meanwhile, the less well known but potentially more dangerous People's Revolutionary Army (EPR) launched a rebellion in 1996 by attacking military and economic targets in six southern states. Unlike the Zapatistas, the EPR openly seeks to overthrow the current regime. While its prospects of doing so may be remote, the EPR's very existence drives a thorn into the government's side. Amidst these struggles, the Mexican military may abandon its long tradition of noninvolvement in politics. Since the 1980s, the government has called on the military to suppress drug-related violence within the country. This use of the military for domestic purposes drew it directly into political disputes it had shied from in the past, and risked spreading corruption within the ranks. Meanwhile, the end of the PRI's monopoly on power may further destabilize the armed forces. For the first time in their history, the troops face an institutionally divided leadership. The military might split into rival political factions, especially if opposition parties are prevented from exercising power. Conflict in Mexico threatens a wide range of core American interests. A civil war would endanger the 350,000 Americans live south of the border who. Direct American investments of at least $ 50 billion would be threatened, as would $ 156 billion in bilateral trade and a major source of petroleum exports. Illegal immigrants would swarm across the 2,000-mile frontier, fleeing civil conflict. And armed incursions might follow; during the Mexican Revolution of 1910, fighting spilled over the border often enough that the United States had to deploy roughly half its armed forces to contain the conflict. In a future war, the millions of Americans with family in Mexico might take sides in the fighting, sparking violence within the United States.

**Extinction**

James **Pinkerton 03**, fellow at the New America Foundation, , Freedom and Survival, p. http://www.newamerica.net/publications/articles/2003/freedom\_and\_survival

Historically, the only way that the slow bureaucratic creep of government is reversed is through revolution or war. And that could happen. But there's a problem: the next American revolution won't be fought with muskets. It could well be waged with proliferated wonder-weapons. That is, about the time that American yeopersons decide to resist the encroachment of the United Nations, or the European Union—or the United States government—the level of destructive power in a future conflict could remove the choice expressed by Patrick Henry in his ringing cry, "Give me liberty, or give me death." The next big war could kill everybody, free and unfree alike.

### Deterrence 2ac

#### The agreement is key to global economic growth and U.S. manufacturing

Hill 3/27/13 (“Manufacturers Outline Priorities for a US-EU Free-Trade Deal,” <http://thehill.com/blogs/on-the-money/1005-trade/290617-manufacturers-press-for-us-eu-free-trade-deal->)

Manufacturers want negotiators to target a reduction in tariffs and a smoothing of regulatory policies during U.S.-European Union trade talks as part of an effort to help create jobs and boost the economy. National Association of Manufacturers (NAM) President and CEO Jay Timmons sent a letter to President Obama on Wednesday calling for a reduction in trade barriers and costs while ensuring that any agreement does not impose new labor, privacy, environmental or other standards that could hamstring competitiveness. In outlining goals for the talks, which are expected to start in June, Timmons cited rules on trade facilitation, investment and intellectual property along with duplicative and contradictory sanitary and phytosanitary rules as those that must be addressed. Timmons suggested that any regulatory agreements must be designed to "favor markets and adhere to sound principles of science, risk assessment and cost-benefit analysis." "More broadly, a growth-producing U.S.-EU agreement will enhance manufacturing competitiveness and commercial opportunities, and not impose rules or seek to harmonize standards that would undermine the United States’ dynamic labor market, strong intellectual property protections or other policies that promote innovation," Timmons wrote. "Proposals to adopt burdensome non-commercial standards — from labor and privacy, to environmental and non-risk based regulations — would not only stall the negotiations, they would undermine the ability to create the economic growth both our economies seek." Last week, the White House sent notice to Congress that it will officially begin talks with the 27-nation European Union. Negotiations could last upward of two years. Timmons also makes an argument for moving forward quickly with renewing trade promotion authority as an avenue to getting a globally example-setting trade deal. "U.S. export growth slowed over the past year, and the answer is access to new markets and removing trade barriers," said David Hoover, chairmyn of NAM's international economic policy committee. "Trade agreements have a proven track record of success, as exports to just our 20 free trade agreement partners accounted for nearly half of U.S.-manufactured goods exports last year.” The NAM backs with the High Level Working Group’s call for a comprehensive agreement that addresses a broad range of bilateral trade and investment issues that will put the economies on both sides of the Atlantic in a stronger economic position. "A comprehensive trade agreement between the United States and EU would be very beneficial to manufacturers in creating additional opportunities and further developing the economic relationship between the world’s largest trading partners,” said Greg Walters, chairmyn of NAM's U.S.-EU Task Force. “An ambitious agreement will drive economic growth, lower existing barriers and serve as a model for the rest of the globe to follow."

#### US Manufacturing is key to overall military superiority and deterrence

Eaglen et al 12 – American Enterprise Institute, Rebecca Grant, IRIS Research, Robert P. Haffa, Haffa Defense Consulting, Michael O'Hanlon, The Brookings Institution, Peter W. Singer, The Brookings Institution, Martin Sullivan, Commonwealth Consulting, Barry Watts, Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments (Mackenzie, “The Arsenal of Democracy and How to Preserve It: Key Issues in Defense Industrial Policy”, January 2012)

Yet there are severe challenges that could result to the nation’s security interests even with 10 percent cutbacks. Despite the likely potential of lesser resources, the demand side of the equation does not seem likely to grow easier. The international security environment is challenging and complex. China’s economic, political and now military rise continues. Its direction is uncertain, but it has already raised tension, especially in the South China Sea. Iran’s ambitions and machinations remain foreboding, with its nuclear plans entering a new phase of both capability but also crisis. North Korea is all the more uncertain with a leadership transition, but has a history of brinkmynship and indeed even the occasional use of force against the South, not to mention nuclear weapons-related activities that raise deep concern. And the hopeful series of revolutions in the broader Arab world in 2011, while inspiring at many levels, also seem likely to raise uncertainty in the broader Middle East. Revolutions are inherently unpredictable and often messy geostrategic events. On top of these remain commitments in Afghanistan and beyond and the frequent U.S. military role in humynitarian disaster relief. Thus, there are broad challenges for American defense planners as they try to address this challenging world with fewer available resources. The current wave of defense cuts is also different than past defense budget reductions in their likely industrial impact, as the U.S. defense industrial base is in a much different place than it was in the past. Defense industrial issues are too often viewed through the lens of jobs and pet projects to protect in congressional districts. But the overall health of the firms that supply the technologies our armed forces utilize does have national security resonance. Qualitative superiority in weaponry and other key military technology has become an essential element of American military power in the modern era—not only for winning wars but for deterring them. That requires world-class scientific and manufacturing capabilities—which in turn can also generate civilian and military export opportunities for the United States in a globalized marketplace. While procurement budgets have finally, in recent years, reached their historic norms as a percent of the overall defense budget, the legacy of the 1990s procurement “holiday” remains real. In that period, the United States as a matter of policy bought much less equipment than it would normally, enjoying the fruits of the 1980s buildup as it sought to reduce defense spending. But Reagan-era weaponry is wearing out, and the recent increase in procurement spending has not lasted long enough to replenish the nation’s key weapons arsenals with new weaponry. The last decade of procurement policy focused more on filling certain gaps in counterinsurgency capabilities than replacing the mainline weapons programs that make up the bulk of conventional capabilities. Meanwhile, the main elements of DoD’s weapons inventories—fighter jets, armored vehicles, surface vessels and submarines—continue to age. We often say that, in today’s American armed forces, people are our most cherished commodity and greatest asset. That is certainly true at one level, through the dedication and excellence shown by our brave myn and womyn in uniform. But it is also true that adjusting the personnel size of the military up or down has been done with success multiple times, and seems likely to happen again. By contrast, scientific and manufacturing excellence in the defense space is not something easily moved up and down. Today’s industrial capabilities took decades to build and would be hard to restore if lost (Great Britain’s difficulty restoring its ability to build nuclear submarines is a frequently cited example.). Unlike the period just after the Cold War, there are no obvious surpluses of defense firms, such that a natural paring process will find the fittest firms and ensure their survival. While there are roughly five major firms, there are often just one or two suppliers in any given major area of defense technology. Similar challenges exist within the subcontractor community, which has become highly specialized, with certain key components or capabilities similarly reflecting monopolies or oligopolies, or being acquired by the primes in a way that risks future competition. The defense economy is also experiencing meta-changes in everything from shifts in traditional sectors, such as the move from mynned to unmynned planes, to new sectors arising like cybersesecurity, to a broader move from the exclusive production of goods to the growing provision of defense services. Such issues in the defense economy also touch on broader areas of national economic and geopolitical competitiveness. Top class American firms rely on top class scientists and engineers. At present, the United States ranks in the lower half of industrial countries for the average math and science scores of its public school students and graduates just a fraction as many scientists and engineers a year from university-level studies as does either China or India. These trends should not be overstated; the quality of American scientists and engineers remains world class. But the trends still pose deep worries in the American defense industrial field as its looks towards the future of its work force, which is aging rapidly in numerous sectors. Not only then are the U.S. military services, but also American defense industry at a crossroads. Normally, defense policy decisions in times of retrenchment begin with strategy, threats, missions, and force structure and only address defense industrial issues as an afterthought. In past days of flush budgets and numerous duplicative suppliers, this approach may have made sense. It makes sense no longer. Careless defense reductions or poor planning won’t just cost jobs or competitiveness, but could actually result in lost American military industrial capability in core areas. The Department of Defense has recently made some encouraging moves towards emphasizing the role of the industrial base in its strategic and budgetary planning. The 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review examined the subject, for example, and Secretary Panetta and his deputies have convened several meetings in recent months with industry leaders to discuss their concerns. But industrial base considerations remain little discussed outside the specialist community and too frequently take a short term or single interest approach, such as asking a candidate to weigh in on an individual product or firm. Rather, it is the overall state of the field and its future that should be of concern to all, regardless of where they stand on the political spectrum. Thus, as presidential candidates and other national leaders develop their platforms for the 2012 elections and beyond, any serious discussion of national security and the current state and future of the military must also give direct attention to matters of the American national security scientific and industrial base. This discussion should be direct and forthright, recognizing the context of severe budgetary dilemmas for the nation, the success and challenges of the defense economy, changing military demands, and the gradual erosion of American manufacturing in many sectors over the last several decades. Among the core questions for candidates to develop their policy answers around are: 4 1. Are there any sectors within American defense industry or types of technologies for the Department of Defense that should be prioritized? If this is the case, what should be prioritized and what are the areas that are not quite as important as others—or even over resourced at present? 2. The Department of Defense is likely to reduce the size of the nation’s ground forces considerably in the years ahead, as the war in Afghanistan gradually winds down. Does this imply prioritizing investment in Air-Sea battle capabilities at the expense of ground force capability, or should the United States try to do all with less? 3. Do the Pentagon and Congress have enough tools for evaluating the strength of the nation’s industrial base and its access to key raw materials and technologies? If not, what should be done to give this subject greater scrutiny and sustained attention? 4. Should the Department of Defense move to more fixed-price contracts in its procurement policies? Should private companies be allowed to compete for a higher share of maintenance contracts, even if that means downsizing government depots? 5. Is the Pentagon’s increased focus on enlarging its acquisition oversight workforce making the acquisition process more innovative, economical, and efficient or more burdensome and bureaucratic? 6. Are there tools of export and trade policy that need to be adjusted to strengthen the U.S. defense industrial base? If so, what? Is the FMS program basically sound? Does the consolidation of export control lists within Commerce bode well or are other steps needed? 7. Are there certain allies from which the United States should be willing to import more defense technology, especially if the improved trade opportunities are reciprocated? Should we explore pooling and joint production options with our close allies, along the lines of what Britain and France have recently launched? 8. How should the nation strengthen STEM education in the United States, in high schools and colleges, to encourage more Americans to pursue careers in science, technology, engineering, and math? Does the nation need to revise any of its immigration and green-card policies to increase the ability of foreign scientists to remain in this country after studying here and contribute to its scientific and industrial strength? 9. Do government regulations and requirements deter new and innovative firms from entering the defense market to the detriment of the nation’s military? If so, what should be done to induce their entry? 10. Are there any other policy interventions that might be needed to ensure American military technological preeminence in the years ahead? A certain floor under R&D budgets? Targeted sustainment funding for specific capabilities such as independent weapons design teams at numerous firms? Greater DoD contributions to research and prototyping by defense firms? The United States, and its civilian leaders, cannot afford to avoid the hard questions that now come with maintaining a strong successful military, a top flight defense industrial base, and a fiscally sound national economy. Our defense industrial base is certainly not broken, but there are clear, unavoidable challenges that loom, which might undercut broader national security, and the looming big budget cutbacks raise the stakes and heighten the sense of urgency in addressing the issue. In sum, the arsenal of democracy that arms the best military in the world, took decades to build. If allowed to atrophy, it would take decades to rebuild. Those who would seek to lead the U.S. armed forces must answer the key questions to ensure these capabilities are not lost in a matter of years.