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#### 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.¶

#### Competition over Latin America isn’t zero sum

Ramírez 2010 (Pablo Telman Sánchez, Phd, Specialist Professor in International Law and Political and Social Sciences, professor at Instituto Tecnológico y de Estudios Superiores de Monterrey, Mexico City campus. He is a Member of the Mexican National Research System, Level 2“Is a New Climate of Confrontation Between Russia and the United States Possible in Latin America?,” Latin American Policy Volume 1, Issue 2, pages 230–243, December 2010, http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.2041-7373.2010.00017.x/abstract )

Russia is demonstrating to the White House its position of establishing a global strategic equilibrium and its capability of defending its own national interests. There is no ideological conflict between the government of the United States and its Russian counterpart like there was during the Cold War because the latter shares the values of democracy and a market economy. Russia’s strategy in Latin America does not consist of establishing a political regional alliance to face the hegemonic power of Washington, but it does send a message to the White House. The Kremlin is moving closer to Latin America with the objective to establish not an ideological or military competition with the United States, but a competition guided by considerations that will prioritize pragmatism and mutual advantage. Russia is attempting to increase its presence in Latin America and will accomplish this through the signing of commercial, energy, and military agreements with some left-wing countries of the region such as Venezuela, Nicaragua, Argentina, Ecuador, Brazil, Bolivia, and Cuba. There is also the possibility of signing energy and military agreements with left-wing countries such as Peru, Colombia, and Mexico. Russia advocates for the end of the unipolar world and feels that the hegemonic power of the United States is in decline. Moscow is taking advantage of this situation and establishing alliances in regions far away from its vital interests, such as Latin America. Nevertheless, a new Russian foreign policy document (2008) points out that Latin America, along with Africa, is still in last place among regional priorities. In the specific case of Venezuela the Kremlin has attempted to obtain a circumstantial if not temporary ally with the incentive of the wealth of Venezuela in terms of hydrocarbons. The example of Cuba during the Cold War and its alliance with the Soviet Union is not comparable because there were clear ties stressed by the Marxist–Leninist ideology and the confrontation between two superpowers. It is risky to assert that Venezuela would turn into a strategic and durable ally for Russia as Cuba did for the Soviet Union. The future of the current government of Venezuela is uncertain, given its internal political instability and the economic crisis. Both represent a blow for the country, and the Russian government would become involved politically and militarily in the government of Hugo Chávez with difficulty. However, Russia continues to move forward with its objectives of tightening economic and commercial ties with Venezuela in strategic spheres of convenience such as the sale of weapons and military technology; collaboration in the peaceful use of nuclear energy; and the extraction, exploitation, transportation, and sale of hydrocarbons. The current Russian strategy in Latin America does not consist of establishing a solid political alliance with countries of this region so as to face the hegemonic power of the United States, as President Chávez has attempted to demonstrate. Russia neither shares the anti-imperialistic positions of Hugo Chávez nor supports unconditionally the Venezuelan president’s attempts at regional leadership. Conversely, Chávez wants to take advantage of his approach to Russia to strengthen his plans for leadership in the region, and he attempts to demonstrate that his close ties with Russia are part of an anti-imperialistic global alliance. During his visit to Moscow in July 2008, Chávez negotiated new contracts for the sale of weapons and mentioned that, “Russia has enough potential as to guarantee its presence in many places around the world. If the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation want to stay in Venezuela, they will be received enthusiastically. . . . [T] he sale of Russian weapons will serve as an instrument to guarantee the sovereignty of Venezuela which is threatened by the United States.” We are in a process of rearmament. (Excélsior, 2008).

#### 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.
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### 2ac – framework

Framework – Our interpretation is that the neg gets the status quo or competitive policy option – that’s key to fairness- infinite assumptions in the 1AC– we should get the aff as offense – also key to plan focus which is necessary for in depth debates

#### The Role of the Ballot is Policy Simulation

Hodson 10 Derek, professor of education – Ontario Institute for Studies @ University of Toronto, “Science Education as a Call to Action,” Canadian Journal of Science, Mathematics and Technology Education, Vol. 10, Issue 3, p. 197-206

\*\*note: SSI = socioscientific issues

The final (fourth) level of sophistication in this issues-based approach is concerned with students findings ways of putting their values and convictions into action, helping them to prepare for and engage in responsible action, and assisting them in **developing the skills**, attitudes, and values **that will enable them to** take control of their lives, **cooperate with others to bring about change**, and work toward a more just and sustainable world in which power, wealth, and resources are more equitably shared. Socially and environmentally responsible behavior will not necessarily follow from knowledge of key concepts and possession of the “right attitudes.” As Curtin (1991) reminded us, it is important to distinguish between caring about and caring for. It is almost always much easier to proclaim that one cares about an issue than to do something about it. Put simply, our values are worth nothing until we live them. Rhetoric and espoused values will not bring about social justice and will not save the planet. We must change our actions. A politicized ethic of care (caring for) entails active involvement in a local manifestation of a particular problem or issue, exploration of the complex sociopolitical contexts in which the problem/issue is located, and attempts to resolve conflicts of interest. FROM STSE RHETORIC TO SOCIOPOLITICAL ACTION Writing from the perspective of environmental education, Jensen (2002) categorized the **knowledge** that is **likely to promote sociopolitical action** and encourage pro-environmental behavior into four dimensions: (a) **scientific and technological knowledge** that informs the issue or problem; (b) knowledge about the underlying social, political, and economic issues, conditions, and structures and how they contribute to creating social and environmental problems; (c) knowledge about how to bring about changes in society through direct or indirect action; and (d) knowledge about the likely outcome or direction of possible actions and the **desirability of those outcomes.** Although formulated as a model for environmental education, it is reasonable to suppose that Jensen's arguments are applicable to all forms of SSI-oriented action. Little needs to be said about dimensions 1 and 2 in Jensen's framework beyond the discussion earlier in the article. With regard to dimension 3, students need knowledge of actions that are likely to have positive impact and knowledge of how to engage in them. **It is essential** that they gain robust knowledge of the social, legal, and **political system(s)** that prevail in the communities in which they live and develop a clear understanding of how **decisions** are **made within** local, regional, and **national government** and within industry, commerce, and the military. Without knowledge of where and with whom power of decision making is located and awareness of the **mechanisms by which decisions are reached**, **intervention is not possible.** Thus, the curriculum I propose requires a concurrent program designed to achieve a measure of political literacy, including knowledge of how to engage in collective action with individuals who have different competencies, backgrounds, and attitudes but share a common interest in a particular SSI. Dimension 3 also includes knowledge of likely sympathizers and potential allies and strategies for encouraging cooperative action and group interventions. What Jensen did not mention but would seem to be a part of dimension 3 knowledge is the nature of science-oriented knowledge that would enable students to appraise the statements, reports, and arguments of scientists, politicians, and journalists and to present their own supporting or opposing arguments in a coherent, robust, and convincing way (s

ee Hodson [2009b] for a lengthy discussion of this aspect of science education). Jensen's fourth category includes awareness of how (and why) others have sought to bring about change and entails formulation of a vision of the kind of world in which we (and our families and communities) wish to live. It is important for students to explore and develop their ideas, dreams, and aspirations for themselves, their neighbors and families and for the wider communities at local, regional, national, and global levels—a clear overlap with futures studies/education. An essential step in cultivating the critical scientific and technological literacy on which **sociopolitical action depends** is the application of a social and political critique capable of challenging the notion of technological determinism. We can control technology and its environmental and social impact. More significantly, we can control the controllers and redirect technology in such a way that adverse environmental impact is substantially reduced (if not entirely eliminated) and issues of freedom, equality, and justice are kept in the forefront of discussion during the **establishment of policy**.

#### Debating about policy towards Latin America is valuable – without it change is impossible and their discourse gets coopted

Ried Ijed ’10- Ried Ijed is the Revista interamericana de Educación para la Democracia Interamerican Journal of Education for Democracy, (“Towards a Deliberative and Democratic Model of International Cooperation in Education in Latin America”, Vol 3 No. 2, December 2010)

While the discourse of international organizations has changed over the past decade to emphasize more local participation, there continues to be a disjuncture between “explicit” statements embodying democratic values and ideals, and the actual practices within these organizations (Samoff, 2004). There are potentially several factors (both political and technical) that lead to disjuncture between policy and practice. Among the most commonly cited of political factors is the tendency for international organizations to co-opt discourses about participation in order to gain legitimacy, but without showing any real commitment to a democratic transformation and the devolution of power, authority, and control (see Klees, 2002). Democratization policies in these contexts are merely “symbolic,” in that at a public level the problem is recognized but at the implementation level they are neither supported with adequate resources nor sufficiently specific enough to be operationalized (Stromquist, 2003). Technical factors may include the inherent limitations on representation in democratic processes, or the lack of financial resources, technical know- how, and skills required to implement changes and mechanisms that would allow for more democratic participation.

#### Perm do both but don’t reject the aff

### Aff is a good idea

#### War is at its lowest level in history because of US primacy-best statistical studies prove heg solves war because it makes democratic peace resilient globalization sustainable-it’s the deeper cause of proximate checks against war

Owen 11 – associate professor in the University of Virginia’s Department of Politics, John, Don’t Discount Hegemony, Cato Unbound, 2-11

 Our colleagues at Simon Fraser University are brave indeed. That may sound like a setup, but it is not. I shall challenge neither the data nor the general conclusion that violent conflict around the world has been decreasing in fits and starts since the Second World War. When it comes to violent conflict among and within countries, things have been getting better. (The trends have not been linear—Figure 1.1 actually shows that the frequency of interstate wars peaked in the 1980s—but the 65-year movement is clear.) Instead I shall accept that Mack et al. are correct on the macro-trends, and focus on their explanations they advance for these remarkable trends. With apologies to any readers of this forum who recoil from academic debates, this might get mildly theoretical and even more mildly methodological. Concerning international wars, one version of the “nuclear-peace” theory is not in fact laid to rest by the data. It is certainly true that nuclear-armed states have been involved in many wars. They have even been attacked (think of Israel), which falsifies the simple claim of “assured destruction”—that any nuclear country A will deter any kind of attack by any country B because B fears a retaliatory nuclear strike from A. But the most important “nuclear-peace” claim has been about mutually assured destruction, which obtains between two robustly nuclear-armed states. The claim is that (1) rational states having second-strike capabilities—enough deliverable nuclear weaponry to survive a nuclear first strike by an enemy—will have an overwhelming incentive not to attack one another; and (2) we can safely assume that nuclear-armed states are rational. It follows that states with a second-strike capability will not fight one another. Their colossal atomic arsenals neither kept the United States at peace with North Vietnam during the Cold War nor the Soviet Union at peace with Afghanistan. But the argument remains strong that those arsenals did help keep the United States and Soviet Union at peace with each other. Why non-nuclear states are not deterred from fighting nuclear states is an important and open question. But in a time when calls to ban the Bomb are being heard from more and more quarters, we must be clear about precisely what the broad trends toward peace can and cannot tell us. They may tell us nothing about why we have had no World War III, and little about the wisdom of banning the Bomb now. Regarding the downward trend in international war, Professor Mack is friendlier to more palatable theories such as the “democratic peace” (democracies do not fight one another, and the proportion of democracies has increased, hence less war); the interdependence or “commercial peace” (states with extensive economic ties find it irrational to fight one another, and interdependence has increased, hence less war); and the notion that people around the world are more anti-war than their forebears were. Concerning the downward trend in civil wars, he favors theories of economic growth (where commerce is enriching enough people, violence is less appealing—a logic similar to that of the “commercial peace” thesis that applies among nations) and the end of the Cold War (which end reduced superpower support for rival rebel factions in so many Third-World countries). These are all plausible mechanisms for peace. What is more, none of them excludes any other; all could be working toward the same end. That would be somewhat puzzling, however. Is the world just lucky these days? How is it that an array of peace-inducing factors happens to be working coincidentally in our time, when such a magical array was absent in the past? The answer may be that one or more of these mechanisms reinforces some of the others, or perhaps some of them are mutually reinforcing. Some scholars, for example, have been focusing on whether economic growth might support democracy and vice versa, and whether both might support international cooperation, including to end civil wars. We would still need to explain how this charmed circle of causes got started, however. And here let me raise another factor, perhaps even less appealing than the “nuclear peace” thesis, at least outside of the United States. That factor is what international relations scholars call hegemony—specifically American hegemony. A theory that many regard as discredited, but that refuses to go away, is called hegemonic stability theory. The theory emerged in the 1970s in the realm of international political economy. It asserts that for the global economy to remain open—for countries to keep barriers to trade and investment low—one powerful country must take the lead. Depending on the theorist we consult, “taking the lead” entails paying for global public goods (keeping the sea lanes open, providing liquidity to the international economy), coercion (threatening to raise trade barriers or withdraw military protection from countries that cheat on the rules), or both. The theory is skeptical that international cooperation in economic matters can emerge or endure absent a hegemon. The distastefulness of such claims is self-evident: they imply that it is good for everyone the world over if one country has more wealth and power than others. More precisely, they imply that it has been good for the world that the United States has been so predominant. There is no obvious reason why hegemonic stability theory could not apply to other areas of international cooperation, including in security affairs, human rights, international law, peacekeeping (UN or otherwise), and so on. What I want to suggest here—suggest, not test—is that American hegemony might just be a deep cause of the steady decline of political deaths in the world. How could that be? After all, the report states that United States is the third most war-prone country since 1945. Many of the deaths depicted in Figure 10.4 were in wars that involved the United States (the Vietnam War being the leading one). Notwithstanding politicians’ claims to the contrary, a candid look at U.S. foreign policy reveals that the country is as ruthlessly self-interested as any other great power in history. The answer is that U.S. hegemony might just be a deeper cause of the proximate causes outlined by Professor Mack. Consider economic growth and openness to foreign trade and investment, which (so say some theories) render violence irrational. American power and policies may be responsible for these in two related ways. First, at least since the 1940s Washington has prodded other countries to embrace the market capitalism that entails economic openness and produces sustainable economic growth. The United States promotes capitalism for selfish reasons, of course: its own domestic system depends upon growth, which in turn depends upon the efficiency gains from economic interaction with foreign countries, and the more the better. During the Cold War most of its allies accepted some degree of market-driven growth. Second, the U.S.-led western victory in the Cold War damaged the credibility of alternative paths to development—communism and import-substituting industrialization being the two leading ones—and left market capitalism the best model. The end of the Cold War also involved an end to the billions of rubles in Soviet material support for regimes that tried to make these alternative models work. (It also, as Professor Mack notes, eliminated the superpowers’ incentives to feed civil violence in the Third World.) What we call globalization is caused in part by the emergence of the United States as the global hegemon. The same case can be made, with somewhat more difficulty, concerning the spread of democracy. Washington has supported democracy only under certain conditions—the chief one being the absence of a popular anti-American movement in the target state—but those conditions have become much more widespread following the collapse of communism. Thus in the 1980s the Reagan administration—the most anti-communist government America ever had—began to dump America’s old dictator friends, starting in the Philippines. Today Islamists tend to be anti-American, and so the Obama administration is skittish about democracy in Egypt and other authoritarian Muslim countries. But general U.S. material and moral support for liberal democracy remains strong.

Evaluate these impacts – consequences matter

Isaac, 2002 (Jeffrey C., James H. Rudy professor of Political Science and director of the Center for the Study of Democracy and Public Life at Indiana University, Bloomington, “Ends, Means and politics,” *Dissent*, Spring)

As writers such as Niccolo Machiavelli,Max Weber, Reinhold Niebuhr, and HannahArendt have taught, an unyielding concern with moral goodness undercuts political responsibility.The concern may be morally laudable, reflectinga kind of personal integrity, but it suffersfrom three fatal flaws: (1) It fails to see that the purity of one’s intention does not ensure the achievement of what one intends. Abjuring violence or refusing to make commoncause with morally compromised parties may seem like the right thing; but if such tactics entail impotence, then it is hard to view them as serving any moral good beyond the clean conscience of their supporters; (2) it fails to see that in a world of real violence and injustice, moral purity is not simply a form of powerlessness; it is often a form of complicity in injustice. This is why, from the standpoint of politics—as opposed to religion—pacifism is alwaysa potentially immoral stand. In categorically repudiatingviolence, it refuses in principle tooppose certain violent injustices with any effect;and (3) it fails to see that politics is as much about unintended consequences as it is about intentions; it is the effects of action, rather than the motives of action, that is most significant. Just as the alignment with “good”may engender impotence, it is often the pursuit of “good” that generates evil. This is thelesson of communism in the twentieth century:it is not enough that one’s goals be sincere oridealistic; it is equally important, always, to askabout the effects of pursuing these goals andto judge these effects in pragmatic and historicallycontextualized ways. Moral absolutism inhibits this judgment. It alienates those who are not true believers. It promotes arrogance. And it undermines political effectiveness.

#### Reject the infinite number of root causes that debilitate action—Focus on strategic deterrence and democracy are key to adverting crisis escalation—

John Moore 4 chaired law prof, UVA. Frm first Chairman of the Board of the US Institute of Peace and as the Counselor on Int Law to the Dept. of State, Beyond the Democratic Peace, 44 Va. J. Int'l L. 341, Lexis

[\*393] If major interstate war is predominantly a product of a synergy between a potential nondemocratic aggressor and an absence of effective deterrence, what is the role of the many traditional "causes" of war? Past, and many contemporary, theories of war have focused on the role of specific disputes between nations, ethnic and religious differences, arms races, poverty and social injustice, competition for resources, incidents and accidents, greed, fear, perceptions of "honor," and many other factors. Such factors may well play a role in motivating aggression or generating fear and manipulating public opinion. The reality, however, is that while some of these factors may have more potential to contribute to war than others, there may well be an infinite set of motivating factors, or human wants, motivating aggression. It is not the independent existence of such motivating factors for war but rather the circumstances permitting or encouraging high-risk decisions leading to war that is the key to more effectively controlling armed conflict. And the same may also be true of democide. The early focus in the Rwanda slaughter on "ethnic conflict," as though Hutus and Tutsis had begun to slaughter each other through spontaneous combustion, distracted our attention from the reality that a nondemocratic Hutu regime had carefully planned and orchestrated a genocide against Rwandan Tutsis as well as its Hutu opponents. n158 Certainly if we were able to press a button and end poverty, racism, religious intolerance, injustice, and endless disputes, we would want to do so. Indeed, democratic governments must remain committed to policies that will produce a better world by all measures of human progress. The broader achievement of democracy and the rule of law will itself assist in this progress. No one, however, has yet been able to demonstrate the kind of robust correlation with any of these "traditional" causes of war that is reflected in the "democratic peace." Further, given the difficulties in overcoming many of these social problems, an approach to war exclusively dependent on their solution may doom us to war for generations to come. [\*394] A useful framework for thinking about the war puzzle is provided in the Kenneth Waltz classic Man, the State and War, n159 first published in 1954 for the Institute of War and Peace Studies, in which he notes that previous thinkers about the causes of war have tended to assign responsibility at one of the three levels of individual psychology, the nature of the state, or the nature of the international system. This tripartite level of analysis has subsequently been widely copied in the study of international relations. We might summarize my analysis in this classical construct by suggesting that the most critical variables are the second and third levels, or "images," of analysis. Government structures, at the second level, seem to play a central role in levels of aggressiveness in high-risk behavior leading to major war. In this, the "democratic peace" is an essential insight. The third level of analysis, the international system, or totality of external incentives influencing the decision to go to war, is also critical when government structures do not restrain such high-risk behavior on their own. Indeed, nondemocratic systems may not only fail to constrain inappropriate aggressive behavior, they may even massively enable it by placing the resources of the state at the disposal of a ruthless regime elite. It is not that the first level of analysis, the individual, is unimportant - I have already argued that it is important in elite perceptions about the permissibility and feasibility of force and resultant necessary levels of deterrence. It is, instead, that the second level of analysis, government structures, may be a powerful proxy for settings bringing to power those who are disposed to aggressive military adventures and in creating incentive structures predisposed to high-risk behavior. We might also want to keep open the possibility that a war/peace model focused on democracy and deterrence might be further usefully refined by adding psychological profiles of particular leaders as we assess the likelihood of aggression and levels of necessary deterrence. Nondemocracies' leaders can have different perceptions of the necessity or usefulness of force and, as Marcus Aurelius should remind us, not all absolute leaders are Caligulas or Neros. Further, the history of ancient Egypt reminds us that not all Pharaohs were disposed to make war on their neighbors. Despite the importance of individual leaders, however, the key to war avoidance is understanding that major international war is critically an interaction, or synergy, of certain characteristics at levels two and three - specifically an absence of [\*395] democracy and an absence of effective deterrence. Yet another way to conceptualize the importance of democracy and deterrence in war avoidance is to note that each in its own way internalizes the costs to decision elites of engaging in high-risk aggressive behavior. Democracy internalizes these costs in a variety of ways including displeasure of the electorate at having war imposed upon it by its own government. And deterrence either prevents achievement of the objective altogether or imposes punishing costs making the gamble not worth the risk. n160

### 2ac – alt fails

#### The alt alone fails devolves into endless reflection and navel-gazing—only practical political solutions can solve the epistemology critique (—prefer this evidence, it is from a leader in epistemic criticism)

Gordon 4 (Lewis, Professor of Philosophy at University of Connecticut, Fanon and Development: A Philosophical Look, http://www.codesria.org/IMG/pdf/4-3.pdf) Democracy and Development: Irene Gendzier Although Sylvia Wynter qualified her conclusions by reminding us that we should work through epistemological categories and ‘not merely economic’ ones, her dis- cussion so focuses on the question of conceptual conditions that it is difficult to determine how those economic considerations configure in the analysis. Irene Gendzier, author of one of the early studies of Fanon’s life and thought, took on this task, in addition to elaborating its political dimensions as well, in her 1995 history of the field of development studies, Development against Democracy: Manipulating Political Change in the Third World. Gendzier first points out that development studies emerged in elite, First World universities as an attempt to offer their vision of modernisation over the Marxist ones of the U.S.S.R., Communist China, and Cuba. Their model was resolute: A capitalist economy and elite (oligarchical) democracy. We see here the normative telos writ large: The United States. Although Gendzier does not present this as a theodicean argument, those elements are unmistakable. The initial phase of development studies granted the United States the status of utopia, which means that both its contradictions and those that emerge from its application abroad must be functions of the limitations of the people who manifest them. In effect, Gendzier’s study is an empirical validation of much of Wynter’s and Fanon’s arguments. The record of those development policies is universally bad, although there seems to be no example that could meet any test of falsification that would convince, say, mem- bers of the Council for Foreign Relations, many of whom are from the neoliberal and conservative wings of the North American academic elite. Gendzier uses an apt term to describe the work such policies have done: maldevelopment. Here is her assessment of their record:¶ For many, terms like Development and Modernization have lost their meaning. They have become code words. They refer to policies pursued by governments and international agencies that enrich ruling elites and technocrats, while the masses are told to await the benefits of the ‘trickle down’ effect. For many, Development and Modernization are terms that refer to a politics of reform designed to preserve the status quo while promising to alter it. And for many social scientists, those who have rationalized the interests of governments committed to such policies are accom- plices in deception (Gendzier 1995:2).¶ North American and European development studies set the foundations for U.S. policies that supported antidemocratic regimes for the sake of preserving the eco- nomic hegemony of American business elites, and the supposed dilemma emerged, in many countries under the yoke of First World developmental dictates, of whether to reduce social inequalities, which often led to economic decline on the one hand, or increase economic prosperity, which often led to social inequalities on the other. The problem, of course, is that this is a false dilemma since no nation attempts either pole in a vacuum. How other countries respond to a nation’s social and eco- nomic policy will impact its outcome. It is not, in other words, as though any nation truly functions as a self-supporting island anymore. A good example is the small Caribbean island of Antigua. To ‘normalise’ relations with the United States, that island was forced to create immigration laws that would stimulate the formation of an underclass, which U.S. advisors claimed would create a cheap labour base to stimulate economic investment and an increase in production and prosperity. There is now such a class in Antigua, but there has, in fact, been a decline in prosperity. The reason is obvious: There was not an infrastructure of capital in need of such a labour force in the first place. The island of Antigua has a good education base, which makes the type of labour suitable for its economy to be one of a trained profes- sional class linked in with the tourist economy and other high-leveled service-ori- ented professions such as banking and trade, all of which, save tourism, the United States does not associate within a predominantly black country. The creation of an underclass without an education or social-welfare system to provide training and economic relief, conjoined with an absence of investments from abroad, has cre- ated a politically and economically noxious situation, and the quality of life in Anti- gua now faces decline.8 This story is no doubt a familiar one in nations with very modest prosperity as in Africa.¶ There has been a set of critical responses to development theory, the most influential of which has been those by theorists of dependency.9 The obvious situa- tion of epistemological dependence emerges from the United States as the standard of development, both economic and cultural. The economic consequence is a func- tion of the international institutions that form usury relationships with countries that are structurally in a condition of serfdom, where they depend on loans that it is no longer possible to believe they can even pay back. Fanon would add, however, that we should bear in mind that in the case of many African countries who re- ceived such loans, the situation might have been different had those funds been spent on infrastructural resources instead of as a source of wealth for neocolonial elites. That European and American banks hold accounts for leaders who have, in effect, robbed their countries and have left their citizens in near perpetual debt to the World Bank reveals the gravity of Fanon’s warnings of forty years past. An additional Fanonian warning has also been updated by sociologist Paget Henry, who warns us that the epistemological struggle also includes fighting ‘to save the sciences from extreme commodification and instrumentalisation’ (Henry 2002–2003:51).¶ To these criticisms, Gendzier poses the following consideration. The critics of development have pointed out what is wrong with development studies, particularly its project of modernisation, but their shortcoming is that many of them have not presented alternative conceptions of how to respond to the problems that plague most of Africa and much of the Third World. Think, for example, of Wynter’s call for a new epistemic order. Calling for it is not identical with creating it. This is one of the ironic aspects of the epistemological project. Although it is a necessary reflec- tion, it is an impractical call for a practical response.

### 2ac Perm

**Perm – Do both**

#### Too sweeping to say working-through-State never counters racism – here’s 7 concrete examples:

Seligman 11

Brad Seligman – Lead Counsel, Dukes v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc – The nationwide class action gender

discrimination case against Wal-Mart Stores and founder of the Impact Fund, which provides financial and technical

assistance and representation for complex public interest litigation – Clearinghouse REVIEW Journal of Poverty Law and Policy – January–February 2011 – http://www.impactfund.org/downloads/Resources/UsingLawForChange-Seligman.pdf

Litigation as a tool for social change has a long and proud tradition in the United States. In the nineteenth century cases were brought to challenge discriminatory laws such as the Chinese Exclusion Act and to advance labor rights and the rights of women and people of color. In the twentieth century the epic battle to dismantle Jim Crow laws and the “separate but equal” doctrine culminated in the famous Brown v. Board of Education decision. In the 1960s federal rules were developed to make class action litigation more feasible, and courts approved massive institutional-change cases against industries and governmental units.1 In the 1970s environmental litigation, aided by the passage of federal laws such as the National Environmental Policy Act, became common. Starting in the 1980s, however, social justice litigation has become more challenging to pursue due to more conservative judges, tougher class certification and substantive law decisions, more demanding attorney-fee and cost-recovery requirements, the decline in federal enforcement of civil rights and environmental laws, and cutbacks and restrictions on legal services funding.2 Still, such litigation remains a potent weapon for change. In recent years the environmental justice and disability rights movements have shown that the path remains open for innovative litigation. Today we nevertheless must be more strategic and thoughtful about how we use litigation. Here I describe a holistic model of social justice litigation that includes adroit use of the media, coalitions, and working partnerships with community and grassroots organizations and other forms of advocacy. I explore the range of procedural devices in the social justice litigator’s tool box. And I remind readers to take pride in and enjoy their work.

**Perm do the plan and reject epistemic privilege and decolonization**

**we do not endorse or strengthen the state – they need to prove the Plan directly causes worse oppression to win a link**

### 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.

### Monolithicism Turn

#### Their monolithic view of modernity is bad—it ignores the emancipatory nature it has for new social movements

**Domingues 9** (Jose, Rio de Janeiro University Research Institute, Global Modernization, `Coloniality' and a Critical Sociology for Contemporary Latin America, Theory Culture Society 2009 26: 112, 2009)

The **opening of identities** **and the very emergence of ethnic movement**s,¶ which the state can no longer prevent, **is part and parcel of the third**¶ **phase of modernity**, as much as it is the result of a couple of decades of¶ ethnic militancy. **Formerly a peasant identity** and working-class movements,¶ **along with a leftist** as well as middle-class **nationalism** within the developmental¶ framework, **were the nodal points of identity formation**. This does¶ not mean that ethnic identities were not important: they just tended to be¶ neither rationalized nor politicized as they often (though not always) are¶ today. Social movements, in this regard, are now quite plural and depend¶ on network mechanisms to organize themselves internally as well as to¶ weave alliances (Domingues, 2007: ch. 5, 2008: ch. 3). **Modernity is**, moreover, **a two-pronged phenomenon; this is why we**¶ **must maintain an ambivalent relation** towards it. **It has at its core some**¶ **entrenched systems of dominatio**n: capitalism, the bureaucratic state and¶ patriarchy, as well as racism. While the two former are intrinsic to¶ modernity, **the latter may entertain a more contingent relation to it, regardless**¶ **of how close-knit they have been since its inception**. But modernity also¶ has some key imaginary elements – emancipatory **–** which have furnished¶ **its horizon of expectations across the planet:** freedom, equality and solidarity**,**¶ **with responsibility playing a more discreet though rather important**¶ part (Domingues, 2006). It is quite likely, as Marx argued in his immanent¶ critique, that they cannot be realized in modernity, and therefore need a¶ different type of society in which they would be sublated, including of course¶ ‘coloniality’, a historical feature of the birth and expansion of modernity,¶ however that is conceptualized. It may be also that **perspectives that bring**¶ **into contemporary modern discussions elements from other civilizational**¶ **sources** can provide new elements of criticism – for instance by insisting¶ on the community moment of democracy, such as is the case in Bolivia today.¶ In any case, an **opening of citizenship** **and** to some extent **its transformation**¶ as well as a re-structuration of the nation **stands at the core of** all these¶ movements and their ‘**epistemic’ proposals**. **New principles of thinking and systematic theorizing can be proposed**¶ **by ‘border thinking’ constructions** rooted in indigenous peoples’ movements,¶ reaching maturation in various forms of (hopefully not dichotomous) ‘another¶ thinking’. But other movements and their own brand of ‘border thinking’ –¶ **race-oriented movements, workers’, women’s and environmental movements**¶ or whatever – **stand on an equal footing with ethnically based social movements**,¶ especially in countries in which those are by far the minority. We¶ are far beyond the days when working-class movements could demand an¶ absolutely central position in social change. **It is not reasonable that we**¶ **should expect other partial movements to take their place. This is certainly**¶ **not the Zapatistas’ perspective. Such movements become really threatening**¶ **when they weave broad alliances and when more encompassing issues –**¶ **such as the traditional left banner of nationalization** or the more recent one,¶ taken up again, though transformed and democratically radicalized, of¶ citizenship – **are pursued to their completion**. Such modernizing moves,¶ from which take different directions, will inevitably develop through modernity,¶ albeit not necessarily within it should radical social change come about.¶ While neoliberalism reiterates modern systems of domination (especially¶ capitalism and bureaucratic state power, with low-intensity democracy),¶ those **democratic moves may remain within modernity** (although widening¶ its democratic horizons, at the imaginary level and institutionally) **or point**¶ **beyond it, in any case being informed by and having to engage with it** –¶ even if their constitution as collective subjectivities centrally includes other¶ civilizational elements. **This is** in some part **happening right now, when some**¶ **of those movements take the telos contained in the horizon of expectations**¶ **of modernity** and lend new specificities to older traditions stemming from¶ liberal and socialist thought, creatively transforming them to a large extent,¶ while the same is happening to indigenous traditions, which have by now¶ been radically modernized themselves.

## PTX

### 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.

#### Even if doesn’t pass Obama will XO it or it gets attached as a rider

### Won’t Pass

#### Won’t Pass, Boehner Pushing and his PC fails

Ignatius 9/27 (David, The Washington Post, “No following this leader” http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/david-ignatius-john-boehner-is-a-leader-without-followers/2013/09/27/c8145b2a-2705-11e3-ad0d-b7c8d2a594b9\_story.html)

We are seeing the consequences of a leaderless House in the GOP’s renewed threat of a government shutdown or debt-ceiling default. These reckless actions are part of a grandstand play to reverse the Affordable Care Act, more parts of which begin to take effect in October, but they’ve assumed an illogic of their own. The House Republicans seem almost to enjoy holding the country hostage. Their version of Russian roulette has become so familiar that we forget just how outrageous it is. Boehner surely knows this course is folly. Legislation to defund Obamacare won’t pass Congress. And the GOP’s brinkmanship, however popular with the right wing, is damaging the party nationally. Boehner this week struggled to find an alternative strategy — to avoid a shutdown by delaying Obamacare a year, or by attaching the defunding plan to the debt-ceiling extension. Both were seriously bad ideas, but even these extreme proposals were rejected by his caucus. Boehner declared his impotence during a July 21 interview on CBS’s “Face the Nation.” Moderator Bob Schieffer asked him to express support for the comprehensive immigration bill he had earlier said he favored. “If I come out and say I’m for this and I’m for that, all I’m doing is making my job harder,” answered Boehner. “This is not about me,” he said several times, as if abdication of control were some kind of virtue. A dumbfounded Schieffer responded: “That is kind of an interesting take on leadership, though. In other words, you don’t see yourself as someone who has an agenda. You’re there to just sort of manage whatever your people want to do?” House Republican sources tell me that Cantor has cunningly worked to undermine his nominal boss. By often allying himself with the roughly 40 tea party extremists who refuse any compromise with Obama, Cantor gives them political oxygen. He encourages their showboating, as on the bill he championed this month to slash the food-stamp program. Sen. Debbie Stabenow (D-Mich.), chair of the Senate Agriculture Committee, described this bill as “a monumental waste of time.” House committee chairmen ignore Boehner; they know Cantor is the guy with the knife. This dysfunction isn’t built into the system. It’s a result of human failure. President Obama gets pummeled daily for his weak leadership but, compared with Boehner, he’s a titan.

### Bill Bundling

#### 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.

### PC Fails

#### PC fails

-won’t negotiate

-won’t push a bill

-too adversarial

-Boehner alienation

Reuters 9/15/13

“Obama will deal on budget, not on debt limit: ABC interview” Mark Felsenthal, Sun Sep 15, 2013, http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/09/15/us-usa-fiscal-obama-idUSBRE98E08W20130915

With a possible government shutdown looming in two weeks, and the threat of a U.S. debt default as early as mid-October, Obama said on ABC's "This Week with George Stephanopoulos" that it is up to lawmakers to work out a budget.¶ He insisted the budget should contain enough spending to help support economic growth and said he will not allow Republicans to attach conditions to raising the $16.7 trillion U.S. borrowing cap.¶ "We've presented our budget," Obama said. "Now it's the job of Congress to come up with a budget that keeps our long-term trends of ... reducing the deficit moving forward, but also allows us to invest in the things we need to grow."¶ Obama said trading cuts to his signature healthcare program in exchange for an increase in the nation's borrowing limit is not an option. "What I haven't been willing to negotiate, and will not negotiate, is on the debt ceiling," he said.¶ With the crisis over Syria off the boil, Washington faces yet another fiscal showdown. Most government operations will cease on October 1 unless Congress passes a budget the president will accept and the United States risks a debt default as early as mid-October if lawmakers delay raising the borrowing cap.¶ Obama and the Republican-led House of Representatives remain at loggerheads over both the budget and the debt limit. Republican lawmakers have sought to make defunding the president's signature healthcare law, the Affordable Care Act, also known as Obamacare, a condition for raising the cap.¶ Obama's administration has delayed implementing such steps as signing final agreements with insurance plans to be sold on federal health insurance exchanges as it struggled to get the law's provisions in place before enrollment opens on October 1.¶ "This administration has already delayed or waived fully a third of this legislation and we believe it is only fair for the American people now to have that same delay and that's the proposal I believe will be coming forward this week," Republican Representative Tom Price of Georgia said on "Fox News Sunday."¶ Democratic Representative Chris Van Hollen said on the same program that legislation mandating delays in putting the law in place would stand in the way of making health insurance affordable to many Americans and is "not acceptable."¶ "WAYS OF DOING THIS"¶ Lawmakers last week considered extending government funding at current $988 billion levels until mid-December, but Tea Party Republicans insisted that cuts to Obamacare remain part of the package.¶ Obama will mark the five-year anniversary of the U.S. financial crisis on Monday in an effort to move back to his domestic agenda after weeks of dealing with Syria and how to respond to its use of chemical weapons. The financial crisis was accelerated on September 15, 2008, when the Lehman Brothers firm filed for bankruptcy protection.¶ Obama is expected to focus on the positive, discussing progress made and highlighting his prescriptions for boosting job creation amid budget battles with Republicans.¶ He said he would be willing to talk to House Speaker John Boehner about reversing deep across-the-board spending cuts that went into effect this year through the process known as sequestration, but said Boehner has been an unwilling partner.¶ "There are ways of doing this. It's just that they haven't been willing to negotiate in a serious way on that," Obama said.

### 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.

### 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.”

### 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.

# 1AR

## Util

#### Nuclear war must be prohibited absolutely

Kateb, Professor of Politics at Princeton University, ‘92 (George, “The Inner Ocean” p 111-112)

Schell's work attempts to force on us an acknowledgment that sounds far-fetched and even ludicrous, an acknowledgment hat the possibility of extinction is carried by any use of nuclear weapons, no matter how limited or how seemingly rational or seemingly morally justified. He himself acknowledges that there is a difference between possibility and certainty. But in a matter that is more than a matter, more than one practical matter in a vast series of practical matters, in the "matter" of extinction, we are obliged to treat a possibility-a genuine possibility-as a certainty. Humanity is not to take any step that contains even the slightest risk of extinction. The doctrine of no-use is based on the possibility of extinction. Schell's perspective transforms the subject. He takes us away from the arid stretches of strategy and asks us to feel continuously, if we can, and feel keenly if only for an instant now and then, how utterly distinct the nuclear world is. Nuclear discourse must vividly register that distinctiveness. It is of no moral account that extinction may be only a slight possibility. No one can say how great the possibility is, but no one has yet credibly denied that by some sequence or other a particular use of nuclear weapons may lead to human and natural extinction. If it is not impossible it must be treated as certain: the loss signified by extinction nullifies all calculations of probability as it nullifies all calculations of costs and benefits. Abstractly put, the connections between any use of nuclear weapons and human and natural extinction are several. Most obviously, a sizable exchange of strategic nuclear weapons can, by a chain of events in nature, lead to the earth's uninhabitability, to "nuclear winter," or to Schell's "republic of insects and grass." But the consideration of extinction cannot rest with the possibility of a sizable exchange of strategic weapons. It cannot rest with the imperative that a sizable exchange must not take place. A so-called tactical or "theater" use, or a so-called limited use, is also prohibited absolutely, because of the possibility of immediate escalation into a sizable exchange or because, even if there were not an immediate escalation, the possibility of extinction would reside in the precedent for future use set by any use whatever in a world in which more than one power possesses nuclear weapons. Add other consequences: the contagious effect on nonnuclear powers who may feel compelled by a mixture of fear and vanity to try to acquire their own weapons, thus increasing the possibility of use by increasing the number of nuclear powers; and the unleashed emotions of indignation, retribution, and revenge which, if not acted on immediately in the form of escalation, can be counted on to seek expression later. Other than full strategic uses are not confined, no matter how small the explosive power: each would be a cancerous transformation of the world. All nuclear roads lead to the possibility of extinction. It is true by definition, but let us make it explicit: the doctrine of no-use excludes any first or retaliatory or later use, whether sizable or not. No-use is the imperative derived from the possibility of extinction. By containing the possibility of extinction, any use is tantamount to a declaration of war against humanity. It is not merely a war crime or a single crime against humanity. Such a war is waged by the user of nuclear weapons against every human individual as individual (present and future), not as citizen of this or that country. It is not only a war against the country that is the target. To respond with nuclear weapons, where possible, only increases the chances of extinction and can never, therefore, be allowed. The use of nuclear weapons establishes the right of any person or group, acting officially or not, violently or not, to try to punish those responsible for the use. The aim of the punishment is to deter later uses and thus to try to reduce the possibility of extinction, if, by chance, the particular use in question did not directly lead to extinction. The form of the punishment cannot be specified. Of course the chaos ensuing from a sizable exchange could make punishment irrelevant. The important point, however, is to see that those who use nuclear weapons are qualitatively worse than criminals, and at the least forfeit their offices. John Locke, a principal individualist political theorist, says that in a state of nature every individual retains the right to punish transgressors or assist in the effort to punish them, whether or not one is a direct victim. Transgressors convert an otherwise tolerable condition into a state of nature which is a state of war in which all are threatened. Analogously, the use of nuclear weapons, by containing in an immediate or delayed manner the possibility of extinction, is in Locke's phrase "a trespass against the whole species" and places the users in a state of war with all people. And people, the accumulation of individuals, must be understood as of course always indefeasibly retaining the right of selfpreservation, and hence as morally allowed, perhaps enjoined, to take the appropriate preserving steps.

## 1ar – overview effect

#### This leads to the overview effect – solves the kritik and peace

**Livingston 02** – M.D. in Business

(David, “The Ethical Commercialization of Outer Space”, http://www.davidlivingston.com/publications/The\_Ethical\_Commercialization\_of\_Outer\_Space.pdf)

Most astronauts claim to view Earth differently after having been in space. Often their commentaries show a world that is united in space, but unfortunately absent on Earth. When the Saudi-Arabian Prince Sultan Bin Salman al-Saud went into orbit in June 1985 he said, "I think the minute I saw the view for the first time was really one of the most memorable moments in my entire life."8 When asked by the interviewer how it changed his understanding of God, the Sultan said, "It really strengthens your convictions. To me, it's an opportunity to prove that there is no conflict being a Muslim, or any other religion. Looking at it from here, the troubles all over the world, and not just the Middle East, look very strange as you see the boundaries and border lines disappearing."9 U.S. Congressman Bill Nelson, who went to space in January 1986, said upon his return: "If the superpower leaders could be given the opportunity to see the Earth from the perspective from which I saw it—perhaps at a summit meeting in space in the context of the next century—they might realize that we're all in this with a common denominator. It would have a positive effect on their future decisions concerning war and peace.”10 Such space-based perspectives and their spillover effects on those of us unable to experience space firsthand may ultimately have a greater influence on our commercial space business practices than anything we do or say on Earth. Robert Bigelow of Bigelow Aerospace of Las Vegas was recently interviewed about his announcement to invest $500 million of his own money over the next several years to build a space cruise liner for Earth to moon tourism. Bigelow understands the limitations of our perceptions and the way we do things, especially since we have technology that enables us to do so much. When asked during his interview if his cruise liner would have defenses onboard in case of a meeting with a hostile ET, Bigelow replied: I'm not so sure exactly who the Klingons are. I think the jury is still out on whether or not it’s the human race. I think we have a huge divergence between our paths of improvement on spiritual maturity, while at the same time this century we compare that against the path of our technological advancements. You have to have some harmony. I think in order to be a member of a species that is a space-faring species that other species shouldn't fear, I think you have some type of meeting where your technological maturity is met to some degree with spiritual maturity.11