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#### Text: The United States federal government should back entry and negotiate as an economic partner with Mexico in the Transatlantic Free Trade Area

#### Integrating Mexico into TAFTA negotiations reignites support for widespread multilateral trade liberalization – decreases international violence globally

Hills 4/24 – former US Trade Representative and Chief Executive Officer of Hills & Company International Consultants (Carla A, “A Trans-Atlantic Trade Pact for the World,” 4/24/13, New York Times, http://www.nytimes.com/2013/04/25/opinion/global/a-trans-atlantic-trade-pact-for-the-world.html)//SJF

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

#### US backing is vital to Mexican negotiation credibility in TAFTA

Glickhouse and Zissis 4/26 – editor-in-chief of the Americas Society and Council of the Americas (Rachel, Carin, “Explainer: President Barack Obama's Trip to Mexico and Costa Rica,” 4/26/13, http://www.as-coa.org/articles/explainer-president-barack-obamas-trip-mexico-and-costa-rica)//SJF

Trade: Talking TPP and More in Mexico Given that Mexico is the third-biggest U.S. trading partner, the two countries’ economies are deeply connected. The North-American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) is closing in on its twentieth birthday, and U.S.-Mexican trade neared $500 billion last year, representing more than a fivefold increase since pre-NAFTA days. As Herminio Blanco, one of the deal’s chief negotiators, commented on NAFTA to AS/COA Online last month: “[I]f somebody would have told me, in 20 years Mexico will be exporting more than a billion dollars per day, I would say, ‘You must be crazy.’” In 2011, trilateral trade between Canada, Mexico, and the United States “reached the $1 trillion threshold,” notes a Congressional Research Service report. More recently, the three countries have become party to negotiations of a larger trade agreement—the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), a multilateral deal seeking to boost economic integration among Pacific Rim countries. In terms of hemispheric membership, Chile and Peru are also members; Colombia, Costa Rica, and Panama are observers (a new Americas Quarterly article notes that Costa Rica “is close to signing with all members, one of the requirements of full membership”). “A concluded TPP would solidify North America as an integrated production platform with Asia-Pacific and parts of South America, while also offering an opportunity to strengthen NAFTA—cutting edge when it entered into force almost 20 years ago but now in need of an update,” says COA Vice President Eric Farnsworth. “This is in equal measure why both Mexico and Canada should be invited to join the United States in the pending negotiations with Europe at the front end, not brought in after the fact when negotiations may already be well advanced,” he added, referring to the EU-U.S. Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership announced in February. It was during Obama’s last trip to Latin America in June 2012—for the G20 in Los Cabos—that the United States backed Mexico’s membership in the TPP. This time around the Mexican government could seek U.S. support to join in the EU-U.S. negotiations.

#### TAFTA is better and solves the affs internal links – comparative evidence to TPP

**Cooper 13** –Ryan Cooper is the web editor of the Washington Monthly, (“A Look at Two Potential Trade Deals”, March 13, 2013, http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/political-animal-a/2013\_03/a\_look\_at\_two\_potential\_trade043546.php#)//sawyer

Prestowitz highlights several little-known facts about the TPP which ought to see wider discussion before any treaty is signed. For example, it has the potential to seriously alter many of our existing trade agreements, especially in Latin America and the Caribbean:

 An additional problem is how **the TPP would destroy the Caribbean Basin Free Trade Agreement (CAFTA) and poke big holes in the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA).** For example, under both agreements, textile producers in the Caribbean and Mexico who use U.S. yarn receive duty-free access to the U.S. market for textiles and apparel. The U.S. struck these deals partly in response to the discriminatory trade and industrial policies of some Asian countries that were distorting markets and causing the loss of U.S. jobs. A second objective was to help create jobs in Mexico and the Caribbean and thereby reduce the number of undocumented immigrants from these countries while also providing an alternative to employment in the drug-trafficking trade. By removing tariffs on textile imports from Vietnam, the TPP would displace an estimated 1.2 million textile workers in the Caribbean Basin and Mexico along with about 170,000 in the United States, according to Mary O’Rourke, an industry analyst. Some see that as simply the price of achieving true free trade and optimizing the planet’s division of labor. But Vietnam is dominated by state-owned enterprises and is far from being a market economy. Furthermore, under a situation of true free trade, it would be China, not Vietnam, that would take most of the textile business, because China has gigantic excess capacity in textiles, as it does in just about everything else. TAFTA, though, comes out as a better deal, according to Prestowitz. It should spark some nontrivial economic growth, for starters, and would have little of the labor market undercutting that is such a problem when dealing with countries like China: This experience is one reason why **TAFTA deserves a second look, but there are also others. First is the need for growth in an age of high debt and austerity**. Neither the U.S. nor Europe is politically prepared to stimulate its economy through any significant increase in deficit spending. That means growth must come from some other source, and the efficiencies that would come from further integration of European and American economies are a plausible answer. Labor unions in the EU are strong and wages are high, so there will be no race to the bottom. And the EU and the U.S. largely share a commitment to free markets, free trade, and democracy. Much of what has gone wrong with the WTO derives from systemic conflicts between the U.S. and the EU on the one side and the more interventionist and authoritarian political economies of the rest of the world on the other. The biggest economic gain from TAFTA would be from harmonizing regulation. Inconsistencies in regulation raise the costs of transatlantic trade in automobiles, for example, by 27 percent, and by 6.5 percent in the electronics sector alone. The United States and Europe both have safe headlights, for instance, but EU cars exported to America must have different headlights than those sold in Europe and vice versa. That non-tariff barrier inhibits exports while raising costs by forcing producers to keep extra stocks of different headlights. The same holds true for electronics and most other products. Mutual recognition of essentially equivalent standards and removal of similar non-tariff barriers would boost U.S. GDP by 1 to 3 percent ($150 billion to $450 billion), according to a 2005 study by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.

### 2

#### Economic engagement isnt normalizing trade

Resnick 1 – Dr. Evan Resnick, Ph.D. in Political Science from Columbia University, Assistant Professor of Political Science at Yeshiva University, “Defining Engagement”, Journal of International Affairs, Spring, 54(2), Ebsco

Scholars have limited the concept of engagement in a third way by unnecessarily restricting the scope of the policy. In their evaluation of post-Cold War US engagement of China, Paul Papayoanou and Scott Kastner define engagement as the attempt to integrate a target country into the international order through promoting "increased trade and financial transactions."(n21) However, limiting engagement policy to the increasing of economic interdependence leaves out many other issue areas that were an integral part of the Clinton administration's China policy, including those in the diplomatic, military and cultural arenas. Similarly, the US engagement of North Korea, as epitomized by the 1994 Agreed Framework pact, promises eventual normalization of economic relations and the gradual normalization of diplomatic relations.(n22) Equating engagement with economic contacts alone risks neglecting the importance and potential effectiveness of contacts in noneconomic issue areas.¶ Finally, some scholars risk gleaning only a partial and distorted insight into engagement by restrictively evaluating its effectiveness in achieving only some of its professed objectives. Papayoanou and Kastner deny that they seek merely to examine the "security implications" of the US engagement of China, though in a footnote, they admit that "[m]uch of the debate [over US policy toward the PRC] centers around the effects of engagement versus containment on human rights in China."(n23) This approach violates a cardinal tenet of statecraft analysis: the need to acknowledge multiple objectives in virtually all attempts to exercise inter-state influence.(n24) Absent a comprehensive survey of the multiplicity of goals involved in any such attempt, it would be naive to accept any verdict rendered concerning its overall merits.¶ A REFINED DEFINITION OF ENGAGEMENT¶ In order to establish a more effective framework for dealing with unsavory regimes, I propose that we define engagement as the attempt to influence the political behavior of a target state through the comprehensive establishment and enhancement of contacts with that state across multiple issue-areas (i.e. diplomatic, military, economic, cultural). The following is a brief list of the specific forms that such contacts might include:¶ DIPLOMATIC CONTACTS¶ Extension of diplomatic recognition; normalization of diplomatic relations¶ Promotion of target-state membership in international institutions and regimes¶ Summit meetings and other visits by the head of state and other senior government officials of sender state to target state and vice-versa¶ MILITARY CONTACTS¶ Visits of senior military officials of the sender state to the target state and vice-versa¶ Arms transfers¶ Military aid and cooperation¶ Military exchange and training programs¶ Confidence and security-building measures¶ Intelligence sharing¶ ECONOMIC CONTACTS¶ Trade agreements and promotion¶ Foreign economic and humanitarian aid in the form of loans and/or grants¶ CULTURAL CONTACTS¶ Cultural treaties¶ Inauguration of travel and tourism links¶ Sport, artistic and academic exchanges (n25)¶ Engagement is an iterated process in which the sender and target state develop a relationship of increasing interdependence, culminating in the endpoint of "normalized relations" characterized by a high level of interactions across multiple domains. Engagement is a quintessential exchange relationship: the target state wants the prestige and material resources that would accrue to it from increased contacts with the sender state, while the sender state seeks to modify the domestic and/or foreign policy behavior of the target state. This deductive logic could adopt a number of different forms or strategies when deployed in practice.(n26) For instance, individual contacts can be established by the sender state at either a low or a high level of conditionality.(n27) Additionally, the sender state can achieve its objectives using engagement through any one of the following causal processes: by directly modifying the behavior of the target regime; by manipulating or reinforcing the target states' domestic balance of political power between competing factions that advocate divergent policies; or by shifting preferences at the grassroots level in the hope that this will precipitate political change from below within the target state.¶ This definition implies that three necessary conditions must hold for engagement to constitute an effective foreign policy instrument. First, the overall magnitude of contacts between the sender and target states must initially be low. If two states are already bound by dense contacts in multiple domains (i.e., are already in a highly interdependent relationship), engagement loses its impact as an effective policy tool. Hence, one could not reasonably invoke the possibility of the US engaging Canada or Japan in order to effect a change in either country's political behavior. Second, the material or prestige needs of the target state must be significant, as engagement derives its power from the promise that it can fulfill those needs. The greater the needs of the target state, the more amenable to engagement it is likely to be. For example, North Korea's receptivity to engagement by the US dramatically increased in the wake of the demise of its chief patron, the Soviet Union, and the near-total collapse of its national economy.(n28)¶ Third, the target state must perceive the engager and the international order it represents as a potential source of the material or prestige resources it desires. This means that autarkic, revolutionary and unlimited regimes which eschew the norms and institutions of the prevailing order, such as Stalin's Soviet Union or Hitler's Germany, will not be seduced by the potential benefits of engagement.¶ This reformulated conceptualization avoids the pitfalls of prevailing scholarly conceptions of engagement. It considers the policy as a set of means rather than ends, does not delimit the types of states that can either engage or be engaged, explicitly encompasses contacts in multiple issue-areas, allows for the existence of multiple objectives in any given instance of engagement and, as will be shown below, permits the elucidation of multiple types of positive sanctions.

#### “Increase” means net increase

Words and Phrases 8(v. 20a, p. 264-265)

Cal.App.2 Dist. 1991. Term “increase,” as used in statute giving the Energy Commission modification jurisdiction over any alteration, replacement, or improvement of equipment that results in “increase” of 50 megawatts or more in electric generating capacity of existing thermal power plant, refers to “net increase” in power plant’s total generating capacity; in deciding whether there has been the requisite 50-megawatt increase as a result of new units being incorporated into a plant, Energy Commission cannot ignore decreases in capacity caused by retirement or deactivation of other units at plant. West’s Ann.Cal.Pub.Res.Code § 25123.

Vote NEG

1. Limits – justifies removing small restrictions on all countries which explodes limits – theyre key to clash

2. Ground – not increasing economic engagement means we don’t have any DA links because they aren’t specific to economic and they don’t increase it
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#### The TPP will cause allow for corporations to subvert regulations accelerating environmental collapse – the Asian-Pacific region is key

**Nash-hoff 13 -**Michele Nash-Hoff, Founder and President at ElectroFab Sales (“The Trans-Pacific Partnership Trade Agreement Would Harm Our Environment”, 7/10/13

[http://www.huffingtonpost.com/michele-nashhoff/the-transpacific-partners\_1\_b\_3568136.html)//sawyer](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/michele-nashhoff/the-transpacific-partners_1_b_3568136.html%29//sawyer)

Proponents say that the Trans Pacific Partnership (TPP) trade agreement would be a platform for economic integration and government deregulation for nations surrounding the Pacific Rim and facilitate free trade to counter China's financial influence in Asia and the Pacific. The negotiating parties include Australia, Brunei, Canada, Chile, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore, Vietnam, and the United States. Japan also announced its intention to join the agreement last spring. Because the TPP is intended as a "docking agreement," other Pacific Rim countries could join over time, and the Philippines, Thailand, Colombia, and others are already expressing interest. The TPP is poised to become the largest Free Trade Agreement in the world. According to[CitizensTrade.org](http://www.citizenstrade.org/ctc/trade-policies/tpp-potential-trade-policy-problems/), "The ongoing, multi-year negotiations over the TPP are supposed to conclude this year, so the window of opportunity for preventing this free trade agreement is rapidly closing." Among other reasons about which I have written [previously](http://savingusmanufacturing.com/blog/2013/02/), opponents of the TPP say it would harm our planet's environment, **subverting climate change measures and regulation of mining, land use, and biotechnology**. The Pacific Rim is an area of great significance from an environmental perspective. It includes **Australia's Great Barrier Reef**, the world's largest coral reef system, home to more than 11,000 species. It includes Peru and its **Amazon Rainforest --** one of the most biologically diverse areas on Earth. In May 2007, citizen-led advocacy groups including the [Sierra Club](http://sierraclub.org/trade/downloads/TPP-LNG%20Factsheet%20FINAL.pdf) forged a bipartisan consensus that set the minimum standards for environment, labor and other provisions to be included in future trade agreements. According to sections of the TPP that have been leaked, it appears that these minimum standards are being ignored. It is essential that the environment chapter of the TPP build on the environmental protection progress that has been made: "At the minimum, the chapter should be binding and subject to the same dispute settlement provisions as commercial chapters; ensure that countries uphold and strengthen their domestic environmental laws and policies and their obligations under agreed multilateral environmental agreements; and include biding provisions to address the core environment and conservation challenges of the Pacific Rim region, **such as efforts to combat illegal trade in wood, wood products, and wildlife and to strengthen fisheries managemen**t." If you "Google" TPP and the environment, you come up with more than 20 pages of articles by one organization after another and one author after another expressing reasons why the **TPP would harm the environment**. The opposition to the TPP began as early as 2011 when the first drafts were leaked and intensified in 2012. These organizations include the [Sierra Club](http://sierraclub.org/trade/downloads/TPP-LNG%20Factsheet%20FINAL.pdf), [Public Citizen](http://www.citizen.org/Page.aspx?pid=5411&frcrld=) group (founded by Ralph Nader), the [Citizens Trade Campaign](http://www.citizenstrade.org/ctc/trade-policies/tpp-potential-trade-policy-problems/), and [Economy in Crisis](http://economyincrisis.org/content/the-trans-pacific-partnership-tpp-will-cause-continued-harm-to-u-s-economy-manufacturing), among many others. A common thread of the articles is either a subtle or overt accusation that President Obama has "sold out" to Wall Street/big banks and multinational/transnational corporations. On their website, Union-backed [We Party Patriots](http://wepartypatriots.com/wp/2012/12/03/the-trans-pacific-parterships-international-tribunals-will-take-corporate-personhood-to-the-level-of-corporate-super-humanism/) states, "...the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) is being put together in extreme secrecy. This secrecy comes complete with a total lack of mainstream media coverage despite serious potential long-term effects. Leaked documents show that the TPP will have **a chilling effect on the ability of the United States government to take legal action against multi-national corporations for their abuses of environmental**, agricultural, and labor laws." The Fair World Project's website [states](http://fairworldproject.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/FWP_Spring_publication_2013_page12.pdf) that in late 2012, "a group of labor leaders, trade justice advocates, family farmers, environmentalists, food sovereignty groups and others from the U.S., Canada and Mexico created a 'North American Unity Statement Opposing NAFTA Expansion through the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP),' with the goal of uniting 1,000 organizations in opposition to the TPP." On March 7, 2013, [Friends of the Earth](http://www.foe.org/news/archives/2013-03-new-video-peril-in-the-pacific) announced that it had released a new video, "Peril in the Pacific: Trans Pacific trade agreement threatens people and the planet." The video illustrates these threats by telling the story of "[Chevron v. Ecuador](http://www.newyorker.com/reporting/2012/01/09/120109fa_fact_keefe?currentPage=all)" international investment suit brought under an existing U.S. treaty. The video raises questions like: "Who should pay to clean up what has been called the "[Rainforest Chernobyl](http://www.foe.org/news/blog/2012-02-the-rainforest-chernobyl--will-us-investment-treaty)" in the Ecuadorian Amazon? Why are the people of the rainforest who suffered the most not represented at the international tribunal hearing the case? **Is it U.S. policy to favor the financial interests of multi-national corporations over people and the environment in such disputes?"** The video also asks why the negotiating framework for the TPP favors Wall Street and multinational corporations at the expense of current U. S. environmental and climate policy and why does it allow multinational corporations to challenge laws that protect our air, land and water. **Because the Asia-Pacific region accounts for about one third of all the threatened species in the world**, Friends of the Earth is concerned that the **TPP trade agreement potentially checkmates many of our country's past environmental victories and would block new initiatives**. The natural environment and rich biodiversity of the Pacific Rim are threatened by illegal and/or unsustainable commercial exploitation of the ocean, natural resources, and forests. Friends of the Earth recommends that the TPP negotiators must address the following issues to avoid the most serious environmental harms by: Including an environment chapter that would obligate countries to enforce domestic environmental protections and abide by global environmental agreements that are enforceable through international lawsuits. Rejecting **the proposed TPP investment chapter** that would authorize foreign investors to bypass domestic courts and bring suit before special international **tribunals biased in favor of multinationals to seek awards of unlimited monetary damages in compensation for the cost of complying with environmental and other public interest regulations**. Rejecting "provisions of the TPP intellectual property chapter that would provide international legal protections for corporate patents on plant and animal life, granting companies ownership and sole access to these building blocks of life." Rejecting the regulatory coherence chapter that could hamstring environmental regulation and "encourage cost-benefit analysis that exaggerates financial costs and minimizes the intrinsic value of protecting living things, wild places, and the stability of the ecosystem." Friends of the Earth urges that **the TPP "must serve to strengthen environmental protection and support the biodiversity in the Pacific Rim and not facilitate a race to the bottom in environmental deregulation."** What surprises me is that all of the above organizations supported President Obama in his bid for reelection last year despite the fact that he had gone back on his [pledge](http://www.populistpac.com/petition) "to oppose Bush-style free trade agreements that lead to thousands of lost American jobs" and his [word](http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/cifamerica/2011/sep/08/obama-trade-deals) to "not support NAFTA-type trade agreements" in his 2008 campaign. Now that he is elected for his second and last term, **what incentive does he have to listen to the opinions of these organizations that oppose the Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement? None!** A few conservative news outlets such as WorldNet Daily began to recognize the dangers of the TPP early this year, beginning with the [article](http://www.wnd.com/2013/02/obama-skirting-congress-in-globalist-plan/), "Obama skirting Congress in globalist plan?" in which Jerome Corsi warn that "the administration apparently plans to restrict congressional prerogatives to an up-or-down vote" utilizing the "fast-track authority," a provision under the Trade Promotion Authority that requires Congress to review a FTA under limited debate, in an accelerated time frame subject to a yes-or-no vote. Under fast-track authority, there is no provision for Congress to modify the agreement by submitting amendments to ensure foreign partners that the FTA, once signed, will not be changed during the legislative process. In a more recent [article](http://www.wnd.com/2013/02/obama-skirting-congress-in-globalist-plan/), "Obama's 2-ocean globalist plan," Jerome Corsi writes, "Quietly, the Obama administration is systematically putting into place a two-ocean globalist plan that will dwarf all prior trade agreements, including NAFTA, with the goal of establishing the global sovereignty envisioned by New World Order enthusiasts. The two agreements are the Trans-Pacific Partnership, or TPP, and the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership, or TIPP. **WND has learned the Obama administration plans to jam the TPP through Congress** no later than Dec. 31." We certainly cannot expect to influence the President to oppose the TPP near the end of three-years of negotiations that took place under his direction. With the virtual black out of coverage about the TPP in the mainstream media, the best we can do is make our opinions heard loud and clear to our Senators and Congressional representatives and urge our family, friends, and members of our personal and business network to do the same. We must urge our elected representatives to vote against granting President Obama "fast track authority" under the Trade Promotion Authority. There is no time to waste. Contact your congressional representative and tell them we cannot afford another damaging "free trade" agreement that would destroy our national sovereignty, hurt American manufacturers, and harm our environment. Tell them to vote "no" to granting the President "fast track authority."

#### Biodiversity collapse will lead to an invisible threshold of destruction

**Diner, 94**[David, Ph.D., Planetary Science and Geology, "The Army and the Endangered Species Act: Who's Endangering Whom?," Military Law Review, 143 Mil. L. Rev. 161]

To accept that the snail darter, harelip sucker, or Dismal Swamp southeastern shrew 74 could save [hu]mankind may be difficult for some. Many, if not most, species are useless to[hu]man[s] in a direct utilitarian sense. Nonetheless, they may be **critical in an indirect role, because their extirpations could affect a directly useful species negatively**. In a closely interconnected ecosystem, the loss of a species affects **other species dependent on it**. 75 Moreover, as the number of species decline, the effect of each new extinction on the remaining species increases dramatically. 4. Biological Diversity. -- The main premise of species preservation is that diversity is better than simplicity. 77 As the current mass extinction has progressed, the world's biological diversity generally has decreased. This trend occurs within ecosystems by reducing the number of species, and within species by reducing the number of individuals. Both trends carry serious future implications. 78 [\*173] Biologically diverse ecosystems are characterized by a large number of specialist species, filling narrow ecological niches. These ecosystems inherently are more stable than less diverse systems. "The more complex the ecosystem, the more successfully it can resist a stress. . . . [l]ike a net, in which each knot is connected to others by several strands, such a fabric can resist collapse better than a simple, unbranched circle of threads -- which if cut anywhere breaks down as a whole." 79 By causing widespread extinctions, humans have artificially simplified many ecosystems. As biologic simplicity increases, so does the risk of ecosystem failure. The spreading Sahara Desert in Africa, and the dustbowl conditions of the 1930s in the United States are relatively mild examples of what might be expected if this trend continues. Theoretically, each new animal or plant extinction, with all its dimly perceived and intertwined affects, could cause total ecosystem collapse and human extinction. **Each new extinction increases the risk of disaster**. Like a mechanic removing, one by one, the rivets from an aircraft's wings, 80 [**hu]mankind may be edging closer to the abyss.**

### 4

#### Strikes inevitable even without congressional approval

Miller 9/6

Jake, “Congress struggling with how to vote on Syria attack” [http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-250\_162-57601727/congress-struggling-with-how-to-vote-on-syria-attack/]

Ultimately, apart from considerations about damaged U.S. credibility, the congressional vote to authorize military action in Syria could be much ado about nothing. The president, backed by his national security team, has insisted he has the right to launch a strike regardless of whether or not Congress approves.¶ It's a message unlikely to push wavering lawmakers to make up their minds any sooner: The vote on Syria could be among the most consequential of their careers, but it could also be entirely inconsequential to the president's ultimate decision.

#### The TPP is unpopular – assumes your turns

**Capling and Ravenhill 11** ­ - Ann Capling went to the University of Melbourne, John Ravenhill went to the Research School of Social Sciences, Australian National University, (“Multilateralising regionalism: what role for the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement?, December 12, 2011 http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/09512748.2011.634078)//sawyer

**Of particular note here has been the capacity of protectionist forces in the US Congress to deny the President a renewal of trade promotion authority, and to signal that their opposition to agreements is so deep seated that the Administration refrains from placing them before the Senate for ratiﬁcation (seen with the Korean and Colombian agreements under both the Bush and Obama administrations).** Substantial opposition to the TPP was expressed in the US Congress even before the negotiations began**. In particular, the US trade deﬁcit with China has increased domestic protectionist pressures and has led many to question the beneﬁt of free trade with developing countries more generally (Aggarwal 2010). The TPP has become caught up in a more general tide of skepticism towards bilateral trade agreements, and in a push by trade unionists and civil society groups, more generally, to see these agreements include provisions on labour rights and environmental protection. And it also attracted opposition speciﬁc to the proposed agreement itself, in particular from dairy interests concerned at the potential competition from NZ’s efﬁcient exporters (Fergusson and Vaughn 2010). The National Milk Producer’s Federation has sought to exclude the dairy industry in any trade agreement with NZ – in March 2010, 30 US Senators wrote to the US Trade Representative, Ron Kirk, warning that opening the US market to NZ dairy products would pose a major threat to the US industry. But opposition to the proposed agreement was not conﬁned to the dairy industry: in May 2010, 20 groups representing agricultural producers wrote to the Obama administration requesting that market access schedules and accompanying ROOs in existing US PTAs not be changed as part of the TPP negotiations (TPP Digest 2010). Some sectors of US manufacturing have also opposed the TPP, most notably the National Council of Textile Organizations, which argues that Vietnam should be excluded from the negotiations.**

#### Congressional approval boosts Obama’s cred – an XO would kill it

Luce 9-1 – Washington bureau chief of the Financial Times (Edward, “Barack Obama risks more than just his credibility on Syria”, September 1 of 2013, <http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/8c1b8faa-128b-11e3-8336-00144feabdc0.html#axzz2dtdrJg26>)

First, the positive side. Mr Obama’s request, which Congress will debate only in the week beginning September 9, has bought him time to push for a diplomatic solution. On Tuesday he travels to St Petersburg for the conference of the Group of 20 leading nations. Last month he turned down an invitation from President Vladimir Putin to hold a bilateral meeting in Moscow after the summit. By postponing strikes for at least 10 days, he opens a window to talk to Mr Putin, the Chinese, the Arab League and other central actors. Hopefully he can prove that diplomacy works with the threat of action. That would be a triumph. But it would be optimistic to suppose Mr Putin and others will take seriously Mr Obama’s threat of strikes before Congress has authorised them. Until then Mr Obama cannot afford to spend too much time out of Washington. Nor can his principals, John Kerry and Chuck Hagel, respectively secretaries of state and defence, both of whom will be needed to testify to Congress.¶ Mr Obama is confident he will get the green light from both houses, as George W Bush did for the 2002 bill authorising the Iraq war, and as George HW Bush did – though by a far narrower Senate majority – for the first Iraq war in 1990. No president has been turned down since the War Powers Act passed in 1973 – though few have bothered to ask. Should Mr Obama win his authorisation next week, or the week after, he will emerge stronger at home and abroad. At home, he will have acquired co-ownership with Congress of whatever happens in Syria. At a moment when a large majority of Americans is sceptical of military action, the president’s hope is to make it bipartisan. His political instinct is sound. Abroad, it will strengthen his credibility too. A Yes vote would demonstrate US exceptionalism at its best – burying its political differences to respond to the barbaric gassing of hundreds of innocent foreign children.

#### Obama’s cred solves south china sea conflict

Ben Coes 11, a former speechwriter in the George H.W. Bush administration, managed Mitt Romney’s successful campaign for Massachusetts Governor in 2002 & author, “The disease of a weak president”, The Daily Caller, http://dailycaller.com/2011/09/30/the-disease-of-a-weak-president/

The disease of a weak president usually begins with the Achilles’ heel all politicians are born with — the desire to be popular. It leads to pandering to different audiences, people and countries and creates a sloppy, incoherent set of policies. Ironically, it ultimately results in that very politician losing the trust and respect of friends and foes alike.¶ In the case of Israel, those of us who are strong supporters can at least take comfort in the knowledge that Tel Aviv will do whatever is necessary to protect itself from potential threats from its unfriendly neighbors. While it would be preferable for the Israelis to be able to count on the United States, in both word and deed, the fact is right now they stand alone. Obama and his foreign policy team have undercut the Israelis in a multitude of ways. Despite this, I wouldn’t bet against the soldiers of Shin Bet, Shayetet 13 and the Israeli Defense Forces.¶ But Obama’s weakness could — in other places — have implications far, far worse than anything that might ultimately occur in Israel. The triangular plot of land that connects Pakistan, India and China is held together with much more fragility and is built upon a truly foreboding foundation of religious hatreds, radicalism, resource envy and nuclear weapons.¶ If you can only worry about preventing one foreign policy disaster, worry about this one.**¶** Here are a few unsettling facts to think about:¶ First, Pakistan and India have fought three wars since the British de-colonized and left the region in 1947. All three wars occurred before the two countries had nuclear weapons. Both countries now possess hundreds of nuclear weapons, enough to wipe each other off the map many times over.¶ Second, Pakistan is 97% Muslim. It is a question of when — not if — Pakistan elects a radical Islamist in the mold of Ayatollah Khomeini as its president. Make no mistake, it will happen, and when it does the world will have a far greater concern than Ali Khamenei or Mahmoud Ahmadinejad and a single nuclear device.¶ Third, China sits at the northern border of both India and Pakistan. China is strategically aligned with Pakistan. Most concerning, China covets India’s natural resources. Over the years, it has slowly inched its way into the northern tier of India-controlled Kashmir Territory, appropriating land and resources and drawing little notice from the outside world.¶ In my book, Coup D’Etat, I consider this tinderbox of colliding forces in Pakistan, India and China as a thriller writer. But thriller writers have the luxury of solving problems by imagining solutions on the page. In my book, when Pakistan elects a radical Islamist who then starts a war with India and introduces nuclear weapons to the theater, America steps in and removes the Pakistani leader through a coup d’état.¶ I wish it was that simple.¶ The more complicated and difficult truth is that we, as Americans, must take sides. We must be willing to be unpopular in certain places. Most important, we must be ready and willing to threaten our military might on behalf of our allies. And our allies are Israel and India.

#### South China Sea conflicts cause extinction

Wittner 11 (Lawrence S. Wittner, Emeritus Professor of History at the State University of New York/Albany, Wittner is the author of eight books, the editor or co-editor of another four, and the author of over 250 published articles and book reviews. From 1984 to 1987, he edited Peace & Change, a journal of peace research., 11/28/2011, "Is a Nuclear War With China Possible?", www.huntingtonnews.net/14446)

While nuclear weapons exist, there remains a danger that they will be used. After all, for centuries national conflicts have led to wars, with nations employing their deadliest weapons. The current deterioration of U.S. relations with China might end up providing us with yet another example of this phenomenon. The gathering tension between the United States and China is clear enough. Disturbed by China’s growing economic and military strength, the U.S. government recently challenged China’s claims in the South China Sea, increased the U.S. military presence in Australia, and deepened U.S. military ties with other nations in the Pacific region. According to Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, the United States was “asserting our own position as a Pacific power.” But need this lead to nuclear war? Not necessarily. And yet, there are signs that it could. After all, both the United States and China possess large numbers of nuclear weapons. The U.S. government threatened to attack China with nuclear weapons during the Korean War and, later, during the conflict over the future of China’s offshore islands, Quemoy and Matsu. In the midst of the latter confrontation, President Dwight Eisenhower declared publicly, and chillingly, that U.S. nuclear weapons would “be used just exactly as you would use a bullet or anything else.” Of course, China didn’t have nuclear weapons then. Now that it does, perhaps the behavior of national leaders will be more temperate. But the loose nuclear threats of U.S. and Soviet government officials during the Cold War, when both nations had vast nuclear arsenals, should convince us that, even as the military ante is raised, nuclear saber-rattling persists. Some pundits argue that nuclear weapons prevent wars between nuclear-armed nations; and, admittedly, there haven’t been very many—at least not yet. But the Kargil War of 1999, between nuclear-armed India and nuclear-armed Pakistan, should convince us that such wars can occur. Indeed, in that case, the conflict almost slipped into a nuclear war. Pakistan’s foreign secretary threatened that, if the war escalated, his country felt free to use “any weapon” in its arsenal. During the conflict, Pakistan did move nuclear weapons toward its border, while India, it is claimed, readied its own nuclear missiles for an attack on Pakistan. At the least, though, don’t nuclear weapons deter a nuclear attack? Do they? Obviously, NATO leaders didn’t feel deterred, for, throughout the Cold War, NATO’s strategy was to respond to a Soviet conventional military attack on Western Europe by launching a Western nuclear attack on the nuclear-armed Soviet Union. Furthermore, if U.S. government officials really believed that nuclear deterrence worked, they would not have resorted to championing “Star Wars” and its modern variant, national missile defense. Why are these vastly expensive—and probably unworkable—military defense systems needed if other nuclear powers are deterred from attacking by U.S. nuclear might? Of course, the bottom line for those Americans convinced that nuclear weapons safeguard them from a Chinese nuclear attack might be that the U.S. nuclear arsenal is far greater than its Chinese counterpart. Today, it is estimated that the U.S. government possesses over five thousand nuclear warheads, while the Chinese government has a total inventory of roughly three hundred. Moreover, only about forty of these Chinese nuclear weapons can reach the United States. Surely the United States would “win” any nuclear war with China. But what would that “victory” entail? A nuclear attack by China would immediately slaughter at least 10 million Americans in a great storm of blast and fire, while leaving many more dying horribly of sickness and radiation poisoning. The Chinese death toll in a nuclear war would be far higher. Both nations would be reduced to smoldering, radioactive wastelands. Also, radioactive debris sent aloft by the nuclear explosions would blot out the sun and bring on a “nuclear winter” around the globe—destroying agriculture, creating worldwide famine, and generating chaos and destruction.

### 5

#### Text: The People’s Republic of China should negotiate as an economic partner in the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

#### Their 1AC Wilson and Olson evidence says China doesn’t have an incentive to join – the CP solves all of the 2nd advantage

### China

#### War is impossible – Chinese democratization will facilitate cooperation

**Friedberg, 05** (Aaron L. Friedberg, Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton University. International Security, Vol. 30, No. 2 (Fall 2005) http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/is3002\_pp007-045\_friedberg.pdf)

Liberal optimists believe that, although it is still far from finished, the process of democratization is already well under way in China.20 This process is being driven largely by economic development, which, in turn, is being accelerated by China’s increasing openness to trade. Rising per capita incomes are creating a growing Chinese middle class. In Europe and North America, and more recently in Asia, those whose rising incomes allow them to do more than attend to the struggle for daily existence have been the prime movers behind progress toward democracy, and there is every reason to hope that they will play a similar role in China.21 Liberals also believe that, in addition to stirring the desire for political rights, economic development creates an objective, functional need for political liberalization. Without courts, contracts, and a reliable rule of law, economic progress will surely falter. Moreover, in an era in which sustained growth depends increasingly on free flows of information, regimes that seek to restrict speech and control communications will be at a fatal disadvantage. Over time, if it wishes even to approach the levels of well-being already attained by its advanced industrial counterparts (all of which are democracies), China too must become democratic.22 As it does, the liberal optimists expect that its relations with the United States will stabilize and that, ultimately, it will enter into the democratic “zone of peace.” Although the process may take time fully to unfold, before too long open conflict between the United States and a democratic China will be as improbable as war among the members of the European Union appears to be today.

#### No China war – economic interdependence

#### China wouldn’t get involved

**Brzezinski, 05** (Zbigniew - national security affairs advisor to the Carter administration – FEB - “Make Money, Not War,” Foreign Policy, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/story/cms.php?story\_id=2740)

There will be inevitable frictions as China’s regional role increases and as a Chinese “sphere of influence” develops. U.S. power may recede gradually in the coming years, and the unavoidable decline in Japan’s influence will heighten the sense of China’s regional preeminence. But to have a real collision, China needs a military that is capable of going toe-to-toe with the United States. At the strategic level, China maintains a posture of minimum deterrence. Forty years after acquiring nuclear-weapons technology, China has just 24 ballistic missiles capable of hitting the United States. Even beyond the realm of strategic warfare, a country must have the capacity to attain its political objectives before it will engage in limited war. It is hard to envisage how China could promote its objectives when it is acutely vulnerable to a blockade and isolation enforced by the United States. In a conflict, Chinese maritime trade would stop entirely. The flow of oil would cease, and the Chinese economy would be paralyzed.

#### No evidence that says there is an incentive for negociation

#### No Taiwan escalation

Shor 12 (Francis, Professor of History – Wayne State, “Declining US Hegemony and Rising Chinese Power: A Formula for Conflict?”, Perspectives on Global Development and Technology, 11(1), pp. 157-167)

While the United States no longer dominates the global economy as it did during the first two decades after WWII, it still is the leading economic power in the world. However, over the last few decades China, with all its internal contradictions, has made enormous leaps until it now occupies the number two spot. In fact, the IMF recently projected that the Chinese economy would become the world's largest in 2016. In manufacturing China has displaced the US in so many areas, including becoming the number one producer of steel and exporter of four-fifths of all of the textile products in the world and two-thirds of the world's copy machines, DVD players, and microwaves ovens. Yet, a significant portion of this manufacturing is still owned by foreign companies, including U.S. firms like General Motors. [5] On the other hand, China is also the largest holder of U.S. foreign reserves, e.g. treasury bonds. This may be one of the reasons mitigating full-blown conflict with the U.S. now, since China has such a large stake in the U.S. economy, both as a holder of bonds and as the leading exporter of goods to the U.S. Nonetheless, "the U.S. has blocked several large scale Chinese investments and buyouts of oil companies, technology firms, and other enterprises." [6] In effect, there are still clear nation-centric responses to China's rising economic power, especially as an expression of the U.S. governing elite's ideological commitment to national security.

### Trade

**Trade does not solve war—there’s no correlation between trade and peace**

**Martin, Mayer and Thoenig, 08** (Phillipe, University of Paris 1 Pantheon—Sorbonne, Paris School of Economics, and Centre for Economic Policy Research; Thierry MAYER, University of Paris 1 Pantheon—Sorbonne, Paris School of Economics, CEPII, and Centre for Economic Policy Research, Mathias THOENIG, University of Geneva and Paris School of Economics, The Review of Economic Studies 75)

Does globalization pacify international relations? The “liberal” view in political science argues that increasing trade flows and the spread of free markets and democracy should limit the incentive to use military force in interstate relations. This vision, which can partly be traced back to Kant’s Essay on Perpetual Peace (1795), has been very influential: The main objective of the European trade integration process was to prevent the killing and destruction of the two World Wars from ever happening again.1 Figure 1 suggests2 however, that during the 1870–2001 period, the correlation between trade openness and military conflicts is not a clear cut one. The first era of globalization, at the end of the 19th century, was a period of rising trade openness and multiple military conflicts, culminating with World War I. Then, the interwar period was characterized by a simultaneous collapse of world trade and conflicts. After World War II, world trade increased rapidly, while the number of conflicts decreased (although the risk of a global conflict was obviously high). There is no clear evidence that the 1990s, during which trade flows increased dramatically, was a period of lower prevalence of military conflicts, even taking into account the increase in the number of sovereign states.

#### Plan isn’t bilateral nor preferencial – their evidence says there are stumbling blocks among countries – that was CX

#### TPP won’t boost the economy – it just replicates the economic inequality of NAFTA

Pérez-Rocha and Trew 12 – \*helps to coordinate the Networking for Justice on Global Investment project, as part of the IPS Global Economy Project, \*\*Trade campaigner for the Council of Canadians (Manu, Stuart, “Don't Expand NAFTA,” 7/26/12, http://www.ips-dc.org/articles/dont\_expand\_nafta)//SJF

¶ The United States recently announced that Canada and Mexico will join negotiations for the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP)—a secretive U.S.-led multinational trade and investment agreement currently being negotiated with eight other countries in the Pacific Rim region.¶ On the other side of the Pacific, Japanese legislators are defecting in droves to try to stop the country’s entry into the negotiations. But the situation is much different in Canada and Mexico, which were admitted to the table with much fanfare during the G20 summit in June. The Japanese response is justifiable, and a recent statement of solidarity against the TPP by North American unions offers a good building block for resisting an agreement that for Mexicans and Canadians amounts to a neoliberal expansion of NAFTA on U.S. President Barack Obama’s terms.¶ Mexico and Canada had been trying to secure a spot at the TPP table for months prior to the G20, and it became a leading story in both countries. Their anxiety played nicely into Obama’s hands, allowing the U.S. trade representative to put humiliating entry conditions on both countries — essentially giving these NAFTA neighbors a second-rate status, or what in Spanish is called convidados de palo (to be invited but without a say). Neither Canada nor Mexico will be able to see any TPP text until they finally join the negotiations in December, following the required 90-day U.S. congressional approval process. Once at the table, they will not be able to make any changes to the finished text or propose any new text in the finished chapters. There is a very real possibility that the existing TPP countries, the United States in particular, will use the following months to fashion a trap for the TPP latecomers.¶ North American Labor Solidarity¶ While most media outlets welcomed the NAFTA partners to the TPP table, national labor federations from the United States, Mexico, and Canada were cautious for very good reasons, and it wasn’t just the obviously imbalanced negotiating dynamic. On July 11, the AFL-CIO, the Canadian Labour Congress, and the National Union of Workers (UNT) of Mexico outlined some of those reasons in an important statement of solidarity, which included a vision of what they believe a 21st-centry trade agreement should look like.¶ The labor unions state that although they “would welcome a TPP that creates good jobs, strengthens protection for fundamental labor rights—such as freedom of association and authentic collective bargaining—protects the environment, and boosts global economic growth and development for all, American, Canadian, and Mexican workers cannot afford another corporate-directed trade agreement.” The joint statement explains that to have any positive effect on the region, “the TPP must break from NAFTA, which imposed a destructive economic model that expands the rights and privileges of multinational corporations at the expense of working families, communities, and the environment.”¶ The unions conclude that if “the TPP follows the neoliberal model and substitutes corporate interests for national interests, workers in all three countries will continue to pay a high price in the form of suppressed wages, a more difficult organizing environment, and general regulatory erosion, even as large corporations will continue to benefit.” Unfortunately, by all accounts, including leaked TPP chapters andstatements from the U.S. trade representative, this is exactly what the Obama administration hopes to achieve through these negotiations.¶ Expanding Investor Rights¶ Instead of breaking with NAFTA, the TPP expands it in almost every chapter, from intellectual property rights to “regulatory coherence,” and from rules for increased “competition” in state-owned enterprises to opening government purchases to foreign bidders.¶ Particularly worrying to Canadians and Mexicans, and not mentioned in the joint statement from North American unions, are the extreme investors’ rights foreseen in the TPP. Under NAFTA, Mexico and Canada continue to be pummelled by investor-state lawsuits from U.S. and Canadian companies, or international firms using their U.S. registration to challenge government measures that can be shown to interfere with profits, even if that interference is not intended. These investment disputes, launched under NAFTA’s Chapter 11 protections, have resulted in hundreds of millions of dollars in fines or settlements to be paid out from public funds. Two recent cases against Mexico and Canada help describe the problem.¶ In 2009, two separate NAFTA investment panels established through the International Center for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID) ruled in favour of U.S. companies Cargill and Corn Products International in their nearly identical cases against a Mexican tax on drinks containing high fructose corn syrup (HFCS), a sugar alternative. The tax was a means of levelling the playing field for Mexican cane sugar producers, who were having no luck accessing the U.S. market on equal terms to U.S. sugar producers despite NAFTA’s promises of open borders.¶ Cargill and CPI argued in part that the Mexican tax made soft drinks sweetened with HFCS less competitive on the Mexican market, depriving them of their national treatment rights in NAFTA. The ICSID panels did not agree that the HFCS tax amounted to a form of regulatory expropriation or performance requirement as the firms had also argued, but did agree on the national treatment claim. Cargill was awarded more than $77 million and CPI more than $58 million in damages. In the CPI case, the ICSID panel deprived Mexico of any countermeasures to defend against a one-way inflow of cheap sugar supplements from the United States.¶ Canada also just lost an important investor-state dispute with Exxon Mobil, which could cost the Canadian government as much as $65 million. At issue were measures requiring offshore oil and gas producers in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador to turn over a portion of their profits to research and development or education and training programs. A NAFTA investment panel ruled in favor of the company, which claimed that the measures were an illegal performance requirement on the firm. Three Canadian courts had previously upheld the legality of the measures, and the Canadian government had excluded the legislation enforcing the measures from national treatment and other investment protections in NAFTA, making the investment panel ruling extremely perplexing. The frustration is worsened by the fact that Exxon Mobil was the richest company in the world in 2011. Under NAFTA and the TPP, investors have rights but no enforceable responsibilities to the countries in which they are operating.¶ These are just two local cases amid a myriad of investor lawsuits against countries all over the world. Though the Obama administration recently released a new model Bilateral Investment Treaty, it is almost identical to NAFTA, with only modest safeguards for regulation in the public interest — safeguards that closed-door tribunals are under little obligation to take into account. In fact, the trend globally is for these secret tribunals to rule expansively in the interest of corporations, perhaps as a means of perpetuating the system by making it more attractive to investors. There is simply no justification for reproducing the investor-state dispute regime in the TPP. In fact, NAFTA should be renegotiated to remove investor-state dispute settlement from Chapter 11.¶ This outcome—removing extreme investment protections from the TPP—is not out of the question. In June of this year, before a negotiating round in San Diego, California, 130 state legislators from all 50 states and Puerto Rico signed a letter to President Obama’s senior trade official warning that they will oppose the deal unless the administration alters its current approach. In the letter they say that “Our experience with NAFTA and other trade deals shows that investor-state dispute settlement is used by large corporations to undermine state and federal laws they don’t like – laws that are fully constitutional, that do not discriminate, and that are needed to protect public health and safety.”¶ There is also the question of Australia, the one TPP partner refusing to abide by these investment rules. In April 2011, the Australian government released a new trade policy that discontinues the inclusion of investor-state dispute settlement in bilateral or regional trade agreements. Despite their second-rate status at the TPP table, Canada and Mexico could eventually help the United States put pressure on Australia and others who doubt the value of these extreme corporate rights. But public pressure might prove strong enough to foil these efforts, as it did when the Multilateral Agreement on Investment was ditched in 1999, followed by the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA) in 2005.¶ A New FTAA, A New Struggle¶ With Canada and Mexico joining the TPP, the agreement is looking more and more like a substitute for the FTAA. So it is not surprising that opposition to the TPP is growing as quickly as it did against that former attempt to expand the neoliberal model throughout the Western hemisphere.¶ The intense secrecy of the TPP negotiations is not helping the Obama administration make its case. In their statement, North American unions “call on our governments to work with us to include in the TPP provisions to ensure strong worker protections, a healthy environment, safe food and products, and the ability to regulate financial and other markets to avoid future global economic crises.” But the truth is that only big business is partaking in consultations, with 600 lobbyists having exclusive passwords to online versions of the negotiating text.¶ A majority of Democratic representatives (132 out of 191) have expressed that they are “troubled that important policy decisions are being made without full input from Congress.” They have written to U.S. Trade Representative Ron Kirk to urge him and his staff to “engage in broader and deeper consultations with members of the full range of committees of Congress whose jurisdiction touches on the wide-ranging issues involved, and to ensure there is ample opportunity for Congress to have input on critical policies that will have broad ramifications for years to come.” In their letter, the representatives also challenge “the lack of transparency of the treaty negotiation process, and the failure of negotiators to meaningfully consult with states on the far-reaching impact of trade agreements on state and local laws, even when binding on our states, is of grave concern to us.” U.S. Senators, for their part,have also sent a letter complaining of the lack of congressional access to the negotiations. What openness and transparency can we in Canada and Mexico expect when the decision to join the TPP, under humiliating conditions, was made without any public consultation?¶ NAFTA turns 20 years old in 2014. Instead of expanding it through the TPP we must learn from NAFTA’s shortcomings, starting with the historic lack of consultation with unions and producers in the three member countries. It is necessary to correct the imbalances in NAFTA, which as the North American union statement explains enhanced corporate power at the expense of workers and the environment. In particular, we need to categorically reject the investor-state dispute settlement process that has proven so costly, in real terms and with respect to our democratic options in Canada and Mexico. The unions’ statement of solidarity provides a strong foundation for the growing trinational opposition to the TPP in Leesburg, Virginia, and beyond.

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

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

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

**There’s also no impact to decline**

**The Seattle Times, 08**

Economists disagree on the Doha round's potential benefits; estimates of economic gain that could have been reaped through additional trade range from $4 billion to $100 billion. Set against the rapid expansion of global trade to $13.6 trillion last year from $7.6 trillion five years ago, however, the bottom-line loss from Doha's failure is "not a market issue," said Julian Callow, an economist at Barclays Capital in London. Nor is the world on the edge of the kind of protectionist wave that ended the last period of globalization in the early 20th century and contributed to two world wars, analysts say. Countries are likely to go on negotiating bilateral trade deals with each other, such as the U.S.-South Korea free-trade deal earlier this year.

#### The bicycle theory of trade protectionism is empirically false

**Alden 13** - Bernard L. Schwartz senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations, and was project director for the CFR Independent Task Force on U.S. Trade and Investment Policy (Edward, “Opportunity Knocks for Obama on Trade,” World Politics Review, January 8, 2013, [http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/12604/opportunity-knocks-for-obama-on-trade)//AC](http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/12604/opportunity-knocks-for-obama-on-trade%29//AC)

That 2013 should matter so much in trade policy is rather surprising. What has come to be known as the “bicycle theory” of trade liberalization holds that if countries are not moving forward to lower trade barriers, they will tip over into protectionism. If so, the past decade should have produced at least some painful bruises. The collapse of the WTO’s Doha Round of negotiations, which are effectively dead if not formally buried, was the first failed round of world trade talks since the creation of the post-World War II trading system. **The global financial crisis of 2008 and the recession that followed produced the first steep decline in world trade since the Great Depression. Yet rather than falling down, the United States and other countries have managed to swerve and keep going.**