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#### A. Interpretation - Economic Engagement is defined as expanding economic ties with a country to change its behavior – this means they have to be gov to gov

**Kahler, 6** - Graduate School of International Relations and Pacific Studies, University of California, San Diego (M., “Strategic Uses of Economic Interdependence: Engagement Policies on the Korean Peninsula and Across the Taiwan Strait” in Journal of Peace Research (2006), 43:5, p. 523-541, Sage Publications)

Economic engagement - a policy of deliberately expanding economic ties with an adversary in order to change the behavior of the target state and improve bilateral political relations

####  ‘Its’ is a possessive pronoun showing ownership

**Glossary of English Grammar Terms, 2005** – (“Term: Possessive Pronoun,”

http://www.usingenglish.com/glossary/possessive-pronoun.html)

Mine, yours, his, hers, its, ours, theirs are the possessive pronouns used to substitute a noun and to show possession or ownership.

EG. This is your disk and that's mine. (Mine substitutes the word disk and shows that it belongs to me.)

#### **B. Violation – the plan only repeals part of a bill – that doesn’t do anything with Mexico**

### 1nc

#### The affirmative’s concept of violence as external from their own lives allows individuals to abdicate their responsibility. Denial of our individual culpability with violence forecloses the possibility of meaningful change; in the process, violence becomes more likely.

Kappeler in 1995 [Susanne Kappeler, *The Will To Violence: The Politics of Personal Behavior,* pg 1-4]

What is striking is that the violence which is talked about is always the violence committed by someone else: women talk about the violence of men, adults about the violence of young people; the left, liberals and the centre about the violence of right extremists; the right, centre and liberals about the violence of leftist extremists; political activists talk about structural violence, police and politicians about violence in the `street', and all together about the violence in our society. Similarly, Westerners talk about violence in the Balkans, Western citizens together with their generals about the violence of the Serbian army. Violence is recognized and measured by its visible effects, the spectacular blood of wounded bodies, the material destruction of objects, the visible damage left in the world of `objects'. In its measurable damage we see the proof that violence has taken place, the violence being reduced to this damage. The violation as such, or invisible forms of violence - the non-physical violence of threat and terror, of insult and humiliation, the violation of human dignity - are hardly ever the issue except to some extent in feminist and anti-racist analyses, or under the name of psychological violence. Here violence is recognized by the victims and defined from their perspective - an important step away from the catalogue of violent acts and the exclusive evidence of material traces in the object. Yet even here the focus tends to be on the effects and experience of violence, either the objective and scientific measure of psychological damage, or the increasingly subjective definition of violence as experience. Violence is perceived as a phenomenon for science to research and for politics to get a grip on. But violence is not a phenomenon: it is the behaviour of people, human action which may be analysed. What is missing is an analysis of violence as action - not just as acts of violence, or the cause of its effects, but as the actions of people in relation to other people and beings or things. Feminist critique, as well as other political critiques, has analysed the preconditions of violence, the unequal power relations which enable it to take place. However, under the pressure of mainstream science and a sociological perspective which increasingly dominates our thinking, it is becoming standard to argue as if it were these power relations which cause the violence. Underlying is a behaviourist model which prefers to see human action as the exclusive product of circumstances, ignoring the personal decision of the agent to act, implying in turn that circumstances virtually dictate certain forms of behaviour. Even though we would probably not underwrite these propositions in their crass form, there is nevertheless a growing tendency, not just in social science, to explain violent behaviour by its circumstances. (Compare the question, `Does pornography cause violence?') The circumstances identified may differ according to the politics of the explainers, but the method of explanation remains the same. While consideration of mitigating circumstances has its rightful place in a court of law trying (and defending) an offender, this does not automatically make it an adequate or sufficient practice for political analysis. It begs the question, in particular, `What is considered to be part of the circumstances (and by whom)?' Thus in the case of sexual offenders, there is a routine search - on the part of the tabloid press or professionals of violence - for experiences of violence in the offender's own past, an understanding which is rapidly solidifying in scientific model of a `cycle of violence'. That is, the relevant factors are sought in the distant past and in other contexts of action, e a crucial factor in the present context is ignored, namely the agent's decision to act as he did. Even politically oppositional groups are not immune to this mainstream sociologizing. Some left groups have tried to explain men's sexual violence as the result of class oppression, while some Black theoreticians have explained the violence of Black men as the result of racist oppression. The ostensible aim of these arguments may be to draw attention to the pervasive and structural violence of classism and racism, yet they not only fail to combat such inequality, they actively contribute to it. Although such oppression is a very real part of an agent's life context, these `explanations' ignore the fact that not everyone experiencing the same oppression uses violence, that is, that these circumstances do not `cause' violent behaviour. They overlook, in other words, that the perpetrator has decided to violate, even if this decision was made in circumstances of limited choice. To overlook this decision, however, is itself a political decision, serving particular interests. In the first instance it serves to exonerate the perpetrators, whose responsibility is thus transferred to circumstances and a history for which other people (who remain beyond reach) are responsible. Moreover, it helps to stigmatize all those living in poverty and oppression; because they are obvious victims of violence and oppression, they are held to be potential perpetrators themselves.' This slanders all the women who have experienced sexual violence, yet do not use violence against others, and libels those experiencing racist and class oppression, yet do not necessarily act out violence. Far from supporting those oppressed by classist, racist or sexist oppression, it sells out these entire groups in the interest of exonerating individual members. It is a version of collective victim-blaming, of stigmatizing entire social strata as potential hotbeds of violence, which rests on and perpetuates the mainstream division of society into so-called marginal groups - the classic clienteles of social work and care politics (and of police repression) - and an implied `centre' to which all the speakers, explainers, researchers and careers themselves belong, and which we are to assume to be a zone of non-violence. Explaining people's violent behaviour by their circumstances also has the advantage of implying that the `solution' lies in a change to circumstances. Thus it has become fashionable among socially minded politicians and intellectuals in Germany to argue that the rising neo-Nazi violence of young people (men), especially in former East Germany, needs to be countered by combating poverty and unemployment in these areas. Likewise anti-racist groups like the Anti. Racist Alliance or the Anti-Nazi League in Britain argue that `the causes of racism, like poverty and unemployment, should be tackled and that it is `problems like unemployment and bad housing which lead to racism'.' Besides being no explanation at all of why (white poverty and unemployment should lead specifically to racist violence (and what would explain middle- and upper-class racism), it is more than questionable to combat poverty only (but precisely) when and where violence is exercised. It not only legitimates the violence (by `explaining' it), but constitutes an incentive to violence, confirming that social problems will be taken seriously when and where `they attract attention by means of violence - just as the most unruly children in schools (mostly boys) tend to get more attention from teachers than well-behaved and quiet children (mostly girls). Thus if German neo-Nazi youths and youth groups, since their murderous assaults on refugees and migrants in Hoyerswerda, Rostock, Dresden etc., are treated to special youth projects and social care measures (to the tune of DM 20 million per year), including `educative' trips to Morocco and Israel,' this is am unmistakable signal to society that racist violence does indeed 'pay off'.

#### Political violence is sustained by organized thinking that looks at violence through meta-analysis. We need to have deeper insight that realizes that each of us is culpable for violence. This is integral to ending the cycle of violence and reclaiming agency.

Kappeler in 1995 [Susanne Kappeler, *The Will To Violence: The Politics of Personal Behavior,* pg 8-11]

Moreover, personal behaviour is no alternative to `political' action; there is no question of either/or. My concern, on the contrary, is the connection between these recognized forms of violence and the forms of everyday behaviour which we consider `normal' but which betray our own will to violence - the connection, in other words, between our own actions and those acts of violence which are normally the focus of our political critiques. Precisely because there is no choice between dedicating oneself either to `political issues' or to `personal behaviour', the question of the politics of personal behaviour has (also) to be moved into the centre of our politics and our critique. Violence - what we usually recognize as such - is no exception to the rules, no deviation from the normal and nothing out of the ordinary, in a society in which exploitation and oppression are the norm, the ordinary and the rule. It is no misbehaviour of a minority amid good behaviour by the majority, nor the deeds of inhuman monsters amid humane humans, in a society in which there is no equality, in which people divide others according to race, class, sex and many other factors in order to rule, exploit, use, objectify, enslave, sell, torture and kill them, in which millions of animals are tortured, genetically manipulated, enslaved and slaughtered daily for `harmless' consumption by humans. It is no error of judgement, no moral lapse and no transgression against the customs of a culture which is thoroughly steeped in the values of profit and desire, of self-realization, expansion and progress. Violence as we usually perceive it is `simply' a specific - and to us still visible - form of violence, the consistent and logical application of the principles of our culture and everyday life. War does not suddenly break out in a peaceful society; sexual violence is not the disturbance of otherwise equal gender relations. Racist attacks do not shoot like lightning out of a non-racist sky, and the sexual exploitation of children is no solitary problem in a world otherwise just to children. The violence of our most commonsense everyday thinking, and especially our personal will to violence, constitute the conceptual preparation, the ideological armament and the intellectual mobilization which make the `outbreak' of war, of sexual violence, of racist attacks, of murder and destruction possible at all. 'We are the war', writes Slavenka Drakulic at the end of her existential analysis of the question, `what is war?': I do not know what war is, I want to tell [my friend], but I see it everywhere. It is in the blood-soaked street in Sarajevo, after 20 people have been killed while they queued for bread. But it is also in your non-comprehension, in my unconscious cruelty towards you, in the fact that you have a yellow form [for refugees] and I don't, in the way in which it grows inside ourselves and changes our feelings, relationships, values - in short: us. We are the war ... And I am afraid that we cannot hold anyone else responsible. We make this war possible, we permit it to happen. ' `We are the war' - and we also `are' the sexual violence, the racist violence, the exploitation and the will to violence in all its manifestations in a society in so-called `peacetime', for we make them possible and we permit them to happen. `We are the war' does not mean that the responsibility for a war is shared collectively and diffusely by an entire society - which would be equivalent to exonerating warlords and politicians and profiteers or, as Ulrich Beck says, upholding the notion of `collective irresponsibility', where people are no longer held responsible for their actions, and where the conception of universal responsibility becomes the equivalent of a universal acquittal.' On the contrary, the object is precisely to analyse the specific and differential responsibility of everyone in their diverse situations. Decisions to unleash a war are indeed taken at particular levels of power by those in a position to make them and to command such collective action. We need to hold them clearly responsible for their decisions and actions without lessening theirs by any collective `assumption' of responsibility. Yet our habit of focusing on the stage where the major dramas of power take place tends to obscure our sight in relation to our own sphere of competence, our own power and our own responsibility - leading to the well-known illusion of our apparent `powerlessness' and its accompanying phenomenon, our so-called political disillusionment. Single citizens - even more so those of other nations - have come to feel secure in their obvious non-responsibility for such large-scale political events as, say, the wars in Croatia and Bosnia-Hercegovina or Somalia - since the decisions for such events are always made elsewhere. Yet our insight that indeed we are not responsible for the decisions of a Serbian general or a Croatian president tends to mislead us into thinking that therefore we have no responsibility at all, not even for forming our own judgement, and thus into underrating the responsibility we do have within our own sphere of action. In particular, it seems to absolve us from having to try to see any relation between our own actions and those events, or to recognize the connections between those political decisions and our own personal decisions. It not only shows that we participate in what Beck calls `organized irresponsibility', upholding the apparent lack of connection between bureaucratically, institutionally, nationally and also individually organized separate competences. It also proves the phenomenal and unquestioned alliance of our personal thinking with the thinking of the major powermongers. For we tend to think that we cannot `do' anything, say, about a war, because we deem ourselves to be in the wrong situation; because we are not where the major decisions are made. Which is why many of those not yet entirely disillusioned with politics tend to engage in a form of mental deputy politics, in the style of `What would I do if I were the general, the prime minister, the president, the foreign minister or the minister of defence?' Since we seem to regard their mega spheres of action as the only worthwhile and truly effective ones, and since our political analyses tend to dwell there first of all, any question of what I would do if I were indeed myself tends to peter out in the comparative insignificance of having what is perceived as `virtually no possibilities': what I could do seems petty and futile. For my own action I obviously desire the range of action of a general, a prime minister, or a General Secretary of the UN - finding expression in ever more prevalent formulations like `I want to stop this war', `I want military intervention', `I want to stop this backlash', or `I want a moral revolution.' 7 , We are this war', however, even if we do not command the troops or participate in so-called peace talks, namely as Drakulic says, in our 'non-comprehension': our willed refusal to feel responsible for our own thinking and for working out our own understanding, preferring innocently to drift along the ideological current of prefabricated arguments or less than innocently taking advantage of the advantages these offer. And we `are' the war in our `unconscious cruelty towards you', our tolerance of the `fact that you have a yellow form for refugees and I don't' - our readiness, in other words, to build identities, one for ourselves and one for refugees, one of our own and one for the `others'. We share in the responsibility for this war and its violence in the way we let them grow inside us, that is, in the way we shape `our feelings, our relationships, our values' according to the structures and the values of war and violence. So if we move beyond the usual frame of violence, towards the structures of thought employed in decisions to act, this also means making an analysis of action. This seems all the more urgent as action seems barely to be perceived any longer. There is talk of the government doing `nothing', of its `inaction', of the need for action, the time for action, the need for strategies, our inability to act as well as our desire to become `active' again. We seem to deem ourselves in a kind of action vacuum which, like the cosmic black hole, tends to consume any renewed effort only to increase its size. Hence this is also an attempt to shift the focus again to the fact that we are continually acting and doing, and that there is no such thing as not acting or doing nothing.

#### The alternative is to vote negative --- their analysis of violence is insufficient and you should punish their failure by politicizing the way we think about violence can we find ways to end the cycle of violence.

**Kappeler in 1995** [Susanne Kappeler, *The Will To Violence: The Politics of Personal Behavior,* pg 4-5]

If we nevertheless continue to explain violence by its ‘circumstances’ and attempt to counter it by changing these circumstances, it is also because in this way we stay in command of the problem. In particular, we do not complicate the problem by any suggestions that it might be people who need to change. Instead, we turn the perpetrators of violence into the victims of circumstances, who as victims by definition, cannot act sensibly (but in changed circumstances will behave differently. ‘We,’ on the other hand, are the subjects able to take in hand the task of changing the circumstances. Even if changing the circumstance – combating poverty, unemployment, injustice, etc. – may not be easy, it nevertheless remains within ‘our’ scope at least theoretically and by means of state power. Changing people, on the other hand, is neither within our power nor, it seems, ultimately in our interest: we prefer to keep certain people under control, putting limits on their violent behavior, but we apparently have no interest in a politics that presupposes people's ability to change and aims at changing attitudes and behavior. For changing (as opposed to restricting) other people's behavior is beyond the range and in­fluence of our own power; only they themselves can change it. It requires their will to change, their will not to abuse power and not to use violence. A politics aiming at a change in people's behavior would require political work that is very much more cumbersome and very much less promising of success than is the use of state power and social control. It would require political consciousness-raising — politicizing the way we think — which cannot be imposed on others by force or compulsory educational measures. It would require a view of people which takes seriously and reckons with their will, both their will to violence and their will to change. To take seriously the will of others however would mean recognizing one's own, and putting people's will, including our own, at the centre of political reflection. A political analysis of violence needs to recognize this will, the personal decision in favour of violence - not just to describe acts of violence, or the conditions which enable them to take place, but also to capture the moment of decision which is the real impetus for violent action. For without this decision there will be no violent act, not even in circumstances which potentially permit it. It is the 3decision to violate, not just the act itself, which makes a person a perpetrator of violence - just as it is the decision not to do so which makes people not act violently and not abuse their power in a situation which would nevertheless permit it. This moment of decision, there­fore, is also the locus of potential resistance to violence. To understand the structures of thinking and the criteria, by which such decisions are reached, but above all to regard this decision as an act of choice, seems to me a necessary precondition for any political struggle against violence and for a non-violent society.
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#### Obama is pushing Congress to resolve the debt ceiling – political capital is key to success

**Pace 9/12**

Julie, AP White House correspondent, Syria debate on hold, Obama refocuses on agenda, The Fresno Bee, 9/12/13, http://www.fresnobee.com/2013/09/12/3493538/obama-seeks-to-focus-on-domestic.html

With a military strike against Syria on hold, President Barack Obama tried Thursday to reignite momentum for his second-term domestic agenda. But his progress could hinge on the strength of his standing on Capitol Hill after what even allies acknowledge were missteps in the latest foreign crisis.¶ "It is still important to recognize that we have a lot of things left to do here in this government," Obama told his Cabinet, starting a sustained White House push to refocus the nation on matters at home as key benchmarks on the budget and health care rapidly approach.¶ "The American people are still interested in making sure that our kids are getting the kind of education they deserve, that we are putting people back to work," Obama said.¶ The White House plans to use next week's five-year anniversary of the 2008 financial collapse to warn Republicans that shutting down the government or failing to raise the debt limit could drag down the still-fragile economy. With Hispanic Heritage Month to begin Monday, Obama is also expected to press for a stalled immigration overhaul and urge minorities to sign up for health care exchanges beginning Oct. 1.¶ Among the events planned for next week is a White House ceremony highlighting Americans working on immigrant and citizenship issues. Administration officials will also promote overhaul efforts at naturalization ceremonies across the country. On Sept. 21, Obama will speak at the Congressional Black Caucus Gala, where he'll trumpet what the administration says are benefits of the president's health care law for African-Americans and other minorities.¶ Two major factors are driving Obama's push to get back on track with domestic issues after three weeks of Syria dominating the political debate. Polls show the economy, jobs and health care remain Americans' top concerns. And Obama has a limited window to make progress on those matters in a second term, when lame-duck status can quickly creep up on presidents, particularly if they start losing public support.¶ Obama already is grappling with some of the lowest approval ratings of his presidency. A Pew Research Center/USA Today poll out this week put his approval at 44 percent. That's down from 55 percent at the end of 2012.¶ Potential military intervention in Syria also is deeply unpopular with many Americans, with a Pew survey finding that 63 percent opposing the idea. And the president's publicly shifting positions on how to respond to a deadly chemical weapons attack in Syria also have confused many Americans and congressional lawmakers.¶ "In times of crisis, the more clarity the better," said Sen. Lindsey Graham, R-S.C., a strong supporter of U.S. intervention in Syria. "This has been confusing. For those who are inclined to support the president, it's been pretty hard to nail down what the purpose of a military strike is."¶ For a time, the Obama administration appeared to be barreling toward an imminent strike in retaliation for the Aug. 21 chemical weapons attack. But Obama made a sudden reversal and instead decided to seek congressional approval for military action.¶ Even after administration officials briefed hundreds of lawmakers on classified intelligence, there appeared to be limited backing for a use-of-force resolution on Capitol Hill. Rather than face defeat, Obama asked lawmakers this week to postpone any votes while the U.S. explores the viability of a deal to secure Syria's chemical weapons stockpiles.¶ That pause comes as a relief to Obama and many Democrats eager to return to issues more in line with the public's concerns. The most pressing matters are a Sept. 30 deadline to approve funding to keep the government open — the new fiscal year begins Oct. 1 — and the start of sign-ups for health care exchanges, a crucial element of the health care overhaul.¶ On Wednesday, a revolt by tea party conservatives forced House Republican leaders to delay a vote on a temporary spending bill written to head off a government shutdown. Several dozen staunch conservatives are seeking to couple the spending bill with a provision to derail implementation of the health care law.¶ The White House also may face a fight with Republicans over raising the nation's debt ceiling this fall. While Obama has insisted he won't negotiate over the debt limit, House Speaker John Boehner on Thursday said the GOP will insist on curbing spending.

#### Economic engagement with Mexico is unpopular – costs PC

**NYT 13**

New York Times. “In Latin America, U.S. Focus Shifts From Drug War to Economy” May 4, 2013. http://www.nytimes.com/2013/05/05/world/americas/in-latin-america-us-shifts-focus-from-drug-war-to-economy.html?pagewanted=all&\_r=1&

Last week, Mr. Obama returned to capitals in Latin America with a vastly different message. Relationships with countries racked by drug violence and organized crime should focus more on economic development and less on the endless battles against drug traffickers and organized crime capos that have left few clear victors. The countries, Mexico in particular, need to set their own course on security, with the United States playing more of a backing role. That approach runs the risk of being seen as kowtowing to governments more concerned about their public image than the underlying problems tarnishing it. Mexico, which is eager to play up its economic growth, has mounted an aggressive effort to play down its crime problems, going as far as to encourage the news media to avoid certain slang words in reports. “The problem will not just go away,” said Michael Shifter, president of the Inter-American Dialogue. “It needs to be tackled head-on, with a comprehensive strategy that includes but goes beyond stimulating economic growth and alleviating poverty. “Obama becomes vulnerable to the charge of downplaying the region’s overriding issue, and the chief obstacle to economic progress,” he added. “It is fine to change the narrative from security to economics as long as the reality on the ground reflects and fits with the new story line.” Administration officials insist that Mr. Obama remains cleareyed about the security challenges, but the new emphasis corresponds with a change in focus by the Mexican government. The new Mexican president, Enrique Peña Nieto, took office in December vowing to reduce the violence that exploded under the militarized approach to the drug war adopted by his predecessor, Felipe Calderón. That effort left about 60,000 Mexicans dead and appears not to have significantly damaged the drug-trafficking industry. In addition to a focus on reducing violence, which some critics have interpreted as taking a softer line on the drug gangs, Mr. Peña Nieto has also moved to reduce American involvement in law enforcement south of the border. With friction and mistrust between American and Mexican law enforcement agencies growing, Mr. Obama suggested that the United States would no longer seek to dominate the security agenda. “It is obviously up to the Mexican people to determine their security structures and how it engages with other nations, including the United States,” he said, standing next to Mr. Peña Nieto on Thursday in Mexico City. “But the main point I made to the president is that we support the Mexican government’s focus on reducing violence, and we look forward to continuing our good cooperation in any way that the Mexican government deems appropriate.” In some ways, conceding leadership of the drug fight to Mexico hews to a guiding principle of Mr. Obama’s foreign policy, in which American supremacy is played down, at least publicly, in favor of a multilateral approach. But that philosophy could collide with the concerns of lawmakers in Washington, who have expressed frustration with what they see as a lack of clarity in Mexico’s security plans. And security analysts say the entrenched corruption in Mexican law enforcement has long clouded the partnership with their American counterparts. Putting Mexico in the driver’s seat on security marks a shift in a balance of power that has always tipped to the United States and, analysts said, will carry political risk as Congress negotiates an immigration bill that is expected to include provisions for tighter border security. “If there is a perception in the U.S. Congress that security cooperation is weakening, that could play into the hands of those who oppose immigration reform,” said Vanda Felbab-Brown, a counternarcotics expert at the Brookings Institution in Washington.

#### Failure collapses the economy – goes global and past events don’t disprove

**Davidson 9/10**

Adam, co-founder of NPR’s “Planet Money,” Our Debt to Society, New York Times, 9/10/13, http://www.nytimes.com/2013/09/15/magazine/our-debt-to-society.html?pagewanted=all

If the debt ceiling isn’t lifted again this fall, some serious financial decisions will have to be made. Perhaps the government can skimp on its foreign aid or furlough all of NASA, but eventually the big-ticket items, like Social Security and Medicare, will have to be cut. At some point, the government won’t be able to pay interest on its bonds and will enter what’s known as sovereign default, the ultimate national financial disaster achieved by countries like Zimbabwe, Ecuador and Argentina (and now Greece). In the case of the United States, though, it won’t be an isolated national crisis. If the American government can’t stand behind the dollar, the world’s benchmark currency, then the global financial system will very likely enter a new era in which there is much less trade and much less economic growth. It would be, by most accounts, the largest self-imposed financial disaster in history.¶ Nearly everyone involved predicts that someone will blink before this disaster occurs. Yet a small number of House Republicans (one political analyst told me it’s no more than 20) appear willing to see what happens if the debt ceiling isn’t raised — at least for a bit. This could be used as leverage to force Democrats to drastically cut government spending and eliminate President Obama’s signature health-care-reform plan. In fact, Representative Tom Price, a Georgia Republican, told me that the whole problem could be avoided if the president agreed to drastically cut spending and lower taxes. Still, it is hard to put this act of game theory into historic context. Plenty of countries — and some cities, like Detroit — have defaulted on their financial obligations, but only because their governments ran out of money to pay their bills. No wealthy country has ever voluntarily decided — in the middle of an economic recovery, no less — to default. And there’s certainly no record of that happening to the country that controls the global reserve currency.¶ Like many, I assumed a self-imposed U.S. debt crisis might unfold like most involuntary ones. If the debt ceiling isn’t raised by X-Day, I figured, the world’s investors would begin to see America as an unstable investment and rush to sell their Treasury bonds. The U.S. government, desperate to hold on to investment, would then raise interest rates far higher, hurtling up rates on credit cards, student loans, mortgages and corporate borrowing — which would effectively put a clamp on all trade and spending. The U.S. economy would collapse far worse than anything we’ve seen in the past several years.¶ Instead, Robert Auwaerter, head of bond investing for Vanguard, the world’s largest mutual-fund company, told me that the collapse might be more insidious. “You know what happens when the market gets upset?” he said. “There’s a flight to quality. Investors buy Treasury bonds. It’s a bit perverse.” In other words, if the U.S. comes within shouting distance of a default (which Auwaerter is confident won’t happen), the world’s investors — absent a safer alternative, given the recent fates of the euro and the yen — might actually buy even more Treasury bonds. Indeed, interest rates would fall and the bond markets would soar.¶ While this possibility might not sound so bad, it’s really far more damaging than the apocalyptic one I imagined. Rather than resulting in a sudden crisis, failure to raise the debt ceiling would lead to a slow bleed. Scott Mather, head of the global portfolio at Pimco, the world’s largest private bond fund, explained that while governments and institutions might go on a U.S.-bond buying frenzy in the wake of a debt-ceiling panic, they would eventually recognize that the U.S. government was not going through an odd, temporary bit of insanity. They would eventually conclude that it had become permanently less reliable. Mather imagines institutional investors and governments turning to a basket of currencies, putting their savings in a mix of U.S., European, Canadian, Australian and Japanese bonds. Over the course of decades, the U.S. would lose its unique role in the global economy.¶ The U.S. benefits enormously from its status as global reserve currency and safe haven. Our interest and mortgage rates are lower; companies are able to borrow money to finance their new products more cheaply. As a result, there is much more economic activity and more wealth in America than there would be otherwise. If that status erodes, the U.S. economy’s peaks will be lower and recessions deeper; future generations will have fewer job opportunities and suffer more when the economy falters. And, Mather points out, no other country would benefit from America’s diminished status. When you make the base risk-free asset more risky, the entire global economy becomes riskier and costlier.

#### Nuclear war

**Friedberg and Schoenfeld 8**

Aaron, Prof. Politics. And IR @ Princeton’s Woodrow Wilson School and Visiting Scholar @ Witherspoon Institute, and Gabriel, Senior Editor of Commentary and Wall Street Journal, “The Dangers of a Diminished America” <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB122455074012352571.html>

Then there are the dolorous consequences of a potential collapse of the world's financial architecture. For decades now, Americans have enjoyed the advantages of being at the center of that system. The worldwide use of the dollar, and the stability of our economy, among other things, made it easier for us to run huge budget deficits, as we counted on foreigners to pick up the tab by buying dollar-denominated assets as a safe haven. Will this be possible in the future? Meanwhile, traditional foreign-policy challenges are multiplying. The threat from al Qaeda and Islamic terrorist affiliates has not been extinguished. Iran and North Korea are continuing on their bellicose paths, while Pakistan and Afghanistan are progressing smartly down the road to chaos. Russia's new militancy and China's seemingly relentless rise also give cause for concern. If America now tries to pull back from the world stage, it will leave a dangerous power vacuum. The stabilizing effects of our presence in Asia, our continuing commitment to Europe, and our position as defender of last resort for Middle East energy sources and supply lines could all be placed at risk. In such a scenario there are shades of the 1930s, when global trade and finance ground nearly to a halt, the peaceful democracies failed to cooperate, and aggressive powers led by the remorseless fanatics who rose up on the crest of economic disaster exploited their divisions. Today we run the risk that rogue states may choose to become ever more reckless with their nuclear toys, just at our moment of maximum vulnerability. The aftershocks of the financial crisis will almost certainly rock our principal strategic competitors even harder than they will rock us. The dramatic free fall of the Russian stock market has demonstrated the fragility of a state whose economic performance hinges on high oil prices, now driven down by the global slowdown. China is perhaps even more fragile, its economic growth depending heavily on foreign investment and access to foreign markets. Both will now be constricted, inflicting economic pain and perhaps even sparking unrest in a country where political legitimacy rests on progress in the long march to prosperity. None of this is good news if the authoritarian leaders of these countries seek to divert attention from internal travails with external adventures.

### 1nc

#### Text: Congress should delegate the authority to clarify that the NAFTA agreement itself obligates binding worker protections in Mexico, including: mechanisms for improving basic labor standards based on the recommendations of the International Labor Organization (ILO); assistance for local organizing education centers; and full public participation in all parts of the dispute settlement process to the Department of State. The Department of State should pursue and enact the congressional delegation.

#### Counterplan solves the aff and doesn’t link to politics.

**Epstein and O’Hallaron 99** (David Epstein- Department of Political Science and Stanford Graduate School of Business, Columbia and Stanford University, and Sharyn O’Hallaron- Department of Political Science and the School of International and Public Affairs and Hoover Institution, Columbia and Stanford University, January 1999 (“The Nondelegation Doctrine and the Separation of Powers” – Cardozo Law Review) p. lexis

Our institutional analysis begins with the observation that there are two alternative modes for specifying the details of public policy. Policy can be made through the typical legislative process, in which a committee considers a bill and reports it to the floor of the chamber, and then a majority of the floor members must agree on a policy to enact. Alternatively, Congress can pass a law that delegates authority to regulatory agencies, allowing them to fill in some or all of the details of policy. The key is that, given a fixed amount of policy details to be specified, these two modes of poli [\*962] cymaking are substitutes for each other. To the degree that one is used more, the other will perforce be used less. Note also that it is Congress who chooses where policy is made. Legislators can either write detailed, exacting laws, in which case the executive branch will have little or no substantive input into policy, they can delegate the details to agencies, thereby giving the executive branch a substantial role in the policymaking process, or they can pick any point in between. Since legislators' primary goal is reelection, it follows that policy will be made so as to maximize legislators' reelection chances. Thus, delegation will follow the natural fault lines of legislators' political advantage. In making this institutional choice, legislators face costs either way. Making explicit laws requires legislative time and energy that might be profitably spent on more electorally productive activities. After all, one of the reasons bureaucracies are created is for agencies to implement policies in areas where Congress has neither the time nor expertise to micro-manage policy decisions, and by restricting flexibility, Congress would be limiting agencies' ability to adjust to changing circumstances. This tradeoff is captured well by Terry Moe in his discussion of regulatory structure: The most direct way [to control agencies] is for today's authorities to specify, in excruciating detail, precisely what the agency is to do and how it is to do it, leaving as little as possible to the discretionary judgment of bureaucrats - and thus as little as possible for future authorities to exercise control over, short of passing new legislation... Obviously, this is not a formula for creating effective organizations. In the interests of public protection, agencies are knowingly burdened with cumbersome, complicated, technically inappropriate structures that undermine their capacity to perform their jobs well. n40 Where oversight and monitoring problems do not exist, legislators would readily delegate authority to the executive branch, taking advantage of agency expertise, conserving scarce resources of time, staff, and energy, and **avoiding the logrolls, delays, and informational inefficiencies** associated with the committee system. Consider, for example, the issue of airline safety, which is characterized on the one hand by the need for technical expertise, and on the other hand by an almost complete absence of potential political benefits. That is, policymakers will receive little credit if airlines run well and no disasters occur, but they will have to with [\*963] stand intense scrutiny if something goes wrong. n41 Furthermore, legislative and executive preferences on this issue would tend to be almost perfectly aligned - have fewer accidents as long as the costs to airlines are not prohibitive. The set of individuals receiving benefits, the public who use the airlines, is diffused and ill organized, while those paying the costs of regulation, the airline companies, are well-organized and politically active. Furthermore, keeping in mind that deficiencies in the system are easily detectable, delegated power is relatively simple to monitor. For all these reasons, even if legislators had unlimited time and resources of their own (which they do not), delegation to the executive branch would be the preferred mode of policymaking.

### Case

#### Neoliberalism prevents conflict --- prefer our evidence --- its backed by comprehensive studies

Gartzk 07, associate professor of political science and a member of the Saltzman Institute of War and Peace Studies, 07 (Erik, “The Capitalist Peace”, American Journal of Political Science 51:1, 1/07, JSTOR)//AS

The discovery that democracies seldom fight each other has led, quite reasonably, to the conclusion that democ- racy causes peace, at least within the community of liberal polities. Explanations abound, but a consensus account of the dyadic democratic peace has been surprisingly slow to materialize. I offer a theory of liberal peace based on capi- talism and common interstate interests. Economic devel- opment, capital market integration, and the compatibility of foreign policy preferences supplant the effect of democ- racy in standard statistical tests of the democratic peace. In fact, after controlling for regional heterogeneity, any one of these three variables is sufficient to account for effects previously attributed to regime type in standard samples of wars, militarized interstate disputes (MIDs), and fatal disputes.' If war is a product of incompatible interests and failed or abortive bargaining, peace ensues when states lack dif- ferences worthy of costly conflict, or when circumstances favor successful diplomacy. Realists and others argue that state interests are inherently incompatible, but this need be so only if state interests are narrowly defined or when conquest promises tangible benefits. Peace can result from at least three attributes of mature capitalist economies. First, the historic impetus to territorial expansion is tempered by the rising importance of intellectual and financial capital, factors that are more expediently enticed than conquered. Land does little to increase the worth of the advanced economies while resource competition is more cheaply pursued through markets than by means of military occupation. At the same time, development actually increases the ability of states to project power when incompatible policy objectives exist. Development affects who states fight (and what they fight over) more than the overall frequency of warfare. Second, substantial overlap in the foreign policy goals of developed nations in the post-World War II period further limits the scope and scale of conflict. Lacking territorial tensions, consensus about how to order the international system has allowed liberal states to cooperate and to accommodate minor differences. Whether this affinity among liberal states will persist in the next century is a question open to debate. Finally, the rise of global capital markets creates a new mechanism for competition and communication for states that might otherwise be forced to fight. Separately, these processes influence patterns of warfare in the modern world. Together, they explain the absence of war among states in the developed world and account for the dyadic observation of the democratic peace. The notion of a capitalist peace is hardly new. Montesquieu, Paine, Bastiat, Mill, Cobden, Angell, and othersaw in market forces the power to end war. Unfortu- nately, war continued, leading many to view as overly op- timistic classical conceptions of liberal peace. This study can be seen as part of an effort to reexamine capitalist peace theory, revising arguments in line with contempo- rary insights much as Kantian claims were reworked in response to evolving evidence of a democratic peace. Existing empirical research on the democratic peace, while addressing many possible alternatives, provides an incomplete and uneven treatment of liberal economic processes. Most democratic peace research examines trade in goods and services but ignores capital markets and of- fers only a cursory assessment of economic development (Maoz and Russett 1992). Several studies explore the im- pact of interests, though these have largely been dismissed by democratic peace advocates (Oneal and Russett 1999a; Russett and Oneal 2001). These omissions or oversights help to determine the democratic peace result and thus shape subsequent research, thinking, and policy on the subject of liberal peace. This study offers evidence that liberal economic processes do in fact lead to peace, even accounting for the well-documented role of liberal pol- itics. Democracy cohabitates with peace. It does not, by itself, lead nations to be less conflict prone, not even to- ward other democracies. The argument and evidence provided here are bound to draw criticism. Skepticism in the face of controversial claims is natural, reasonable, even essential for the cumu- lation of knowledge. The democratic peace observation is supported by an exceptionally large and sophisticated body of research.2 At the same time, excessive deference to previous conclusions privileges conventional wisdom.3 A willingness to doubt that which we have come to believe is a hallmark of scientific inquiry. Indeed, the weight of existing evidence does not directly contradict this study as previous research has typically failed to address the claims of classical liberal political economists like Mon- tesquieu, Richard Cobden, and Norman Angell. As with previous research, this study finds support for a liberal peace, though the key causal variables, and some major policy implications, are considerably changed.

#### Extinction outweighs

Bostrom 12 - Professor of Philosophy at Oxford

(Nick, directs Oxford's Future of Humanity Institute, Interview with Ross Andersen, correspondent at The Atlantic, 3/6, “We're Underestimating the Risk of Human Extinction”, http://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2012/03/were-underestimating-the-risk-of-human-extinction/253821/)//BB

Bostrom, who directs Oxford's Future of Humanity Institute, has argued over the course of several papers that human extinction risks are poorly understood and, worse still, severely underestimated by society. Some of these existential risks are fairly well known, especially the natural ones. But others are obscure or even exotic. Most worrying to Bostrom is the subset of existential risks that arise from human technology, a subset that he expects to grow in number and potency over the next century.¶ Despite his concerns about the risks posed to humans by technological progress, Bostrom is no luddite. In fact, he is a longtime advocate of transhumanism---the effort to improve the human condition, and even human nature itself, through technological means. In the long run he sees technology as a bridge, a bridge we humans must cross with great care, in order to reach new and better modes of being. In his work, Bostrom uses the tools of philosophy and mathematics, in particular probability theory, to try and determine how we as a species might achieve this safe passage. What follows is my conversation with Bostrom about some of the most interesting and worrying existential risks that humanity might encounter in the decades and centuries to come, and about what we can do to make sure we outlast them.¶ Some have argued that we ought to be directing our resources toward humanity's existing problems, rather than future existential risks, because many of the latter are highly improbable. You have responded by suggesting that existential risk mitigation may in fact be a dominant moral priority over the alleviation of present suffering. Can you explain why? ¶ Bostrom: Well suppose you have a moral view that counts future people as being worth as much as present people. You might say that fundamentally it doesn't matter whether someone exists at the current time or at some future time, just as many people think that from a fundamental moral point of view, it doesn't matter where somebody is spatially---somebody isn't automatically worth less because you move them to the moon or to Africa or something. A human life is a human life. If you have that moral point of view that future generations matter in proportion to their population numbers, then you get this very stark implication that existential risk mitigation has a much higher utility than pretty much anything else that you could do. There are so many people that could come into existence in the future if humanity survives this critical period of time---we might live for billions of years, our descendants might colonize billions of solar systems, and there could be billions and billions times more people than exist currently. Therefore, even a very small reduction in the probability of realizing this enormous good will tend to outweigh even immense benefits like eliminating poverty or curing malaria, which would be tremendous under ordinary standards.

**Do not evaluate their value system without first assessing the consequences of its actual implementation. Viewing ethics in isolation is irresponsible & complicit with the evil they criticize.**

**Issac** **2002**.,( Jeffery C. Professor of political science at Indiana-Bloomington & Director of the Center for the Study of Democracy and Public Life. PhD Yale University. From “Ends, Means, and Politics.” Dissent Magazine. Volume 49. Issue # 2. Available online @ subscribing institutions using Proquest. Herm

As a result, the most important political questions are simply not asked. It is assumed that U.S. military intervention is an act of "aggression," but no consideration is given to the aggression to which intervention is a response. The status quo ante in Afghanistan is not, as peace activists would have it, peace, but rather terrorist violence abetted by a regime--the Taliban--that rose to power through brutality and repression. This requires us to ask a question that most "peace" activists would prefer not to ask: What should be done to respond to the violence of a Saddam Hussein, or a Milosevic, or a Taliban regime? What means are likely to stop violence and bring criminals to justice? Calls for diplomacy and international law are well intended and important; they implicate a decent and civilized ethic of global order. But they are also vague and empty, because they are not accompanied by any account of how diplomacy or international law can work effectively to address the problem at hand. The campus left offers no such account. To do so would require it to contemplate tragic choices in which moral goodness is of limited utility. Here what matters is not purity of intention but the intelligent exercise of power. Power is not a dirty word or an unfortunate feature of the world. It is the core of politics. Power is the ability to effect outcomes in the world. Politics, in large part, involves contests over the distribution and use of power. To accomplish anything in the political world, one must attend to the means that are necessary to bring it about. And to develop such means is to develop, and to exercise, power. To say this is not to say that power is beyond morality. It is to say that power is not reducible to morality. As writers such as Niccolo Machiavelli, Max Weber, Reinhold Niebuhr, and Hannah Arendt have taught, an unyielding concern with moral goodness undercuts political responsibility. The concern may be morally laudable, reflecting a kind of personal integrity, but it suffers from 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 common cause 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 always a potentially immoral stand. In categorically repudiating violence, it refuses in principle to oppose 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 the lesson of communism in the twentieth century: it is not enough that one's goals be sincere or idealistic; it is equally important, always, to ask about the effects of pursuing these goals and to judge these effects in pragmatic and historically contextualized ways. Moral absolutism inhibits this judgment. It alienates those who are not true believers. It promotes arrogance. And it undermines political effectiveness.

**Rejecting consequences undermines responsibility, freedom and politics**

**Williams, 2005-** Professor of International Politics at the University of Wales (Michael, “the realist tradition and the limits of international relations”, p 174-176)

A commitment to an ethic of consequences reflects a deeper ethic of criticism, of ‘self-clarification’, and thus of reflection upon the values adopted by an individual or a collectivity. It is part of an attempt to make critical evaluation an intrinsic element of responsibility. Responsibility to this more fundamental ethic gives the ethic of consequences meaning. Consequentialism and responsibility are here drawn into what schluchter, in terms that will be familiar to anyone conversant with constructivism in international relations, has called a ‘reflexive principle’. In the wilful realist vision, scepticism and consequentialism are linked in an attempt to construct not just a more substantial vision of political responsibility, but also the kinds of actors who might adopt it, and the kinds of social structures that might support it. A consequentialist ethic is not simply a choice adopted by actors: it is a means of trying to foster particular kinds of self-critical individuals and societies, and in so doing to encourage a means by which one can justify and foster a politics of responsibility. The ethic of responsibility in wilful realism thus involves a commitment to both autonomy and limitation, to freedom and restraint, to an acceptance of limits and the criticism of limits. Responsibility clearly involves prudence and an accounting for current structures and their historical evolution; but it is not limited to this, for it seeks ultimately the creation of responsible subjects within a philosophy of limits. Seen in this light, the realist commitment to objectivity appears quite differently. Objectivity in terms of consequentialist analysis does not simply take the actor or action as given, it is a political practice — an attempt to foster a responsible self, undertaken by an analyst with a commitment to objectivity which is itself based in a desire to foster a politics of responsibility. Objectivity in the sense of coming to terms with the ‘reality’ of contextual conditions and likely outcomes of action is not only necessary for success, it is vital for self-reflection, for sustained engagement with the practical and ethical adequacy of one’s views. The blithe, self-serving, and uncritical stances of abstract moralism or rationalist objectivism avoid self-criticism by refusing to engage with the intractability of the world ‘as it is’. Reducing the world to an expression of their theoretical models, political platforms, or ideological programmes, they fail to engage with this reality, and thus avoid the process of self-reflection at the heart of responsibility. By contrast, realist objectivity takes an engagement with this intractable ‘object’ that is not reducible to one’s wishes or will as a necessary condition of ethical engagement, self-reflection, and self-creation.7 objectivity is not a naïve naturalism in the sense of scientific laws or rationalist calculation; it is a necessary engagement with a world that eludes one’s will. A recognition of the limits imposed by ‘reality’ is a condition for a recognition of one’s own limits — that the world is not simply an extension of one’s own will. But it is also a challenge to use that intractability as a source of possibility, as providing a set of openings within which a suitably chastened and yet paradoxically energised will to action can responsibly be pursued. In the wilful realist tradition, the essential opacity of both the self and the world are taken as limiting principles. Limits upon understanding provide chastening parameters for claims about the world and actions within it. But they also provide challenging and creative openings within which diverse forms of life can be developed: the limited unity of the self and the political order is the precondition for freedom. The ultimate opacity of the world is not to be despaired of: it is a condition of possibility for the wilful, creative construction of selves and social orders which embrace the diverse human potentialities which this lack of essential or intrinsic order makes possible.8 but it is also to be aware of the less salutary possibilities this involves. Indeterminacy is not synonymous with absolute freedom — it is both a condition of, and imperative toward, responsibility.

restaurants, stores, and nightclubs.¶ Of course, problems have not all ceased, and residents are still healing from the long period of fear and uncertainty. Nevertheless, the strong economy and undeniable positive signs in community life deserve much praise and provide real hope. Data indicate that incidences of homicide, kidnapping, theft, and other crimes have all drastically declined in the past year. President Calderon continues to earmark funds to sustain crackdowns on the warfare between the cartels. Hundreds of arrests have been made, and the local police force has made noticeable efforts to weed out and punish corruption among its ranks.¶ Juarez is one of the premier locations for manufacturing in Mexico. Like Tijuana, its proximity to the United States enables businesses to avoid long transit times between production and distribution, and Juarez’s central location is second to none. The environment is ripe for new businesses and investors to operate in Juarez and contribute to its flourishing economy.

#### Recent reforms to Mexico’s labor laws solves the plan in its entirety

De la Vega et al. 2012

(Oscar De la Vega is Office Managing Shareholder in Littler Mendelson's Mexico City office and has been an active spokesperson on behalf of several business committees, advocating for a labor law reform for many years. Monica Schiaffino is a Shareholder, and Liliana Hernández is an Associate, in the Mexico City office. Eduardo Arrocha is Of Counsel in the Mexico City office and has over 40 years of employment and labor law experience in Mexico, having been the general counsel for a major international company for many years. “Mexico Enacts Important Reforms to the Federal Labor Law.” November 30, 2012. Littler.com. http://www.littler.com/publication-press/publication/mexico-enacts-important-reforms-federal-labor-law.)

¶ Mexico's Federal Official Gazette today published a Decree that reforms and repeals various provisions of its Federal Labor Law (FLL). The reform will become effective on December 1, 2012, with some exceptions which are discussed below. The FLL had not been subjected to any substantial modifications since 1970. Accordingly, the reform has extensive implications for employers with operations in Mexico. ¶ Below we provide a summary of the FLL reforms and their potential impact. ¶ Employment Relationship¶ The reform adds seasonal employment agreements and initial training agreements as new types of employment contracts, in addition to those already permitted under the statute (i.e., employment contracts for specific work and for a definite or indefinite period). ¶ The initial training employment agreements must establish a time period of three months, as a general rule, and six months, for executive positions. Additionally, a probationary period of 30 days, generally, and 180 days, for executive positions, will apply to employment agreements for an indefinite term or to those exceeding 180 days. ¶ Notably, the reform adds the requirement that, in order to avoid employer liability, the opinion of the Joint Commission for Productivity and Training must be taken into consideration before terminating an "initial training employment agreement" or an employment agreement subject to a probationary period. Requiring the opinion of the Joint Commission for Productivity and Training will likely result in a bureaucratic and potentially conflictive process. ¶ Outsourcing¶ The reform heightens the regulations on outsourcing (subcontracting) with severe implications to many employers. Under the new law, "outsourcing" is defined as follows: ¶ The subcontracting regime occurs when work is performed or services are rendered through workers hired by and working under a contractor's control, for the benefit of a customer, whether a legal or natural person, and the customer sets the tasks for the contractor and supervises the contractor in rendering the services or performing the contracted work: ¶ This type of work must comply with the following conditions: ¶ It cannot cover the totality of the activities, whether equal or similar in totality, undertaken at the center of the workplace.¶ It is justified due to its specialized character.¶ It cannot include tasks equal or similar to the ones carried out by the customer's workers. If these conditions are not met, the customer will be deemed to be the employer for purposes and effects under the Law, including as it applies to obligations related to social security. ¶ The reform initiative also establishes new requirements, including that the contract must be in writing and that the customer (or beneficiary of the services) must ensure that the contractor complies with its obligations under the labor law. It further provides that the subcontracting regime will not allow the transfer of workers from a customer to a contractor, for purposes of undermining any right under the labor law. ¶

#### New labor laws increase workers’ rights

Starner 1-3

(Thomas Starner, freelance writer and editor. “New Labor Law in Mexico: Positive changes -- and potential pitfalls for U.S. multinationals -- are part of a new labor law in Mexico, which was 42 years in the making but, experts say, was much needed.” Thursday, January 3, 2013. http://www.hreonline.com/HRE/view/story.jhtml?id=534354722).

They have been 42 years in the making, but American employers that either have facilities in Mexico or outsource work there should benefit from recent changes in the country's antiquated labor laws. Not everything in the new law may help, however, according to employment lawyers with extensive international experience. On the positive side, changes passed by the Mexican Congress (and that went into effect on Dec. 1) will help lower the cost of hiring and firing workers in areas such as back wages and the ability to hire and fire employees with much less red tape. Oscar De la Vega, managing shareholder in the Mexico City office of Littler Mendelson, says from a strictly financial standpoint, the law imposes a new one-year limit on any back wages employers must pay a worker who eventually wins a lawsuit over a wrongful dismissal. Under the old law, which existed since 1970, lawsuits dragged on for years and employers were liable for full back pay if they eventually lost – no matter how long the case went on. Other key changes affecting American companies with employees or outsourced workers in Mexico revolve around temporary training contracts and probationary periods, outsourcing regulations, and discrimination and harassment, among others. "On balance the new law is a good thing, although there are some issues that are not very clear and could generate some potential liability," he says.

#### Maquiladoras working to improve workers’ living conditions

Davidson 11

([Miriam Davidson](http://aliciapatterson.org/users/miriam-davidson). 16 year fellow at Alicia Patterson Foundation [One-year and six month grants are awarded to working journalists to pursue independent projects of significant interest and to write articles based on their investigations for The APF Reporter, a web published magazine by the Foundation and available on the web. Winners are chosen by an annual competition. The competition opens in June and all entries must be postmarked by October 1. Applications are accepted from U.S. citizens who are print journalists with at least five years of professional experience.] “Maquiladora Workers Get Homes of Their Own”. 2011-05-03. <http://aliciapatterson.org/stories/maquiladora-workers-get-homes-their-own>)

From his office window, Tom Higgins looks across the city of Nogales, Sonora, Mexico, and sees rows of new tin roofs shining on a hilltop. "I'm so pleased," he says, "that in all the crap and corruption of this world, the little guys got something good." Higgins has reason to be pleased. As manager of one of the 82 maquiladoras, or foreign-owned assembly plants, in Nogales, he helped pioneer a unique collaboration between his industry and the Mexican government to provide housing for low-income maquiladora workers. The first 500 single-family, worker-owned homes were built last year, and another 250 will be finished by this summer. The program has been so successful in Nogales that it recently was expanded to other border cities.The housing program represents an unprecedented effort to confront one of the main criticisms of maquiladoras: the lack of housing and infrastructure for workers who make less than $10 a day. Many, if not most, of the more than 800,000 maquiladora workers in Mexico live in crowded squatters' camps surrounding the factories. Their shacks are cobbled together from wood pallets, scrap metal, cardboard boxes, and plastic sheets. Few have indoor plumbing. Some, particularly new arrivals to the border, don't have water or electricity. "We all feel shame about the deplorable living conditions that still exist for newcomers," says Marco Antonio Valenzuela, head of the Mexico City-based National Council of the Maquiladora Industry. "Hopefully, this program will have a long-term effect toward eliminating the housing shortage on the border." Tom Higgins, who calls himself "a gringo with a Mexican soul," has worked in the Nogales maquiladora industry for 12 years. For at least half that time, Higgins, his former boss, and a handful of others also have worked to get the housing project built. It hasn't been easy. Higgins' former boss proposed the idea in 1990, after reading an article about the Nogales maquiladora industry in the New York Times Sunday magazine. It depicted a family living in a shack made out of cardboard boxes. The boxes had the name of his company's maquiladora printed on them. "I had pangs of guilt," says Douglas Chapman, the retired chairman of ACCO World Corporation, a Chicago-based office-supply manufacturer. "I felt that, if we're profiting and benefiting down there, we had an obligation to try to do something about this." Chapman and another senior ACCO executive then put up several hundred thousand dollars of their own money to start the Esperanza (Hope) Foundation. The idea was to use this money, as well as contributions from the Nogales maquiladora industry, to help workers make down payments on government-financed homes. "We wanted them to be nice houses, with bedrooms, bathroom, water, sewer, electricity, paved streets, sidewalks, and street lights," Chapman says. The foundation also required that the houses be fairly distributed among all qualified maquiladora workers in Nogales. The Nogales maquiladora industry had some objections to the plan. Maquiladoras already pay a 5 percent housing tax to the Mexican government, money that, in the past, has not been used to benefit their workers. Managers point out that their companies contribute millions to the Mexican economy through salaries, taxes, and local suppliers. They also don't like the fact that the foundation was set up to benefit all maquiladora workers, not just workers for contributing companies. Nevertheless, with the Esperanza Foundation leading the way, most of the maquiladoras in Nogales have agreed to help qualified workers make a down payment on a home. Some are doing it through the Esperanza Foundation. Others are giving all or most of the money directly to their employees. "It doesn't matter how they do it, as long as they do it," Chapman says. Getting the support of the maquiladoras wasn't the only hurdle the foundation had to overcome. Problems with an unscrupulous developer and the economic and political turmoil of the 1994 peso devaluation forced the project to be delayed and scaled back several times. Things finally came together in late 1995, when INFONAVIT, the Mexican government's low-income housing authority, agreed to finance the construction. INFONAVIT also agreed to make the houses affordable by easing its requirements to qualify for a home loan. Such loans had previously been out of reach for most maquiladora workers. Today, the $10 million San Carlos project, looking much like Chapman and Higgins envisioned it, is going up on a hill above a new industrial park on the east side of Nogales. The first 500 of the 511-square foot, two-bedroom homes were presented to their owners in a ceremony last fall. At least one worker at each of the 41 companies that belong to the Nogales Maquiladora Association - employers of some 90 percent of the 25,000 maquiladora workers in town - received a house.

#### No risk of offense – neolib is inevitable

Mark Hudson 1999 (Reference and Instruction Librarian at the University of Pittsburgh at Johnstown, “Understanding Information Media in the Age of Neoliberalism: The Contributions of Herbert Schiller”, Progressive Librarian, No. 16, Fall)

Neoliberal ideas are as old as capitalism itself, but in recent decades they have seen a tremendous resurgence and have displaced the state-interventionist economic theories of the interwar and post-World War II periods to become the reigning ideology of our time. Neoliberalism emerged full force in the 1980s with the right-wing Reagan and Thatcher regimes, but its influence has since spread across the political spectrum to encompass not only centrist political parties but even much of the traditional social-democratic left. In the 1990s, neoliberal hegemony over our politics and culture has become so overwhelming that it is becoming difficult to even rationally discuss what neoliberalism is; indeed, as Robert McChesney notes, the term "neoliberalism" is hardly known to the U.S. public outside of academia and the business community (McChesney). The corporate stranglehold on our information and communications media gives neoliberal ideologues a virtually unchallenged platform from which to blast their pro-market messages into every corner of our common culture. At the same time, neoliberalism provides the ideological cover for deregulatory legislation (most recently the 1996 Telecommunications Act) that enables corporations to extend their monopoly over these media even more. For the past three decades, one of the fiercest and most coherent critics of corporate control over the information/communications sphere has been the social scientist Herbert Schiller. Although Schiller began his career before neoliberalism's ascendance, and he does not even today use the term in his writings, his work provides essential insights into the roots of neoliberal/corporate hegemony over our information media and the adverse consequences of that hegemony for our politics, economy and culture.
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#### Engaging Mexico is politically divisive

**Wilson 13**

Christopher E., Associate at the Mexico Institute of the Woodrow Wilson International. Center for Scholars , January, “A U.S.-Mexico Economic Alliance: Policy Options for a Competitive Region,” http://www.wilsoncenter.org/sites/default/files/new\_ideas\_us\_mexico\_relations.pdf

At a time when Mexico is poised to experience robust economic growth, a manufacturing renaissance is underway in North America and bilateral trade is booming, the United States and Mexico have an important choice to make: sit back and reap the moderate and perhaps temporal benefits coming naturally from the evolving global context , or implement a robust agenda to improve the competitiveness of North America for the long term . Given that job creation and economic growth in both the United States and Mexico are at stake, t he choice should be simple, but a limited understanding about the magnitude, nature and depth of the U.S.-Mexico economic relationship among the public and many policymakers has made serious action to support regional exporters more politically divisive than it ought to be.

#### Kills political capital

**Farnsworth and Werz 12**

Eric, vice president of the Council of the Americas and Americas Society, and Michael, Senior Fellow at the Center for American Progress, The United States and Mexico: The Path Forward, 11/30/12, http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/security/news/2012/11/30/46430/the-united-states-and-mexico-the-path-forward/

On the economic front, the success of the new Mexican administration’s economic reform and growth agenda is a core interest of the United States. A number of policy fields will be crucial to create a successful North American growth model and will elevate the transactional partnership with Mexico to a strategic relationship much like the United States enjoys with Canada. To achieve this goal, both countries must address a number of issues simultaneously.¶ The creation of jobs will play a central role in domestic politics in both countries. U.S-Mexican trade needs to be encouraged in the border region and beyond. To achieve this, the U.S.-Mexican border needs to be more permeable and allow more crossings at lower cost.¶ To secure energy independence, both countries need to prioritize research and development investments to ensure that technologies that facilitate access to shale gas—such as horizontal drilling combined with hydraulic fracking—do not adversely affect the environment. This is a necessary step to move forward with the development of massive North American shale gas resources—a potential strategic game-changer.¶ Mexican states along the U.S. border are official observers in the Western Climate Initiative, joining California and four Canadian provinces. The federal governments in both the United States and Mexico should take aggressive steps to make it more feasible for these Mexican states to become full partners in the initiative to achieve meaningful reductions in carbon pollution and move toward greater U.S.-Mexican cooperation on future North American pollution cuts.¶ Both countries need to expand their economic relations with Asia and Europe. President-Elect Peña Nieto sees China as an important future partner for economic growth. Both Mexico and Canada were invited in June to join the negotiations toward the Trans-Pacific Partnership—an important if belated step. Both should also be included at the very beginning of discussions with Europe—should they occur as has been rumored—toward the creation of a free trade zone in the Atlantic. Such trade negotiations would provide an added means for the three North American economies to build cooperation.¶ The war against cartels and gangs involved in the illegal drugs trade continues to rage on both sides of the border, although indications of progress include a reduction in violence, cleaned-up cities, and increasing professionalization of the Mexican security forces. Achieving a reduction of violence will be a key challenge for President-Elect Peña Nieto, with street protests demanding as much. Judicial reform is moving forward, albeit slowly, but Mexican authorities still rely too greatly on confession by apprehended suspects and have deficits in the acquisition and use of intelligence. This fight needs to be framed as a joint challenge, emphasizing the co-responsibility of the United States, as Secretary of State Hillary Clinton has expressed several times.¶ The re-launch of a U.S.-Mexican bilateral commission would be an important vehicle to institutionalize cabinet-level discussions across the broad range of issues that affect our countries and maybe trilateralize along with Canada from time to time. Tone and perception count a lot in the bilateral relationship. In addition, both sides should establish permanent working groups to help change the image and perception of Mexico in the United States and vice versa. Such an engagement in public diplomacy could include messaging and outreach to counter the often-distorted perception of Mexican society in the United States.¶ The election of Enrique Peña Nieto and the re-election of President Obama mean that the U.S.-Mexican relationship has a unique opportunity to grow closer and bring numerous benefits to both sides of the border. To fully appreciate this unique opportunity, both sides must invest political capital and be prepared to engage domestic public opinion when it comes to explaining why our countries are united by much more than a fence.

#### No link turn – no constituency in Congress – only a risk of PC decline

**Hakim et al 12**

Peter Hakim, Andrés Rozental, Rubens Barbosa, Riordan Roett, Ruben Olmos, “What Will Obama's Second Term Mean for Latin America?” [http://www.thedialogue.org/page.cfm?pageID=32&pubID=3135] November 8 //mtc

Q: Barack Obama was re-elected president of the United States on Tuesday. What is his vision for foreign policy and how does Latin America fit into his plans? How will Latin American leaders and their citizens react to the election results? What role did Latinos in the United States play in the election and what does that mean for U.S. policy changes on issues such as immigration, drugs and Cuba? ¶ A: Peter Hakim, member of the Advisor board and president emeritus of the Inter-American Dialogue: "Any speculation about Obama's second term has to come mainly from his first-term performance. The campaign was about the candidates and their biographies—not about issues. Nothing suggests Congress will be more productive. The House remains virtually unchanged. The Senate will be more divisive still as most remaining moderate Republicans and Democrats resigned or lost their seats. We will know soon whether compromise is possible when the lame-duck Congress returns next week, and begins discussion of the fiscal cliff embroglio. The best guess is that Congress will find a way, not to resolve the problem, but to defer its consequences. The election results focused attention on immigration policy, which both Republicans and Democrats may be motivated to address. President Obama's declared intention to address immigration was surely reinforced by the huge Latino vote. Many of the Republicans who blocked previous immigration initiatives will resist again. But some recognize their party may become irrelevant unless they take seriously the Latino and black constituencies that accounted for more than 40 percent of Obama's total. U.S. immigration reform would be a welcome change in most of Latin America, particularly in Mexico, Central America and the Caribbean. Obama may seek to pursue further openings to Cuba—but these will be limited unless the Cuban government shows a willingness to reciprocate with new human rights measures or political changes. Drug policy is not high on the U.S. agenda, but the approval in Colorado and Washington of ballot initiatives to legalize marijuana use may spark wider discussion on drug issues. But Mitt Romney offered the most significant policy proposal for Latin America, when called for more intensive U.S. efforts to pursue multiplying economic opportunities in the region." ¶ A: Andrés Rozental, member of the Advisor board, president of Rozental & Asociados in Mexico City and senior fellow at the Brookings Institution: "President Obama's re-election is a welcome development for Latin Americans in general, and Mexicans in particular. Although many of Obama's campaign promises in 2008 relevant to the region remain unrealized, there is a modicum of hope that as a leader in his second term, with more political capital to spend, he can at least make a stronger effort to tackle comprehensive immigration reform and trade issues critical to Latin American prosperity. Although I don't foresee any major change in the United States' foreign policy toward the region, especially as long as Afghanistan, Iran and the Middle East remain priorities for Washington, that may not necessarily be a bad thing. We often complain when Washington pays too much attention to us, and equally when there's less overt interest in the region, but I believe that Obama has mostly shown a much more mature attitude toward Latin America over the last four years than has traditionally been the case. This will hopefully also be the case as his administration continues through 2016. Presumably, there will continue to be a strong focus on completing ongoing trade negotiations, especially the Trans-Pacific Partnership, to open new opportunities for economic growth and hopefully a re-visiting of NAFTA as a key option to make North America more competitive on the global scene. Latinos played a key role in re-electing Obama, just as they did in 2008, and the one message that Republicans have to take home at this stage is that the anti-immigrant, exclusionary policies voiced during the campaign by Mitt Romney, the Tea Party and other conservatives were a key factor in their ultimate defeat. Many of Obama's liberal views on minority rights and tolerance turned out to be much more popular among Americans as a whole than the opposing Republican positions on those same issues."¶ A: Rubens Barbosa, former ambassador of Brazil to the United States: "In his second term, Obama will be more interested in looking for his legacy in history. The U.S. government will tend to be more proactive and try to increase its influence in the current hot spots: Pakistan, Syria, Iran and elsewhere in the Middle East. The relationship with China will continue to be high on the foreign policy agenda. Having in mind this scenario, Latin America will continue to be off the radar of U.S. decision makers: the region will remain a low priority for Washington. Despite this fact, the reaction of the Latin American leaders and citizens to Obama's re-election has been very positive. The role of Latinos in the election was important and in some places crucial. In terms of policy changes on issues such as immigration, drugs and Cuba, Obama will continue to face strong opposition from the Republican Party but I would not be surprised if new ideas could be advanced by the administration especially in relation to immigration and Cuba."¶ A: Riordan Roett, director of the Latin American Studies program at the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies: "While the president's re-election is welcome in general terms, it is difficult to imagine Latin America will receive greater attention in the next four years. Congress remains deeply divided. The administration's foreign policy priorities will continue to focus on China, the Middle East and the ongoing fiscal challenges. Given the strong turnout by the Latino community, one area that should receive priority is continued immigration reform, but it is the third rail for the Republican majority in the House. In general, the democratic governments of the region will welcome the president's election without great expectation for major policy initiatives. The populist regimes will continue to denounce any democratically elected administration. The deadlock over Cuba will continue unless there is a dramatic leadership shift to a new generation. The major policy initiative that would be welcome in the region is on drug policy, but that issue will remain taboo."

#### Err neg – legislation can only deplete capital

**Fisher** (staffwriter) 1/6/**03**[Kenneth L., “Three’s a Charm,” Forbes, LN]

Having bucked the trend and added midterm power, will President Bush now legislate heavily, voiding the third-year magic? Unlikely. He can build political capital or spend it. Legislating means spending it, hurting his 2004 goals. I'd bet he keeps building capital. Remember, he needs marginal 2004 voters. If he pushes legislation, those he takes from will hate it more than those he gives to will love it. The losers will be energized for 2004 revenge; the winners, placated, will lose their urge to vote or help Bush's campaign.

#### No budget thumper – the fight is about the debt ceiling

**Hoover 9/9**

Kent, Washington bureau chief at the Business Journals, What to expect from Congress now that it's back, 9/9/13, http://www.bizjournals.com/bizjournals/washingtonbureau/2013/09/09/what-to-expect-from-congress-now-that.html?page=all

Obama and Senate Democrats may balk at continuing the sequester, but they have may have little choice but to accept it, at least for a few months. The alternative could be a government shutdown, which no one wants.¶ Debt ceiling¶ The heavy lifting when it comes to the federal government's fiscal crisis will come in October. That's when the government will reach its borrowing limit, and Congress will have to raise this debt ceiling in order for the government to avoid defaulting on its debt. Cantor, in a memo to House Republicans, said the "House will act to prevent a default on our obligations."¶ Republicans, however, want something in return for "another increase in the debt limit," he wrote -- "fiscal reforms and pro-growth policies which put us on a path to balance in 10 years."¶ Obama, however, said he will not negotiate when it comes to raising the debt ceiling, because that step is necessary to pay bills the government has already rung up.¶ In 2011, Congress and Obama walked to the edge of default before reaching a deal that cut spending in return for raising the debt ceiling. This deal led to sequestration when Congress failed to adopt an alternative deficit reduction plan.¶ What will this year's debt ceiling lead to, and will there even be a deal? Nobody knows, which is why you can expect anxiety attacks on Wall Street and Main Street in the weeks ahead. Consumer confidence plummeted during the 2011 debt ceiling showdown.

#### Bipartisan resolution to solve sequester coming now

**Bloomberg 9-12**-13 (“Republicans Shift Fiscal Strategy to Health-Care Delay,” http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-09-11/house-republicans-said-to-delay-spending-vote.html)

Republican Senator Johnny Isakson said today the stopgap spending bill is a “better place” than the debt limit for Republicans to wage their fight to postpone the health-care law. Trading a postponement of the law for relief from the automatic spending cuts is a “possible” basis of a compromise he’d be willing to explore, Isakson said at at Bloomberg Government breakfast.¶ “There’s bipartisan interest in solving the sequester problem,” Isakson said. “There is not bipartisan interest in postponing Obamacare,” he added, saying that vote “would be problematic for a lot of Democrats” seeking re-election next year because many voters dislike the law.¶ Isakson predicted the continued partisan wrangling won’t lead to a government shutdown even as the Oct. 1 deadline nears.¶ The two-term senator said he was first elected to the House in a 1999 special election to fill a vacancy created by the resignation of House Speaker Newt Gingrich, a Georgia Republican who had forced a government shutdown in late 1995 and early 1996.¶ “I am not a fan of shutdowns,” he said. “Having been a beneficiary once, I certainly don’t want to do that again.”

#### No budget thumper – no fight

**Dovere 9/12**

Edward, Reporter, Politico, “W.H. aides: Obama prepared for shutdown if necessary”, http://www.politico.com/politico44/2013/09/wh-aides-obama-prepared-for-shutdown-if-necessary-172540.html

Asked about the meeting, a White House official said the focus of the meeting wasn’t about a shutdown or not. The president’s fine with signing a continuing resolution, free of extraneous conditions, that would buy Congress some more time to work out a deal, the official said, but Nabors and Rodriguez “made clear that there is absolutely no negotiating over the debt limit, and any delay or defunding of ACA is unacceptable.”¶ Republican leaders have largely backed away from shutdown threats, though White House press secretary Jay Carney was still goading them from the podium Thursday.¶ “The leaders in Congress of the Republican Party have made clear that they understand that allowing a shutdown would inflict harm on the economy and I think cause political problems for them,” Carney said. “And I assume that the combination of those two incentives would compel them to come up with a solution, so that we can fund the government responsibly, and not engage in these games that inflict unnecessary wounds on our economy.”

#### Obama wont cave – will pass but will be extremely close

**Kapur 9/17**

Sahil, Talking Points Memo, No Endgame In Sight To Avert A Government Shutdown, 9/17/13, http://talkingpointsmemo.com/dc/no-endgame-in-sight-to-avert-a-government-shutdown

President Barack Obama is losing his patience. He scolded Republicans during a speech Monday for threatening a government shutdown -- or worse, a debt default -- to unwind the health care law, reminding them that they lost the 2012 election.¶ "I cannot remember a time when one faction of one party promises economic chaos if it can't get 100 percent of what it wants. That's never happened before. But that's what's happening right now," the president said. "The Affordable Care Act ... was an issue in last year's election and the candidate who called for repeal lost."¶ The White House has no intention of caving, for several reasons: there's no election looming; the falling deficit reduces the impetus for spending cuts; and Republicans will take the blame for a shutdown. Republicans don't want to cave because they're anxious to undermine Obamacare before its implementation accelerates on Oct. 1 and extract spending concessions after getting none in the fiscal cliff deal early this year.¶ "It's a shame that the president could not manage to rise above partisanship today," Boehner retorted on Monday afternoon. "Instead, he should be working in a bipartisan way to address America's spending problem -- the way presidents of both parties have done before. He should work with us to delay his health care law for everyone."¶ It's a particularly bad sign if even Boehner, who wants to avoid a shutdown, is fueling the sentiments of the anti-Obamacare crowd at this critical juncture. Even the deeply polarized Congress of recent years has managed to avert shutdown and default. But it remains to be seen whether, in the face of all the new obstacles, leaders can pull another rabbit out of their hats. The final days tend to focus their minds.

#### Will pass – GOP will capitulate because they can’t get Obamacare repealed

**Giroux 9/19**

Greg, Bloomberg, Senate Budget Chief Sees Republican Yield on Debt Lifting, 9/19/13, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-09-19/senate-budget-chief-sees-republican-yield-on-debt-lifting.html

Republicans seeking to curb President Barack Obama’s health-care law probably will capitulate to demands from Democrats to enact a “clean” bill raising the nation’s debt ceiling, the Senate’s top Democratic budget writer said.¶ “I see no deals on the debt ceiling,” Senator Patty Murray of Washington state, who leads the Budget Committee, said in an interview on Bloomberg Television’s “Political Capital with Al Hunt” airing this weekend.¶ “The downside of not paying our bills is our credit-rating tanks,” Murray said. “That affects every family, every business, every community. It affects Main Street. It affects Wall Street.”¶ Murray said she also expects Republicans to relent on their demands for stripping spending from Obama’s health plan as part of action on a spending bill needed to keep the government running after Sept. 30.¶ Republicans led by House Speaker John Boehner of Ohio have clashed with Obama over the debt ceiling, with the lawmakers demanding changes to spending programs as a condition of raising the $16.7 trillion federal borrowing limit.¶ Republicans “will come together with some mishmash policy of everything in the bag they’ve ever promised” to anti-tax Tea Party activists, though “they haven’t been able to get the votes for anything yet,” said Murray, 62, fourth-ranking Democrat in the Senate’s leadership.¶ Federal Reserve¶ As Federal Reserve Chairman Ben S. Bernanke nears the end of his second term in January, Murray said there’s “a very good chance” that Obama will nominate Fed vice chairman Janet Yellen to succeed him.¶ Yellen is “very experienced” and “certainly understands that we need to create jobs, the kind of economic climate that brings stability to families in my home state and across the country,” Murray said.¶ Yellen also would be a “historic choice,” as the first woman to lead the U.S. central bank, Murray said.¶ Yellen became the front-runner to lead the Fed after Larry Summers withdrew from consideration Sept. 15 amid opposition from some Democratic senators. Murray was among the one-third of the 54-member Senate Democratic caucus who signed a July letter urging Obama to appoint Yellen as Bernanke’s successor.¶ The Senate will have to confirm Obama’s nominee.¶ Republicans led by Boehner have said they won’t negotiate with Obama over raising the debt ceiling. The House will act on a debt-ceiling measure that would also reduce the deficit, promote growth and delay Obama’s health-care law by one year, Boehner said at a press conference yesterday.¶ Reduce Deficit¶ “If you’re going to raise the debt ceiling, you should work to reduce the deficit and grow the economy at the same time,” Boehner said.¶ The House plans to vote today on the stopgap spending bill that would finance federal government operations through Dec. 15 while denying money for the president’s health-care overhaul. Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid has called that plan “dead on arrival.”¶ Obama would veto the bill because the legislation “advances a narrow ideological agenda that threatens our economy,” the president’s Office of Management and Budget said yesterday in a statement of administration policy.¶ The Democratic-run Senate won’t pass any bill curbing Obama’s top domestic policy achievement, Murray said.¶ ‘Helping Millions’¶ Republicans are demanding to repeal a health-care law “that is already in place, that’s been upheld by the Supreme Court and is helping millions of Americans,” she said.¶ Treasury Secretary Jacob J. Lew told Congress in a letter last month that lawmakers need to raise the borrowing limit by mid-October to remove the threat of a government default.¶ A government shutdown and a failure to raise the debt limit “could have very serious consequences for the financial markets and for the economy,” Bernanke said Sept. 18 as he announced that the Federal Open Market Committee wouldn’t reduce the $85 billion pace of its monthly securities buying.¶ Bernanke “sees what I see right now,” Murray said, that the economy “is starting to get stable again, but there’s a lot of uncertainty around it.”

#### Pressure on the GOP gives Obama leverage

**Shabad 9/20**

Rebecca, The Hill, Schumer on GOP: 'They'll blink', 9/20/13, http://thehill.com/blogs/blog-briefing-room/news/323609-schumer-gop-on-fiscal-battle-at-the-end-of-the-day-theyll-blink

Sen. Charles Schumer (D-N.Y.) on Friday said he believes Republicans will eventually capitulate in the fights over government funding and the debt ceiling.¶ “At the end of the day, they’ll blink,” Schumer said.¶ “One thing that’s happened in the last week or two where Republicans have lost dramatic ground is all this internal fighting. And that has weakened them with the public, and strengthened us,” he said on MSNBC’s “Morning Joe.” ¶ Congress must pass a funding bill by Oct. 1 or the government will shut down for the first time since the 1990s. ¶ On Friday, the House is likely to pass a government funding bill that would strip money for ObamaCare.¶ Senate Democrats have vowed to reject the defunding of the Afforable Care Act, and say they are prepared to cut the provision out of the legislation once it passes the House.¶ “All of the Republican leadership knows that doing this is a disaster for them,” Schumer said. “They’re not strong enough to resist the Tea Party, and so what they’re hoping is, ‘Well, let it play out.’ ”¶ Schumer said Sen. Ted Cruz (R-Texas) helped create the problem for GOP leaders with his summer campaign to defund ObamaCare.¶ “He knows that it’s a disaster, and he took this hot potato — which he created — he heated up the potato and threw it over to the House,” Schumer said.¶ The senior senator said Republicans have backed themselves into a corner trying to raise the debt ceiling, and suggested the fight could put the economy at risk. But he foresees that a bloc of Republicans will eventually help Democrats raise the debt ceiling.

#### PC causes passage – business pressures

**Cowan and Lowder 9/13**

Richard and David, Reuters, Analysis: House Republicans go for broke in fiscal battles, 9/13/13, http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/09/13/us-usa-congress-debt-ceiling-analysis-idUSBRE98C04620130913

There are risks for Democrats and Obama too. While polling results showed the public more upset with Republicans then Obama after the "fiscal cliff" fight that led to across-the-board budget cuts, Obama's Gallup approval rating started on a downward trend then from which it has yet to recover, with other polls suggesting that Americans hold all parties in Washington as well as the president responsible for "gridlock."¶ With the deadlines fast-approaching, the maneuvering is well underway.¶ The White House announced that Obama would speak to the Business Roundtable group of big-company chief executives next week. White House spokesman Jay Carney did not offer any details about what Obama will say, but he has used business groups in the past to pressure Congress to avoid fiscal brinkmanship.¶ "We will never accept anything that delays or defunds" Obamacare, Carney stressed again on Thursday.¶ In the U.S. Capitol, the top four Republican and Democratic leaders of the Senate and House met in the office of House of Representative Speaker John Boehner on Thursday to try to plot out a happy ending to their government spending and debt limit challenges. Afterward, Boehner told reporters "there are a million options that are being discussed by a lot of people."¶ But while Republicans control the House, Boehner does not control Republicans.¶ HIGH-STAKES MANEUVER¶ The intra-party fight on such a high-stakes maneuver as coupling Obamacare changes to the debt limit hike is seen as pushing negotiations on the legislation right up to the October or November deadline.

#### Default collapses the economy – no resiliency

- citing Moody's economist Mark Zandi

**McAuliff 9/18**

Michael McAuliff covers Congress and politics for The Huffington Post, Debt Limit Showdown Could Be Catastrophic For Economy: Analysts, 9/18/13, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/09/18/debt-limit-showdown\_n\_3950890.html

Such a default would be devastating, Zandi warned.¶ "You need to raise the debt limit. There's no other option," he told lawmakers. "Otherwise, it's disastrous. It's counterproductive to your own goals because it's going to result in a recession, bigger deficits and raise the debt."¶ House Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) argued earlier on Wednesday that the debt limit is often used as a negotiating lever for politicians, and Rep. Sean Duffy (R-Wis.) made the same point during the hearing, asking why Democrats shouldn't be more willing to talk over Republican demands.¶ Much like Democrats who released their own report on the topic, Zandi noted, however, that in the last showdown over the debt ceiling two years ago, the U.S. government's credit rating was downgraded and the stock market tanked.¶ "You can only put the gun to your head so many times before someone's going to make a mistake and pull the trigger, and it's to everyone's detriment," Zandi told Duffy.¶ He gave a crushing summary of the potential impacts of a default.¶ "If you don't raise the debt limit in time, you will be opening an economic Pandora's box. It will be devastating to the economy," he predicted. "If you don't do it in time, confidence will evaporate, consumer confidence will sharply decline, [as well as] investor confidence, business confidence. Businesses will stop hiring, consumers will stop spending, the stock market will fall significantly in value, borrowing costs for businesses and households will rise."¶ "We'll be in the middle of a very, very severe recession, and I don't see how we get out of it," he added.

#### Debt ceiling collapses business and consumer confidence – crushes the economy

**Swagel 9/4**

Phillip, professor at the School of Public Policy at the University of Maryland and was assistant secretary for economic policy at the Treasury Department from 2006 to 2009, Fiscal Collisions Ahead, 9/4/13, http://economix.blogs.nytimes.com/2013/09/04/fiscal-collisions-ahead/?\_r=0

A failure to act would harm the economy. Not lifting the debt ceiling in particular would be expected to have catastrophic economic effects. Interest rates could skyrocket if investors question the full faith and credit of the United States government, leading to a credit crunch that pummels business and consumer spending. The calamity might be avoided if the Treasury Department makes payments to bondholders to avoid a default, but even with this contingency plan (which the Treasury shows no sign of putting into place), the spectacle of a government that cannot finance its routine operations would doubtless translate into a severe negative impact on private confidence and spending.

#### Collapses power projection – leads to nuclear war

**Harris and Burrows 9**

Mathew, PhD European History @ Cambridge, counselor in the National Intelligence Council (NIC) and Jennifer is a member of the NIC’s Long Range Analysis Unit “Revisiting the Future: Geopolitical Effects of the Financial Crisis” <http://www.ciaonet.org/journals/twq/v32i2/f_0016178_13952.pdf>

Increased Potential for Global Conflict

Of course, the report encompasses more than economics and indeed believes the future is likely to be the result of a number of intersecting and interlocking forces. With so many possible permutations of outcomes, each with ample Revisiting the Future opportunity for unintended consequences, there is a growing sense of insecurity. Even so, history may be more instructive than ever. While we continue to believe that the Great Depression is not likely to be repeated, the lessons to be drawn from that period include the harmful effects on fledgling democracies and multiethnic societies (think Central Europe in 1920s and 1930s) and on the sustainability of multilateral institutions (think League of Nations in the same period). There is no reason to think that this would not be true in the twenty-first as much as in the twentieth century. For that reason, the ways in which the potential for greater conflict could grow would seem to be even more apt in a constantly volatile economic environment as they would be if change would be steadier. In surveying those risks, the report stressed the likelihood that terrorism and nonproliferation will remain priorities even as resource issues move up on the international agenda. Terrorism’s appeal will decline if economic growth continues in the Middle East and youth unemployment is reduced. For those terrorist groups that remain active in 2025, however, the diffusion of technologies and scientific knowledge will place some of the world’s most dangerous capabilities within their reach. Terrorist groups in 2025 will likely be a combination of descendants of long established groups\_inheriting organizational structures, command and control processes, and training procedures necessary to conduct sophisticated attacks\_and newly emergent collections of the angry and disenfranchised that become self-radicalized, particularly in the absence of economic outlets that would become narrower in an economic downturn. The most dangerous casualty of any economically-induced drawdown of U.S. military presence would almost certainly be the Middle East. Although Iran’s acquisition of nuclear weapons is not inevitable, worries about a nuclear-armed Iran could lead states in the region to develop new security arrangements with external powers, acquire additional weapons, and consider pursuing their own nuclear ambitions. It is not clear that the type of stable deterrent relationship that existed between the great powers for most of the Cold War would emerge naturally in the Middle East with a nuclear Iran. Episodes of low intensity conflict and terrorism taking place under a nuclear umbrella could lead to an unintended escalation and broader conflict if clear red lines between those states involved are not well established. The close proximity of potential nuclear rivals combined with underdeveloped surveillance capabilities and mobile dual-capable Iranian missile systems also will produce inherent difficulties in achieving reliable indications and warning of an impending nuclear attack. The lack of strategic depth in neighboring states like Israel, short warning and missile flight times, and uncertainty of Iranian intentions may place more focus on preemption rather than defense, potentially leading to escalating crises.

#### Statistical studies go neg

**Royal 10**

Jedediah Royal, Director of Cooperative Threat Reduction at the U.S. Department of Defense, 2010, “Economic Integration, Economic Signaling and the Problem of Economic Crises,” in Economics of War and Peace: Economic, Legal and Political Perspectives, ed. Goldsmith and Brauer, p. 213-214

Less intuitive is how periods of economic decline may increase the likelihood of external conflict. Political science literature has contributed a moderate degree of attention to the impact of economic decline and the security and defence behaviour of interdependent states. Research in this vein has been considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow. First, on the systemic level, Pollins (2008) advances Modelski and Thompson's (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, finding that rhythms in the global economy are associated with the rise and fall of a pre-eminent power and the often bloody transition from one pre-eminent leader to the next. As such, exogenous shocks such as economic crises could usher in a redistribution of relative power (see also Gilpin. 1981) that leads to uncertainty about power balances, increasing the risk of miscalculation (Feaver, 1995). Alternatively, even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflict as a rising power may seek to challenge a declining power (Werner. 1999). Separately, Pollins (1996) also shows that global economic cycles combined with parallel leadership cycles impact the likelihood of conflict among major, medium and small powers, although he suggests that the causes and connections between global economic conditions and security conditions remain unknown. Second, on a dyadic level, Copeland's (1996, 2000) theory of trade expectations suggests that 'future expectation of trade' is a significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behaviour of states. He argues that interdependent states are likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations. However, if the expectations of future trade decline, particularly for difficult to replace items such as energy resources, the likelihood for conflict increases, as states will be inclined to use force to gain access to those resources. Crises could potentially be the trigger for decreased trade expectations either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states.4 Third, others have considered the link between economic decline and external armed conflict at a national level. Blomberg and Hess (2002) find a strong correlation between internal conflict and external conflict, particularly during periods of economic downturn. They write: The linkages between internal and external conflict and prosperity are strong and mutually reinforcing. Economic conflict tends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn returns the favour. Moreover, the presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which international and external conflicts self-reinforce each other. (Blomberg & Hess, 2002. p. 89) Economic decline has also been linked with an increase in the likelihood of terrorism (Blomberg, Hess, & Weerapana, 2004), which has the capacity to spill across borders and lead to external tensions. Furthermore, crises generally reduce the popularity of a sitting government. "Diversionary theory" suggests that, when facing unpopularity arising from economic decline, sitting governments have increased incentives to fabricate external military conflicts to create a 'rally around the flag' effect. Wang (1996), DeRouen (1995). and Blomberg, Hess, and Thacker (2006) find supporting evidence showing that economic decline and use of force are at least indirectly correlated. Gelpi (1997), Miller (1999), and Kisangani and Pickering (2009) suggest that the tendency towards diversionary tactics are greater for democratic states than autocratic states, due to the fact that democratic leaders are generally more susceptible to being removed from office due to lack of domestic support. DeRouen (2000) has provided evidence showing that periods of weak economic performance in the United States, and thus weak Presidential popularity, are statistically linked to an increase in the use of force. In summary, recent economic scholarship positively correlates economic integration with an increase in the frequency of economic crises, whereas political science scholarship links economic decline with external conflict at systemic, dyadic and national levels.5 This implied connection between integration, crises and armed conflict has not featured prominently in the economic-security debate and deserves more attention.

#### Even if Obama is weak, he’s comparatively stronger than the GOP

**Mardell 9/18**

Mark, North America Editor @ BBC, Obama presidency: Decline in the fall?, 9/18/13, http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-us-canada-24155464

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

#### PC high – multiple reasons

**Kornblum 9/11**

John, Former U.S. ambassador to Germany, Judy Asks: Is Obama a Lame-Duck President?, 9/11/13, http://carnegieeurope.eu/strategiceurope/?fa=52932&lang=en

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

#### Delegation shifts blame with no risk to solvency

**Almendares’ 12** (Nicholas Almendares – Professor of politics @ NYU, “Blame-Shifting, Judicial Review, and Public Welfare”, 2012) MaxL

Delegating authority to bureaucrats raises two principal concerns. The first is how to ensure that the bureaucrats use this authority to serve the best interests of the public. The second is how to prevent the legislature, namely Congress, from using delegation to promote its own interests to the detriment of the public’s. This latter phenomenon is referred to as blameshifting: rather than enacting an unpopular policy itself, Congress enacts a vague or broad delegation, shifting responsibility and blame onto the agency for the policy. On the conventional account, blame-shifting is thought to enable policies that make the public worse off, allowing for more special interest legislation that benefits a select group at the public’s expense, which has led to calls for a strengthened nondelegation doctrine to bar the sorts of delegations that make blame-shifting possible. I argue that the conventional account of blame-shifting is founded on inconsistent premises. For example, it has not adequately explained how it is that voters are able to punish legislators for passing statutes they dislike while being seemingly incapable of punishing delegations about which they feel the same. In its place, I propose a reconstructed account of delegation where such broad delegations of policymaking authority are part of a strategy that allows the public to take advantage of the agency’s expertise. While something resembling blame-shifting can occur within this reconstructed account, these broad delegations of authority overall make the public better off. Contrary to the conventional account, then, I find little reason to institute a stricter nondelegation doctrine. With this new account of delegation in mind, I then consider the potential benefits of judicial review of agency policy. In particular, I find that hard look review, where the courts evaluate the merits of the agency’s policy, makes the public better off only under demanding conditions that are unlikely to be met. In some cases, it can make the public worse off especially when the legislature delegates broad, relatively unconstrained authority to the agency. This conclusion is somewhat counterintuitive, as we might expect judicial review of agency policymaking to be most important in cases of broad delegation, and a result of the limited technical information available to the court

#### And, here’s proof of distinction between the CP and the Plan.

**Schoenbrod 93**, David- Professor of Law, New York Law School, Adjunct Scholar, Cato Institute, Former Staff Attorney and Co-director, Project on Urban Transportation, Natural Resources Defense Council, Former Director of Program Development, Bedford Stuyvesant Restoration Corporation, Former Staff Attorney, Association of the Bar, City of New York Committee on Electric Power and the Environment, Former Professor, Yale Law School, and Member, American Tree Farmers’ Association, (Power Without Responsibility) p. 9-10

Understanding how such pervasive consequences flow from a seemingly technical change in the lawmaking process requires defining the fine but fundamental difference between a statute that makes law and one that delegates. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, a law is "a rule of conduct imposed by authority"; therefore, a statute makes law when it states a rule of conduct. For example, a statute that prohibits power plants from emitting pollution above a certain rate or that prohibits orange growers from shipping more than a certain pro-portion of their crop makes law, because the statute itself defines what conduct is illegal. In contrast, a statute delegates when it empowers an agency to state the rules governing such emissions or shipments, even if the statute instructs the agency in some detail about what goals to achieve or what procedures to follow in making the rules. Even though all statutory laws require some interpretation, statutes that state laws differ in a critical way from statutes that delegate. In making laws, Congress has to allocate both rights and duties in the very course of stating what conduct it prohibits, and so must make manifest the benefits and costs of regulation.

#### The means all parts

**Merriam-Websters, 8** [Online Collegiate Dictionary, http://www.m-w.com/cgi-bin/dictionary]

4 -- used as a function word before a noun or a substantivized adjective to indicate reference to a group as a whole <the elite>

#### “Federal Government” is all three branches

**Truman Library, No Date** (Harry S. Truman: Library and Museum- One of thirteen presidential libraries, “Three Branches of Government”, <http://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/teacher_lessons/3branches/1.htm>) MaxL

Our federal government has three parts. They are the Executive, (President and about 5,000,000 workers) Legislative (Senate and House of Representatives) and Judicial (Supreme Court and lower Courts).
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