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**Debt ceiling will pass – Obama political strength and Dem unity means the GOP will cave**

**Bolton, 9/14/13** (Alexander, The Hill, “Confident Democrats want separate showdowns on shutdown and debt limit” Read more: http://thehill.com/homenews/senate/322247-confident-democrats-want-separate-showdowns-on-shutdown-and-debt-limit#ixzz2g92IX3s7

Democrats, however, want to force the GOP to debate these issues successively.

“We’re not negotiating on the debt ceiling. We think we have the high ground in both of those fights,” said a senior Senate Democratic aide.

The Senate Democratic strategy over the next several weeks will be to stand pat and refuse to make any significant concessions in exchange for funding the government or raising the debt ceiling.

“If push comes to shove on debt ceiling, I’m virtually certain **they’ll blink**,” said Sen. Charles Schumer (N.Y.), the third-ranking member of the Senate Democratic leadership. “They know they shouldn’t be playing havoc with the markets.”

Schumer said Republicans are on stronger political ground if there’s a government shutdown, but warned “even on that one, they’re on weak ground because the public sort of is finally smelling that these guys are for obstructing.”

**Increasing economic engagement splits Congressional Democrats and consumes political capital**

**Magnus, ‘9**

John R. Magnus, trade lawyer in Washington, DC, is President of TradeWins LLC and Of Counsel

at Miller & Chevalier Chartered, ‘9

3. Votes: Will the new government allow any major trade-liberalizing items to come to a vote in the first two years? Conventional wisdom holds that trade votes are **bad for the Democratic party -- they split the caucus, demoralize stakeholders, and generally spell trouble for the party’s political majority.** Many regard allowing trade initiatives to reach the front of the legislative queue as a **blunder** of the early Clinton administration. A precious period of unified government was **squandered** when it could, the argument goes, have been **used to enact important Democratic priorities**. And then it might have lasted longer -- the 1994 Republican takeover could have been averted! Although questionable in several particulars, this narrative is present in the minds of many Democrats in and out of government today, and they are determined to manage the new period of unified government differently. There will be a strong temptation to **use President Obama’s political capital** exclusively for initiatives favored by a strong majority of Democrats, to keep trade-liberalizing measures (and related items like Trade Promotion Authority) **off the voting agenda** for months or even years, and to limit any congressional trade votes to matters like adjustment assistance and enforcement. But, of course, foreign policy concerns, and business community desires, will pull in the opposite direction.

**It disrupts Obama’s attempt to prioritize the debt ceiling by consuming political capital**

**Frumin, 9/21/13 –** reporter for MSNBC (Aliyah, “Bright prospects on foreign agenda; domestic in chaos” <http://tv.msnbc.com/2013/09/21/bright-prospects-for-obama-on-foreign-agenda-domestic-in-chaos/>)

Conservative strategist Keith Appell said having a full plate is just part of being president and his legacy is at risk because his number one priority of improving the economy has not been significantly addressed.

Fixing the economy, he said, could arguable be pegged to **how much political capital** he has on the issues Obama is currently facing (Syria, Iran, **debt ceiling**, gun control). “But certainly, if you’re talking about legacy, unless there is an overwhelming foreign policy situation like the Cold War, then it’s all about the economy.”

But Jeanne Zaino, a professor of political science at Iona College and of political campaign management at New York University said “Every time Obama tries to refocus on the economy, there’s these enormous crises that break out. You can just imagine how frustrating that can be and how it’s been difficult for him to prioritize.”

“It’s not only the amount he has on his plate. It’s that he doesn’t’ have the ability to get anything done without Congress,” she added.

**That takes Obama off-message – it undermines his strategy of constant pressure on the GOP and makes a deal impossible**

**Milbank, 9/27/13** – Washington Post Opinion Writer (Dana, “Obama should pivot to Dubya’s playbook” Washington Post, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/dana-milbank-obama-should-try-pivoting-to-george-bushs-playbook/2013/09/27/c72469f0-278a-11e3-ad0d-b7c8d2a594b9_story.html>)

If President Obama can stick to his guns, **he will win** his October standoff with Republicans.

That’s an awfully big “if.”

This president has been consistently inconsistent, predictably unpredictable and reliably erratic. Consider the events of Thursday morning:

Obama gave a rousing speech in suburban Washington, in defense of Obamacare, on the eve of its implementation. “We’re now only five days away from finishing the job,” he told the crowd.

But before he had even left the room, his administration let slip that it was delaying by a month the sign-up for the health-care exchanges for small businesses. It wasn’t a huge deal, but it was enough to trample on the message the president had just delivered.

Throughout his presidency, Obama has had great difficulty delivering a consistent message. Supporters plead for him to take a position — any position — and stick with it. His shifting policy on confronting Syria was the most prominent of his vacillations, but his allies have seen a similar approach to the Guantanamo Bay prison, counterterrorism and climate change. Even on issues such as gun control and immigration where his views have been consistent, Obama has been inconsistent in promoting his message. Allies are reluctant to take risky stands, because they fear that Obama will change his mind and leave them standing alone.

Now come the budget showdowns, which could define the rest of his presidency. Republican leaders are trying to shift the party’s emphasis from the fight over a government shutdown to the fight over the debt-limit increase, where they have more support. A new Bloomberg poll found that Americans, by a 2-to-1 margin, disagree with Obama’s view that Congress should raise the debt limit without any conditions.

**But Obama has a path to victory**. That poll also found that Americans think lawmakers should stop trying to repeal Obamacare. And that was before House Republicans dramatically overplayed their hand by suggesting that they’ll allow the nation to default if Obama doesn’t agree to their laundry list of demands, including suspending Obamacare, repealing banking reforms, building a new oil pipeline, easing environmental regulations, limiting malpractice lawsuits and restricting access to Medicare.

To beat the Republicans, Obama might follow the example of a Republican, George W. Bush. Whatever you think of what he did, he knew how to get it done: by simplifying his message and repeating it, ad nauseam, until he got the result he was after.

Obama instead tends to give a speech and move along to the next topic. This is why he is forever making “pivots” back to the economy, or to health care. But the way to pressure Congress is to be **President One Note.**

In the debt-limit fight, Obama already has his note: He will not negotiate over the full faith and credit of the United States. That’s as good a theme as any; it matters less what the message is than that he **delivers it consistently.**

The idea, White House officials explained to me, is to avoid getting into a back-and-forth over taxes, spending and entitlement programs. “We’re right on the merits, but I don’t think we want to argue on the merits,” one said. “Our argument is not that our argument is better than theirs; it’s that theirs is stupid.”

This is a clean message: Republicans are threatening to tank the economy — through a shutdown or, more likely, through a default on the debt — and Obama isn’t going to negotiate with these hostage-takers.

Happily for Obama, Republicans are helping him to make the case by being publicly belligerent. After this week’s 21-hour speech on the Senate floor by Sen. Ted Cruz (R-Tex.), the publicity-seeking Texan and Sen. Mike Lee (R-Utah) objected to a bipartisan request to move a vote from Friday to Thursday to give House Republicans more time to craft legislation avoiding a shutdown. On the Senate floor, Sen. Bob Corker (R-Tenn.) accused them of objecting because they had sent out e-mails encouraging their supporters to tune in to the vote on Friday. The Post’s Ed O’Keefe caught Cruz “appearing to snicker” as his colleague spoke — more smug teenager than legislator.

Even if his opponents are making things easier for him, Obama still needs to stick to his message. As in Syria, the president has drawn a “red line” by saying he won’t negotiate with those who would put the United States into default. If he retreats, he will **embolden his opponents and demoralize his supporters**.

**Default will destroy the U.S. and global economy**

**Davidson, 9/10/13** – co-founder of NPR’s Planet Money (Adam, “Our Debt to Society” New York Times, <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.

**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”, 10-28, <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.
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#### The plan’s neoliberal policies is the root cause of economic crisis and guarantees inevitable systems collapse

**Palley 10 –** PhD in economics from Yale (Thomas, MA in IR from Yale, and a BA from Oxford, “AMERICA’S EXHAUSTED PARADIGM: MACROECONOMIC CAUSES OF THE FINANCIAL CRISIS AND GREAT RECESSION”, New School Economic Review, Volume 4(1), 2010: 15-43, ZBurdette)

This paper traces the **roots** of the current financial crisis to a **faulty U.S. macroeconomic paradigm**. One flaw in this paradigm was the neoliberal growth model adopted after 1980 that relied on debt and asset price inflation to drive demand in place of wage growth. A second flaw was the model of U.S. engagement with the global economy that created a **triple economic hemorrhage of spending on imports, manufacturing job losses, and off-shoring of investment.** Financial deregulation and financial excess are important parts of the story, but they are not the ultimate cause of the crisis. These developments contributed significantly to the housing bubble but they were a **necessary** part of the neoliberal model, their function being to fuel demand growth by making ever larger amounts of credit easily available. As **the neoliberal model slowly cannibalized itself** by undermining income distribution and accumulating debt, the economy needed larger speculative bubbles to grow. **The flawed model of global engagement accelerated the cannibalization process**, thereby creating need for a huge bubble that only housing could provide. However, when that bubble burst it pulled down the entire economy because of the bubble’s massive dependence on debt. The old postWorld War II growth model based on rising middle-class incomes has been dismantled, while the new neoliberal growth model has imploded. The United States needs a new economic paradigm and a new growth model, but as yet this challenge has received little attention from policymakers or economists.

#### Neoliberal engagement of Latin America results in loss of value to life, political oppression, military intervention, and environmental destruction – makes extinction inevitable

**Makwana 06 –** (Rajesh, STWR, 23rd November 06, <http://www.stwr.org/globalization/neoliberalism-and-economic-globalization.html>, ZBurdette)

Neoliberalism and Economic Globalization

The goal of neoliberal economic globalization is the removal of all barriers to commerce, and the privatization of all available resources and services. In this scenario, public life will be at the mercy of market forces, as the extracted profits benefit the few, writes Rajesh Makwana.

The thrust of international policy behind the phenomenon of economic globalization is neoliberal in nature. Being hugely profitable to corporations and the wealthy elite, neoliberal polices are propagated through the IMF, World Bank and WTO. Neoliberalism favours the free-market as the most efficient method of global resource allocation. Consequently it favours large-scale, corporate commerce and the privatization of resources.

There has been much international attention recently on neoliberalism. Its ideologies have been rejected by influential countries in Latin America and its moral basis is now widely questioned. Recent protests against the WTO, IMF and World Bank were essentially protests against the neoliberal policies that these organizations implement, particularly in low-income countries.

The neoliberal experiment has **failed to combat extreme poverty**, has **exacerbated global inequality**, and is hampering international aid and development efforts. This article presents an overview of neoliberalism and its effect on low income countries.

Introduction

After the Second World War, corporate enterprises helped to create a wealthy class in society which enjoyed excessive political influence on their government in the US and Europe. Neoliberalism surfaced as a reaction by these wealthy elites to counteract post-war policies that favoured the working class and strengthened the welfare state.

Neoliberal policies advocate market forces and commercial activity as the most efficient methods for producing and supplying goods and services. At the same time they shun the role of the state and discourage government intervention into economic, financial and even social affairs. The process of economic globalization is driven by this ideology; removing borders and barriers between nations so that market forces can drive the global economy. The policies were readily taken up by governments and still continue to pervade classical economic thought, allowing corporations and affluent countries to secure their financial advantage within the world economy.

The policies were most ardently enforced in the US and Europe in the1980s during the Regan–Thatcher–Kohl era. These leaders believed that expanding the free-market and private ownership would create greater economic efficiency and social well-being. The resulting deregulation, privatization and the removal of border restrictions provided fertile ground for corporate activity, and over the next 25 years corporations grew rapidly in size and influence. Corporations are now the most productive economic units in the world, more so than most countries. With their huge financial, economic and political leverage, they continue to further their neoliberal objectives.

There is a **consensus between the financial elite, neoclassical economists and the political classes** in most countries that neoliberal policies will create global prosperity. So entrenched is their position that this view determines the policies of the international agencies (IMF, World Bank and WTO), and through them dictates the functioning of the global economy. Despite reservations from within many UN agencies, neoliberal policies are accepted by most development agencies as the most likely means of reducing poverty and inequality in the poorest regions.

There is a **huge discrepancy** between the measurable result of economic globalization and its proposed benefits. Neoliberal policies have unarguably generated massive wealth for some people, but most crucially, they have been unable to benefit those living in extreme poverty who are most in need of financial aid. Excluding China, annual economic growth in developing countries between 1960 and 1980 was 3.2%. This dropped drastically between 1980 and 2000 to a mere 0.7 %. This second period is when neoliberalism was most prevalent in global economic policy. (Interestingly, China was not following the neoliberal model during these periods, and its economic growth per capita grew to over 8% between 1980 and 2000.)

Neoliberalism has also been unable to address growing levels of global inequality. Over the last 25 years, the income inequalities have increased dramatically, both within and between countries. Between 1980 and 1998, the income of richest 10% as share of poorest 10% became 19% more unequal; and the income of richest 1% as share of poorest 1% became 77% more unequal (again, not including China).

The shortcomings of neoliberal policy are also apparent in the well documented economic disasters suffered by countries in Latin America and South Asia in the 1990s. These countries were left with no choice but to follow the neoliberal model of privatization and deregulation, due to their financial problems and pressure from the IMF. Countries such as Venezuela, Cuba, Argentina and Bolivia have since rejected foreign corporate control and the advice of the IMF and World Bank. Instead they have favoured a redistribution of wealth, the re-nationalization of industry and have prioritized the provision of healthcare and education. They are also sharing resources such as oil and medical expertise throughout the region and with other countries around the world.

The dramatic economic and social improvement seen in these countries has not stopped them from being demonized by the US. Cuba is a well known example of this propaganda. Deemed to be a danger to ‘freedom and the American way of life’, Cuba has been subject to intense US political, economic and military pressure in order to tow the neoliberal line. Washington and the mainstream media in the US have recently embarked on a similar propaganda exercise aimed at Venezuela’s president Chavez. This over-reaction by Washington to ‘economic nationalism’ is consistent with their foreign policy objectives which have not changed significantly for the past 150 years. Securing resources and economic dominance has been and continues to be the USA’s main economic objective.

According to Maria Páez Victor:

“Since 1846 the United States has carried out **no fewer than 50 military invasions** and destabilizing operations involving 12 different Latin American countries. Yet, none of these countries has ever had the capacity to threaten US security in any significant way. The US intervened because of **perceived threats to its economic control** and expansion. For this reason it has also supported some of the region’s most vicious dictators such as Batista, Somoza, Trujillo, and Pinochet.”

As a result of corporate and US influence, the key international bodies that developing countries are forced to turn to for assistance, such as the World Bank and IMF, are major exponents of the neoliberal agenda. The WTO openly asserts its intention to improve global business opportunities; the IMF is heavily influenced by the Wall Street and private financiers, and the World Bank ensures corporations benefit from development project contracts. They all gain considerably from the neo-liberal model.

So influential are corporations at this time that many of the worst violators of human rights have even entered a Global Compact with the United Nations, the world’s foremost humanitarian body. Due to this international convergence of economic ideology, it is no coincidence that the assumptions that are key to increasing corporate welfare and growth are the same assumptions that form the thrust of mainstream global economic policy.

However, there are huge differences between the neoliberal dogma that the US and EU dictate to the world and the policies that they themselves adopt. Whilst fiercely advocating the removal of barriers to trade, investment and employment, The US economy remains one of the most protected in the world. Industrialized nations only reached their state of economic development by fiercely protecting their industries from foreign markets and investment. For economic growth to benefit developing countries, the international community must be allowed to nurture their infant industries. Instead economically dominant countries are ‘kicking away the ladder’ to achieving development by imposing an ideology that suits their own economic needs.

The US and EU also provide huge subsidies to many sectors of industry. These devastate small industries in developing countries, particularly farmers who cannot compete with the price of subsidized goods in international markets. Despite their neoliberal rhetoric, most ‘capitalist’ countries have increased their levels of state intervention over the past 25 years, and the size of their government has increased. The requirement is to ‘do as I say, not as I do’.

Given the tiny proportion of individuals that benefit from neoliberal policies, **the chasm between what is good for the economy and what serves the public good is growing fast**. Decisions to follow these policies are out of the hands of the public, and the national sovereignty of many developing countries continues to be violated, preventing them from prioritizing urgent national needs.

Below we examine the false assumptions of neoliberal policies and their effect on the global economy.

Economic Growth

Economic growth, as measured in GDP, is the yardstick of economic globalization which is fiercely pursued by multinationals and countries alike. It is the commercial activity of the tiny portion of multinational corporations that drives economic growth in industrialized nations. Two hundred corporations account for a third of global economic growth. Corporate trade currently accounts for over 50% of global economic growth and as much as 75% of GDP in the EU. The proportion of trade to GDP continues to grow, highlighting the belief that economic growth is the only way to prosper a country and reduce poverty.

Logically, however, a model for continual financial growth is unsustainable. Corporations have to go to extraordinary lengths in order to reflect endless growth in their accounting books. As a result, finite resources are wasted and the environment is dangerously neglected. The equivalent of two football fields of natural forest is cleared each second by profit hungry corporations.

Economic growth is also used by the World Bank and government economists to measure progress in developing countries. But, whilst economic growth clearly does have benefits, the evidence strongly suggests that these benefits do not trickle down to the 986 million people living in extreme poverty, representing 18 percent of the world population (World Bank, 2007). Nor has economic growth addressed inequality and income distribution. In addition, accurate assessments of both poverty levels and the overall benefits of economic growth have proved impossible due to the inadequacy of the statistical measures employed.

The mandate for economic growth is the perfect platform for corporations which, as a result, have grown rapidly in their economic activity, profitability and political influence. Yet this very model is also the cause of the growing inequalities seen across the globe. The privatization of resources and profits by the few at the expense of the many, and the inability of the poorest people to afford market prices, are both likely causes.

Free Trade

Free trade is the foremost demand of neoliberal globalization. In its current form, it simply translates as greater access to emerging markets for corporations and their host nations. These demands are contrary to the original assumptions of free trade as affluent countries adopt and maintain protectionist measures. Protectionism allows a nation to strengthen its industries by levying taxes and quotas on imports, thus increasing their own industrial capacity, output and revenue. Subsidies in the US and EU allow corporations to keep their prices low, effectively pushing smaller producers in developing countries out of the market and impeding development.

With this self interest driving globalization, economically powerful nations have created a global trading regime with which they can determine the terms of trade.

The North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) between the US, Canada, and Mexico is an example of free-market fundamentalism that gives corporations legal rights at the expense of national sovereignty. Since its implementation it has caused job loss, undermined labour rights, privatized essential services, **increased inequality** and **caused environmental destruction**.

In Europe only 5% of EU citizens work in agriculture, generating just 1.6% of EU GDP compared to more than 50% of citizens in developing countries. However, the European Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) provides subsidies to EU farmers to the tune of £30 billion, 80% of which goes to only 20% of farmers to guarantee their viability, however inefficient this may be.

The General Agreement on Trade and Services (GATS) was agreed at the World Trade Organization (WTO) in 1994. Its aim is to remove any restrictions and internal government regulations that are considered to be "barriers to trade". The agreement effectively abolishes a government’s sovereign right to regulate subsidies and provide essential national services on behalf of its citizens. The Trade Related agreement on International Property Rights (TRIPS) forces developing countries to extend property rights to seeds and plant varieties. Control over these resources and services are instead granted to corporate interests through the GATS and TRIPS framework.

These examples represent modern free trade which is clearly **biased** in its approach. It fosters corporate globalization at the expense of local economies, the environment, democracy and human rights. The primary beneficiaries of international trade are large, multinational corporations who fiercely lobby at all levels of national and global governance to further the free trade agenda.

Liberalization

The World Bank, IMF and WTO have been the main portals for implementing the neoliberal agenda on a global scale. Unlike the United Nations, these institutions are over-funded, continuously lobbied by corporations, and are politically and financially dominated by Washington, Wall Street, corporations and their agencies. As a result, the key governance structures of the global economy have been primed to serve the interests of this group, and market liberalization has been another of their key policies.

According to neoliberal ideology, in order for international trade to be ‘free’ all markets should be open to competition, and market forces should determine economic relationships. But the overall result of a completely open and free market is of course market dominance by corporate heavy-weights. The playing field is not even; all developing countries are at a great financial and economic disadvantage and simply cannot compete.

Liberalization, through Structural Adjustment Programs, forces poorer countries to open their markets to foreign products which largely **destroys local industries**. It **creates dependency upon commodities which have artificially low prices** as they are heavily subsidized by economically dominant nations. Financial liberalization removes barriers to currency speculation from abroad. The resulting rapid inflow and outflow of currencies is often responsible for acute financial and **economic crisis** in many developing countries. At the same time, foreign speculators and large financial firms make huge gains. Market liberalization poses a clear economic risk; hence the EU and US heavily protect their own markets.

A liberalized global market provides corporations with new resources to capitalize and new markets to exploit. Neoliberal dominance over global governance structures has enforced access to these markets. Under WTO agreements, a sovereign country cannot interfere with a corporation’s intentions to trade even if their operations go against domestic environmental and employment guidelines. Those governments that do stand up for their sovereign rights are frequently sued by corporations for loss of profit, and even loss of potential profit. Without this pressure they would have been able to stimulate domestic industry and self sufficiency, thereby reducing poverty. They would then be in a better position to compete in international markets.

#### Reject the AFF as a means to create space for alternatives to neoliberal engagement

**Munck 03 –** professor of Globalization and Social Exclusion(Ronaldo, Department of Sociology, Social Policy & Social Work Studies and Globalisation and Social Exclusion Unit, University of Liverpool, “Neoliberalism, necessitarianism and alternatives in Latin America: there is no alternative (TINA)?”, Third World Quarterly, Vol 24, No 3, pp 495–511, 2003, [http://www-e.uni-magdeburg.de/evans/Journal%20Library/Trade%20and%20Countries/Neoliberalism,%20necessitarianism%20and%20alternatives%20in%20Latin%20America.pdf](http://www-e.uni-magdeburg.de/evans/Journal%20Library/Trade%20and%20Countries/Neoliberalism%2C%20necessitarianism%20and%20alternatives%20in%20Latin%20America.pdf), ZBurdette)

Taking as its point of departure the position that **there are or must be alternatives to neoliberalism**, this article explores the issue in relation to some examples from Latin America. The 2001–02 virtual collapse of the economy of Argentina and the recent victory of Workers Party candidate, Lula, in Brazil highlight, in very different ways, the **need for a viable alternative democratic economic strategy for Latin America**. Many progressive analysts seem to be paralysed by a false ‘necessitarianism’ which grants more coherence and solidity to the neoliberal project than it merits. Argentina puts paid to that illusion. Will the exciting experience of Porto Alegre’s ‘participatory budget’ in Brazil now be scaled up to the national level or does ‘globalisation’ block this option? Do the old questions of imperialism and dependency now come to the fore again after being left dormant under the spell of globalisation? We may not have all the answers yet but Latin America is back in the foreground of thinking and practice around alternative economic theories.

**There is no alternative** (TINA) was an oft-repeated expression of Margaret Thatcher’s, **used to dismiss any plausible alternatives** to her brand of hard-nosed neoliberalism. One imagines that her friend General Pinochet, with whom she shared tea during his enforced stay in London, would agree with her. What is more surprising is the influence the TINA philosophy has had on social science analysis of neoliberalism in Latin America since Pinochet. What I propose is a radically anti-necessitarian approach to neoliberalism, inspired by the work of Roberto Mangabeira Unger. Things are not always how they are because they have to be so. **There is life beyond neoliberalism.** There are alternatives taking shape all the time at all levels of society in Latin America. The so-called Washington Consensus is no longer so consensual even in Washington and there is growing recognition that globalisation requires global governance. We therefore need to return to the rise of neoliberalism and globalisation in a nonnecessitarian spirit and examine the whole horizon of possibilities that is now opening up in Latin America as elsewhere. If the virtual collapse of Argentina in 2001–02 shows that ‘actually existing’ neoliberalism simply **does not work even on its own terms**, the exciting but also challenging prospects now opening up in Brazil under Lula underline the urgency of developing a credible and viable alternative to its policies.
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**Economic engagement is** long-term strategy **for promoting** structural linkage **between two economies – the plan is neither.**

**Mastanduno, 1** – professor of Government at Dartmouth College (Michael, “Economic Engagement Strategies: Theory and Practice” [http://web.archive.org/web/20120906033646/http://polisci.osu.edu/faculty/bpollins/book/Mastanduno.pdf](http://web.archive.org/web/20120906033646/http%3A//polisci.osu.edu/faculty/bpollins/book/Mastanduno.pdf)

The basic causal logic of economic engagement, and the emphasis on domestic politics, can be traced to Hirschman. He viewed economic engagement as a **long-term, transformative strategy**. As one state gradually expands economic interaction with its target, the resulting (asymmetrical) interdependence creates vested interests within the target society and government. The beneficiaries of interdependence become addicted to it, and they protect their interests by pressuring the government to accommodate the source of interdependence. **Economic engagement is a form of structural linkage**; it is a means to get other states to *want* what you want, rather than to *do* what you want. The causal chain runs from economic interdependence through domestic political change to foreign policy accommodation.

**That’s a voter for limits – broad interpretations of engagement include anything that effects the economy, which means everything**

**And, Good is not good enough – precise definition outweighs –** don’t allow **new** 1AR **answers to this card.**

**Resnick 01** – Dr. Evan Resnick, Ph.D. in Political Science from Columbia University, Assistant Professor of Political Science at Yeshiva University, “Defining Engagement”, Journal of International Affairs, Spring, 54(2), Ebsco

CONCLUSION

In matters of national security, establishing a clear definition of terms is a **precondition for effective policymaking**. Decisionmakers who invoke critical terms in an **erratic, ad hoc fashion** risk alienating their constituencies. They also risk exacerbating misperceptions and hostility among those the policies target. Scholars who commit the same error **undercut their ability to conduct valuable empirical research**. Hence, if scholars and policymakers fail rigorously to define "engagement," they **undermine the ability to build an effective foreign policy**.
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**Text: The United States federal government should ratify the Transboundary Hydrocarbons Agreement. The United States federal government should fund construction of passive solar homes through the BECC if and** only **if the net revenues Mexico receives from the THA are used to finance the Mexican Development Fund.**

**CP solves the case and is key to democracy, US oil independence, and Mexico’s economy.**

**Alberro 05,** José Luis, an arbitrator at the World Bank's International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID) and the American Arbitration Association, April 2005, “A US-Mexico Partnership in Energy: A Policy Of Convenience,” Web Document)//DR. H

Four years have come and gone in the Mexico-US relationship since the almost simultaneous inaugurations of Presidents Bush and Fox. The optimism bred by their first auspicious meetings has given way to aloofness and/or irritation in the post 9/11 era. Indeed, for some in the United States, Porfirio Díaz’s dictum should be turned on its head to state “poor United States, so far away from God and so close to Mexico.” The fact remains that geography is destiny. Moreover, in the post-9/11, post-PRI environment, Mexico and the United States have complementary needs that could become the foundation of a policy of convenience and be the basis for a commitment to further strengthen their long-term economic ties.

President Bush recently stated that his second administration will “pursue more energy … in our own hemisphere so that we're less dependent on energy from unstable parts of the world." Mexico has the largest conventional crude oil proved reserves in North America.

Two thirds into the Fox administration, it is clearer than ever that per capita GDP will not grow lastingly because structural changes have not been implemented. Stagnation translates into weak job creation and migration to the United States. Turning the Mexican economy around will require considerable will and political imagination to carry out profound institutional reforms, but it also calls for debottlenecking physical infrastructure, as well as human capital and technological development. Such expensive investments are a prerequisite for job creation and poverty alleviation and will not be carried out by the private sector on its own: the Mexican government needs to take the lead, while eliminating the obstacles to private investment. Given Mexico’s weak public revenues, financing such projects can only come from leveraging Mexico’s large hydrocarbon resource base.

Mexico and the United States can help each other while pursuing their own interests: a quid pro quo in which the United States helps finance the development of Mexico’s hydrocarbons reserves so that it can double its exports, has the dual effect of decreasing the United States’ dependence on Middle East oil and provide Mexico with additional revenues to fuel a productivity-based growth strategy. Faster economic growth could lead to job creation, poverty alleviation, slowing down undocumented migration, strengthening the middle class and consolidating democracy.

Once before, the United States and Mexico’s complementary needs led to a marriage of convenience. By late 1994, Mexico found itself with more short-term debt coming due than it could repay and a currency it could not defend given that reserves were insufficient. The specter of a debt default similar to the one that had happened 22 years earlier became a concern for the Clinton administration. The “Tequila Crisis” could have spread to US financial markets, weakened as they were by the doubling of interest rates over the previous year. Self-interest created an opportunity for both countries to cooperate.

Along with international financial institutions, the Clinton administration assembled a rescue package backed by oil revenues worth 50 billions dollars that bolstered Mexican solvency. The Mexican government had to accept supervision of the disbursements and had to commit to make prudent use of the resources before it could use them. Mexico’s access to financial markets was reestablished preventing further blows to tight markets, all loans were repaid and both countries came out ahead.

A decade later, a new opportunity has emerged. Again, it entails having the US government play a key role in assembling a financing package backed by oil revenues. But, in this case, the resources would be used not for conjunctural purposes but to transform the very structure of the Mexican economy: invest in oil production to generate additional revenues to invest in a productivity based growth strategy that will benefit both countries. As before, the disbursement of those funds would have to be contingent on accepting supervision and a commitment to make prudent use of them.

**Democracy is key to solve nuclear war and extinction**

Larry Diamond, Hoover Institution Senior Fellow, 95

[Stanford Univ. Political Science and Sociology professor, former Baghdad CPA senior adviser,

"Promoting Democracy in the 1990s," <http://wwics.si.edu/subsites/ccpdc/pubs/di/fr.htm>]

This hardly exhausts the lists of threats to our security and well-being in the coming years and decades. In the former Yugoslavia nationalist aggression tears at the stability of Europe and could easily spread. The flow of illegal drugs intensifies through increasingly powerful international crime syndicates that have made common cause with authoritarian regimes and have utterly corrupted the institutions of tenuous, democratic ones. Nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons continue to proliferate. The very source of life on Earth, the global ecosystem, appears increasingly endangered. Most of these new and unconventional threats to security are associated with or aggravated by the weakness or absence of democracy, with its provisions for legality, accountability, popular sovereignty, and openness. The experience of this century offers important lessons. Countries that govern themselves in a truly democratic fashion do not go to war with one another. They do not aggress against their neighbors to aggrandize themselves or glorify their leaders. Democratic governments do not ethnically "cleanse" their own populations, and they are much less likely to face ethnic insurgency. Democracies do not sponsor terrorism against one another. They do not build weapons of mass destruction to use on or to threaten one another. Democratic countries form more reliable, open, and enduring trading partnerships. In the long run they offer better and more stable climates for investment. They are more environmentally responsible because they must answer to their own citizens, who organize to protest the destruction of their environments. They are better bets to honor international treaties since they value legal obligations and because their openness makes it much more difficult to breach agreements in secret. Precisely because, within their own borders, they respect competition, civil liberties, property rights, and the rule of law, democracies are the only reliable foundation on which a new world order of international security and prosperity can be built.
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#### Grid upgrades now, but pacing is key

**POWERGRID International, 12/17/12** – from the editors based on an interview with Andre Begosso, managing director in the Accenture management consulting practice and is focused on the resources operating group. He has more than seventeen years of experience in the utility and energy industries and advises clients in the alternative energy, power generation and oil and gas sectors (“2013 trends for the power industry” December, <http://www.elp.com/blogs/eye-on-the-grid/2012/12/2013-trends-for-the-power-industry.html>)

In the absence of some major advance in energy storage, Andre said, he expects that renewable energy installation will probably start to slow as its shortcomings become more apparent to utilities and power companies.¶ "I would not expect these trends to continue because of the tremendous limitation that renewable technologies have. You cannot break the laws of physics or the laws of chemistry. The wind doesn't blow all the time and it never will, and the sun doesn't always shine and it never will," he said.¶ Trend No. 4: Energy back on the agenda¶ In my last blog post , I speculated about what it might take to get energy policy back on the agenda. When I asked about this, Andre said energy already is back on the agenda.¶ "Over the next 3 years, over $220 billion in new infrastructure will be built. But the problem with infrastructure is Rome wasn't built in a day. It takes time," he said.¶ This new wave of infrastructure upgrades will require a level of patience and understanding on the part of ratepayers that Andre wonders whether the average person is capable of. During Hurricane Sandy, for example, Con Edison had one of the most sophisticated electric grids available — yet it still failed, and people wonder why.

#### Decentralized solar causes overproduction and trades off with grid stability

**Jansson and Michelfelder, 8** - \*Associate Professor at Rowan University in the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering AND \*\*assistant professor of finance at Rutgers University's School of Business (Peter and Richard, “Integrating Renewables into the U.S. Grid: Is It Sustainable?,” The Electricity Journal, July, science direct)

From utility economic and practical engineering perspectives, we have reached an impasse. Electric utilities are motivated by investors to provide real and growing returns on their capital investments and by state and national regulators to provide reliable electric power at the lowest costs to their consumers. Market-driven, independent power producers (IPPs) are motivated to develop projects that maximize shareholder value and minimize other investments that do not provide direct returns to their project investors. In today’s market-driven paradigm investing in major transmission facilities to increase reliability and new renewable generation technologies to achieve environmental responsibility goals will not provide high short-term ﬁnancial performance for any of the major players. Also, since the utilities can no longer control where customers may site new generation sources, new capacity additions (in either generation or transmission) will not necessarily increase grid reliability. Present evidence suggests that U.S. grid reliability in the early 21st century may actually be degrading (Anderson and Boulanger, 2004; NERC, 2004) with the areas most affected by massive outages being those states that have most aggressively embraced industry restructuring (Jansson and Michelfelder, 2005). As we move to more decentralized, market-driven, power generation systems based upon intermittent renewable energy sources the strain on existing utility infrastructure will mount unless wise public policy direction is provided.

#### Overloads the entire grid

**Rutgers News 8** (“Sustainable Energy Must Be Integrated Into Existing Power Grid, Says Rutgers–Camden Finance Scholar,” 11/18, <http://news.rutgers.edu/medrel/news-releases/2008/11/sustainable-energy-m-20081118/>)

CAMDEN -- Engineers and entrepreneurs are rushing to explore alternative sources of efficient and renewable energy in New Jersey and elsewhere in the country. A Rutgers School of Business—Camden professor has strong words of caution as projects involving wind farms and photovoltaic cells proliferate.¶ With the electric-power industry poised for its most dramatic changes in decades, too little thought is being devoted to coordinating these piecemeal initiatives, warns [Richard Michelfelder](http://business.camden.rutgers.edu/FacultyStaff/Directory/michelfelder.htm) in a recent edition of The Electricity Journal, the leading policy journal for the electric industry.¶ The consequence, he fears, might well be a disastrous overload of the nation’s electrical grid.¶ An assistant professor of finance at the Rutgers School of Business—Camden and former president and CEO of Quantum Consulting Inc., a national public utilities consulting firm based in Berkeley, Cal., Michelfelder comes to his assessment after a quarter-century in the energy-technology industry.¶ “When you start adding random assets to the grid, you also add the possibility of disruptions in the coordination of the flow of electricity,” says Michelfelder.

#### Blackouts cause nuclear meltdowns

**Cappiello ‘11** (Dina, reporter for the AP March 29, 2011 “AP IMPACT: Long Blackouts Pose Risk to US Reactors” The Post and Courier <http://www.postandcourier.com/news/2011/mar/29/ap-impact-long-blackouts-pose-risk-us-reactors/?print>)

Long before the nuclear emergency in Japan, U.S. regulators knew that a power failure lasting for days at an American nuclear plant, whatever the cause, could lead to a radioactive leak. Even so, they have only required the nation’s 104 nuclear reactors to develop plans for dealing with much shorter blackouts on the assumption that power would be restored quickly. In one nightmare simulation presented by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in 2009, it would take less than a day for radiation to escape from a reactor at a Pennsylvania nuclear power plant after an earthquake, flood or fire knocked out all electrical power and there was no way to keep the reactors cool after backup battery power ran out. That plant, the Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station outside Lancaster, has reactors of the same older make and model as those releasing radiation at Japan’s Fukushima Dai-ichi plant, which is using other means to try to cool the reactors. And like Fukushima Dai-ichi, the Peach Bottom plant has enough battery power on site to power emergency cooling systems for eight hours. In Japan, that wasn’t enough time for power to be restored. According to the International Atomic Energy Agency and the Nuclear Energy Institute trade association, three of the six reactors at the plant still can’t get power to operate the emergency cooling systems. Two were shut down at the time. In the sixth, the fuel was removed completely and put in the spent fuel pool when it was shut down for maintenance at the time of the disaster. A week after the March 11 earthquake, diesel generators started supplying power to two other two reactors, Units 5 and 6, the groups said. The risk of a blackout leading to core damage, while extremely remote, exists at all U.S. nuclear power plants, and some are more susceptible than others, according to an Associated Press investigation. While regulators say they have confidence that measures adopted in the U.S. will prevent or significantly delay a core from melting and threatening a radioactive release, the events in Japan raise questions about whether U.S. power plants are as prepared as they could and should be. A top Nuclear Regulatory Commission official said Tuesday that the agency will review station blackouts and whether the nation’s 104 nuclear reactors are capable of coping with them. As part of a review requested by President Barack Obama in the wake of the Japan crisis, the NRC will examine “what conditions and capabilities exist at all 104 reactors to see if we need to strengthen the regulatory requirement,” said Bill Borchardt, the agency’s executive director for operations. Borchardt said an obvious question that should be answered is whether nuclear plants need enhanced battery supplies, or ones that can last longer. “There is a robust capability that exists already, but given what happened in Japan there’s obviously a question that presents itself: Do we need to make it even more robust?” He said the NRC would do a site-by-site review of the nation’s nuclear reactors to assess the blackout risk. “We didn’t address a tsunami and an earthquake, but clearly we have known for some time that one of the weak links that makes accidents a little more likely is losing power,” said Alan Kolaczkowski, a retired nuclear engineer who worked on a federal risk analysis of Peach Bottom released in 1990 and is familiar with the updated risk analysis. Risk analyses conducted by the plants in 1991-94 and published by the commission in 2003 show that the chances of such an event striking a U.S. power plant are remote, even at the plant where the risk is the highest, the Beaver Valley Power Station in Pennsylvania. These long odds are among the reasons why the United States since the late 1980s has only required nuclear power plants to cope with blackouts for four or eight hours. That’s about how much time batteries would last. After that, it is assumed that power would be restored. And so far, that’s been the case. Equipment put in place after the Sept. 11, 2001, terrorist attacks could buy more time. Otherwise, the reactor’s radioactive core could begin to melt unless alternative cooling methods were employed. In Japan, the utility has tried using portable generators and dumped tons of seawater, among other things, on the reactors in an attempt to keep them cool. A 2003 federal analysis looking at how to estimate the risk of containment failure said that should power be knocked out by an earthquake or tornado it “would be unlikely that power will be recovered in the time frame to prevent core meltdown.” In Japan, it was a one-two punch: first the earthquake, then the tsunami.

#### Extinction

**Lendman ‘11** (Stephen, Research Associate of the Center for Research on Globalization, “Nuclear Meltdown in Japan,” <http://www.opednews.com/articles/Nuclear-Meltdown-in-Japan-by-Stephen-Lendman-110313-843.html>)

Fukushima Daiichi "nuclear power plant in Okuma, Japan, appears to have caused a reactor meltdown." Stratfor downplayed its seriousness, adding that such an event "does not necessarily mean a nuclear disaster," that already may have happened - the ultimate nightmare short of nuclear winter. According to Stratfor, "(A)s long as the reactor core, which is specifically designed to contain high levels of heat, pressure and radiation, remains intact, the melted fuel can be dealt with. If the (core's) breached but the containment facility built around (it) remains intact, the melted fuel can be....entombed within specialized concrete" as at Chernobyl in 1986. In fact, that disaster killed nearly one million people worldwide from nuclear radiation exposure. In their book titled, "Chernobyl: Consequences of the Catastrophe for People and the Environment," Alexey Yablokov, Vassily Nesterenko and Alexey Nesterenko said: "For the past 23 years, it has been clear that there is a danger greater than nuclear weapons concealed within nuclear power. Emissions from this one reactor exceeded a hundred-fold the radioactive contamination of the bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki." "No citizen of any country can be assured that he or she can be protected from radioactive contamination. One nuclear reactor can pollute half the globe. Chernobyl fallout covers the entire Northern Hemisphere." Stratfor explained that if Fukushima's floor cracked, "it is highly likely that the melting fuel will burn through (its) containment system and enter the ground. This has never happened before," at least not reported. If now occurring, "containment goes from being merely dangerous, time consuming and expensive to nearly impossible," making the quake, aftershocks, and tsunamis seem mild by comparison. Potentially, millions of lives will be jeopardized.

#### And, local solar jacks up customer electricity prices

**Burr, 12** – editor in chief of Public Utilities Fortnightly (Michael, “Rooftop Tsunami; Utilities sound the alarm as PV nears grid parity” PUBLIC UTILITIES FORTNIGHTLY, July, lexis)

From the utility's point of view, a growing wave of rooftop PV projects is starting to look ominous. And now, some utilities are taking action to shore up their defenses--advocating legislative and regulatory changes that pull back net metering policies and other solar incentives. Concerns focus in part on operational challenges from integrating dispersed generation that's variable, non-dispatchable, and sometimes beyond the utility's ability to control. But the biggest worry seems to involve the prospect of a fixed-costs dilemma, which I addressed in this column last issue. (see "Facing Facts," Fortnightly, June 2012). The shorthand is this: As PV gets cheaper, an increasing number of PV-owning customers will pay less than their fair share of utility system costs, leaving a shrinking number of non-solar customers to pick up the tab for keeping the lights on. Although PV's market penetration is tiny today, it's growing rapidly enough to raise real concerns for many utilities.¶ "Distributed generation is becoming one of the largest subsidies on our system," said Ron Litzinger, president of Southern California Edison, during a panel discussion at this year's Edison Electric Institute Annual Convention. "That subsidy tends to go from low-income to higher-income customers. We need to make sure all the costs of distributed generation are known before decisions are made.¶ "Left unchecked, we could see rates increase by 40 to 50 percent by 2020, which we know isn't sustainable."

#### This causes a depression

**Entine, 9** – adjunct fellow at the American Enterprise Institute (Jon, “U.S. and Climate Change--Rescue of the Planet Postponed?”, 2/24, [http://aei.org/publications/filter.all,pubID.29333/pub\_detail.asp](http://aei.org/publications/filter.all%2CpubID.29333/pub_detail.asp))

The correlation between economic growth and energy costs is high and negative; when energy costs go up, productivity takes a nosedive. In these extraordinary times, arguably the top priority must be to ensure that a secular financial downturn doesn't turn into a worldwide structural depression. If that happens, both the economy and the environment will be losers.

#### Nuclear war

Cesare Merlini 11, nonresident senior fellow at the Center on the United States and Europe and chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Italian Institute for International Affairs, May 2011, “A Post-Secular World?”, Survival, Vol. 53, No. 2

Two neatly opposed scenarios for the future of the world order illustrate the range of possibilities, albeit at the risk of oversimplification. The first scenario entails the premature crumbling of the post-Westphalian system. One or more of the acute tensions apparent today evolves into an open and traditional conflict between states, perhaps even involving the use of nuclear weapons. The crisis might be triggered by a collapse of the global economic and financial system, the vulnerability of which we have just experienced, and the prospect of a second Great Depression, with consequences for peace and democracy similar to those of the first. Whatever the trigger, the unlimited exercise of national sovereignty, exclusive self-interest and rejection of outside interference would self-interest and rejection of outside interference would likely be amplified, emptying, perhaps entirely, the half-full glass of multilateralism, including the UN and the European Union. Many of the more likely conflicts, such as between Israel and Iran or India and Pakistan, have potential religious dimensions. Short of war, tensions such as those related to immigration might become unbearable. Familiar issues of creed and identity could be exacerbated. One way or another, the secular rational approach would be sidestepped by a return to theocratic absolutes, competing or converging with secular absolutes such as unbridled nationalism.

**1nc util**

#### 1) Focus on extinction is ethical –

extinction would be enormously painful

#### 2) Util is inevitable –

they just shift util to be about what group of people is worth the most, even if util is bad only they make it about something other than numbers which is worse

#### 3) All lives infinitely valuable—only ethical option is maximizing number saved

**Cummisky, 96** (David, professor of philosophy at Bates, Kantian Consequentialism, p. 131)

Finally, even if one grants that saving two persons with dignity cannot outweigh and compensate for killing one—because dignity cannot be added and summed this way—this point still does not justify deontological constraints. On the extreme interpretation, why would not killing one person be a stronger obligation than saving two persons? If I am concerned with the priceless dignity of each, it would seem that I *may* still save two; it is just that my reason cannot be that the two compensate for the loss of one. Consider Hill’s example of a priceless object: If I can save two of three priceless statutes only by destroying one, then I cannot claim that saving two is not outweighed by the one that was not destroyed. Indeed, even if dignity cannot be simply summed up, how is the extreme interpretation inconsistent with the idea that I should save as many priceless objects as possible? Even if two do not simply outweigh and thus compensate for the loss of one, each is priceless; thus, I have good reason to save as many as I can. In short, it is not clear how the extreme interpretation justifies the ordinary killing/letting-die distinction or even how it conflicts with the conclusion that the more persons with dignity who are saved, the better.

#### 4) Ethics focus turns the K - Focus on guilt-based pancea politics leads to compassion fatigue that results in a net-decrease in ethical acts

**Moeller, 99** Dr. Susan Moeller is the director of the International Center for Media and the Public Agenda (ICMPA), an academic center that forms a bridge between the College of Journalism and the School of Public Policy at the University of Maryland, College Park. She is Professor of Media and International Affairs in the Philip Merrill College of Journalism at the University of Maryland and an affiliated faculty member at the School of Public Policy. “Compassion Fatigue : How the Media Sells Disease, Famine, War and Death” <http://site.ebrary.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/lib/umich/docDetail.action?docID=10054625> pg. 9-12 BJM

It all started with an advertising campaign. We have all been cued by that famous series of ads by Save the Children. You can help this child or you can turn the page. The first time a reader sees the advertisement he is arrested by guilt. He may come close to actually sending money to the organization. The second time the reader sees the ad he may linger over the photograph, read the short paragraphs of copy and only then turn the page. The third time the reader sees the ad he typically turns the page without hesitation. The fourth time the reader sees the ad he may pause again over the photo and text, not to wallow in guilt, but to acknowledge with cynicism how the advertisement is crafted to manipulate readers like him— even if it is in a “good” cause. As the Chicago Tribunes 1998 series investigating four international charities bluntly stated, “Child sponsorship is one of the most powerful and seductive philanthropic devices ever conceived.” 7 Most media consumers eventually get to the point where they turn the page. Because most of us do pass the advertisement by, its curse is on our heads. “Either you help or you turn away,” stated one ad. “Whether she lives or dies, depends on what you do next.” Turning away kills this child. We are responsible. “Because without your help, death will be this child’s only relief.” 8 In turning away we become culpable. But we can’t respond to every appeal. And so we’ve come to believe that we don’t care. If we turn the page originally because we don’t want to respond to what is in actuality a fund-raising appeal, although in the guise of a direct humanitarian plea, it becomes routine to thumb past the pages of news images showing wide-eyed children in distress. We’ve got compassion fatigue, we say, as if we have involuntarily contracted some kind of disease that we’re stuck with no matter what we might do. But it’s not just the tactics of the advocacy industry which are at fault in our succumbing to this affliction. After all, how often do we see one of their ads, anyway?…unless it’s Christmastime and we’re opening all our unsolicited mail. It’s the media that are at fault. How they typically cover crises helps us to feel overstimulated and bored all at once. Conventional wisdom says Americans have a short attention span. A parent would not accept that pronouncement on a child; she would step in to try to teach patience and the rewards of sticktoitiveness. But the media are not parents. In this case they are more like the neighborhood kid who is the bad influence on the block. Is your attention span short? Well then, let the media give you even more staccato bursts of news, hyped and wired to feed your addiction. It is not that there’s not good, comprehensive, responsible reporting out there. There is. “Sometimes,” said the late Jim Yuenger, former foreign editor with the Chicago Tribune, “you put the news in and people just aren’t going to read it and you have to say the hell with it.” 9 But that type of coverage is expensive as well as spaceand time-consuming. It rarely shows enough bang for the buck. So only a few elite media outlets emphasize such coverage, and even they frequently lapse into quick once-over reporting. “We give you the world,” yes, but in 15-second news briefs. The print and broadcast media are part of the entertainment industry— an industry that knows how to capture and hold the attention of its audience. “The more bizarre the story,” admitted UPI foreign editor Bob Martin, “the more it’s going to get played.” 10 With but a few exceptions, the media pay their way through selling advertising, not selling the news. So the operating principle behind much of the news business is to appeal to an audience— especially a large audience— with attractive demographics for advertisers. Those relatively few news outlets that consider international news to be of even remote interest to their target audiences try to make the world accessible. The point in covering international affairs is to make the world fascinating— or at least acceptably convenient: “News you can use.” “When we do the readership surveys, foreign news always scores high,” said Robert Kaiser, former managing editor of The Washington Post. “People say they’re interested and appreciate it, and I know they’re lying but I don’t mind. It’s fine. But I think it’s an opportunity for people to claim to be somewhat better citizens than they are.” 11 But in reality, they’re bored. When problems in the news can’t be easily or quickly solved— famine in Somalia, war in Bosnia, mass murder of the Kurds— attention wanders off to the next news fashion. “What’s hardest,” said Yuenger, “is to sustain interest in a story like Bosnia, which a lot of people just don’t want to hear about.” The media are alert to the first signs in their audience of the compassion fatigue “signal,” that sign that the short attention span of the public is up. “If we’ve just been in Africa for three months,” said CBS News foreign editor Allen Alter, “and somebody says, ‘You think that’s bad? You should see what’s down in Niger,’ well, it’s going to be hard for me to go back. Everybody’s Africa’d out for the moment.” As Milan Kundera wrote in The Book of Laughter and Forgetting, “The bloody massacre in Bangladesh quickly covered over the memory of the Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia, the assassination of Allende drowned out the groans of Bangladesh, the war in the Sinai Desert made people forget Allende, the Cambodian massacre made people forget Sinai and so on and so forth, until ultimately everyone lets everything be forgotten.” 12 The causes of compassion fatigue are multiple. Sometimes there are just too many catastrophes happening at once. “I think it was the editor Harold Evans,” said Bill Small, former president of NBC News and UPI, “who noted that a single copy of the [London] Sunday Times covers more happenings than an Englishman just a few hundred years ago could be expected to be exposed to in his entire lifetime.” 13 In 1991, for instance, it was hard not to be overwhelmed by the plethora of disasters. So compassion fatigue may simply work to pre-empt attention of “competing” events. Americans seem to have an appetite for only one crisis at a time. The phenomenon is so well-known that even political cartoonists make jokes about it, such as the frame drawn by Jeff Danziger of a newsroom with one old hack saying to someone on the phone: “Tajikistan? Sorry, we’ve already got an ethnic war story,” and another old warhorse saying on another phone: “Sudan? Sorry we’ve already got a famine story.” 14 Even during “slower” disaster seasons, there is always a long laundry list of countries and peoples in upheaval. Many and perhaps most of the problems are not of the quick-fix variety— the send-in-the-blankets-and-vaccination-suppliesand-all-will-be-well emergencies. Most global problems are entrenched and longlasting, rarely yielding to easy solutions available to individuals or even NGO and governmental authorities. “The same theme just dulls the psyche. For the reader, for the reporter writing it, for the editor reading it,” said Bernard Gwertzman, former foreign editor at The New York Times. 15 Tom Kent, international editor at the Associated Press, noted the same problem in covering ongoing crises. “Basically, in our coverage we cover things until there’s not much new to say. And then we back off daily coverage and come back a week or a month later, but not day-to-day.” He could tell, he said, when the sameness of the situation was drugging an audience into somnolence. We can certainly get a sense for the degree that people care about a story in the public. For example, when Bosnia started, people were calling up all the time for addresses of relief organizations and how we can help and all that. We did lists, and then requests dropped off. And in the first part of the Somalia story we heard “How can we help?” “How can we get money to these people?” We sent out the lists, then those calls dropped off Either the people who wanted to contribute had all the information they needed, or there just wasn’t anybody else who was interested. In Rwanda, we got practically no inquiries about how to help, although our stories certainly suggested there’s as much misery in Rwanda as anywhere else. 16 Sometimes to Americans, international problems just seem too permanent to yield to resolution. Sometimes even when problems flare out into crisis— by which point it is too late for the patch-’em-up response— the public is justified in believing that outside intervention will do little good…so what’s the use in caring? It’s difficult for the media and their audience to sustain concern about individual crises over a period of months and maybe even years. Other more decisive— and short-term— events intervene, usurping attention, and meanwhile, little seems to change in the original scenario. There is a reciprocal circularity in the treatment of low-intensity crises: the droning “same-as-it-ever-was” coverage in the media causes the public to lose interest, and the media’s perception that their audience has lost interest causes them to downscale their coverage, which causes the public to believe that the crisis is either over or is a lesser emergency and so on and so on. Another, especially pernicious form of compassion fatigue can set in when a crisis seems too remote, not sufficiently connected to Americans’ lives. Unless Americans are involved, unless a crisis comes close to home— either literally or figuratively— unless compelling images are available, preferably on TV, crises don’t get attention, either from the media or their audience. Some of the public may turn the television off when they see sad reports from around the world, but unless the news is covered by the media, no one has an opportunity to decide whether to watch or not. “Thanks to the news media,” noted Newsweek, “the face of grieving Kurdish refugees replaced the beaming smiles of victorious GIs.” Publicity, Newsweek argued, “galvanized the public and forced the president’s hand.” In just two weeks, the Bush administration sent $188 million in relief to the Kurds. 17 It’s a bit like that tree falling in the middle of the forest. If it falls and no one hears, it’s like it never happened. The tree may lie on the forest floor for years, finally to rot away, without anyone ever realizing it once stood tall.

#### 5) Consequences outweigh—fierce dogmatism makes them complicit with the evil they criticize

**Isaac 02** – Professor of political science at Indiana-Bloomington, Director of the Center for the Study of Democracy and Public Life, PhD from Yale (Jeffery C., Dissent Magazine, Vol. 49, Iss. 2, “Ends, Means, and Politics,” p. Proquest)

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.

#### 6) Large impacts always outweigh smaller ones – they are using cognitive biases to trick you into being immoral – don’t fall for it

**YUDKOWSKY 2006** (Eliezer, Singularity Institute for Artificial Intelligence, “Cognitive biases potentially affecting judgment of global risks,” forthcoming in *Global Catastrophic Risks*, August 31)\*we don’t endorse gendered language used by Eliezer Yudkowsky

Three groups of subjects considered three versions of the above question, asking them how high a tax increase they would accept to save 2,000, 20,000, or 200,000 birds. The response - known as Stated Willingness-To-Pay, or SWTP - had a mean of $80 for the 2,000-bird group, $78 for 20,000 birds, and $88 for 200,000 birds. (Desvousges et. al. 1993.) This phenomenon is known as scope insensitivity or scope neglect. Similar studies have shown that Toronto residents would pay little more to clean up all polluted lakes in Ontario than polluted lakes in a particular region of Ontario (Kahneman 1986); and that residents of four western US states would pay only 28% more to protect all 57 wilderness areas in those states than to protect a single area (McFadden and Leonard, 1995). The most widely accepted explanation for scope neglect appeals to the affect heuristic. Kahneman et. al. (1999) write: "The story constructed by Desvouges et. al. probably evokes for many readers a mental representation of a prototypical incident, perhaps an image of an exhausted bird, its feathers soaked in black oil, unable to escape. The hypothesis of valuation by prototype asserts that the affective value of this image will dominate expressions of the attitute to the problem - including the willingness to pay for a solution. Valuation by prototype implies extension neglect." Two other hypotheses accounting for scope neglect include purchase of moral satisfaction (Kahneman and Knetsch, 1992) and good cause dump (Harrison 1992). Purchase of moral satisfaction suggests that people spend enough money to create a 'warm glow' in themselves, and the amount required is a property of the person's psychology, having nothing to do with birds. Good cause dump suggests that people have some amount of money they are willing to pay for "the environment", and any question about environmental goods elicits this amount. Scope neglect has been shown to apply to human lives. Carson and Mitchell (1995) report that increasing the alleged risk associated with chlorinated drinking water from 0.004 to 2.43 annual deaths per 1,000 (a factor of 600) increased SWTP from $3.78 to $15.23 (a factor of 4). Baron and Greene (1996) found no effect from varying lives saved by a factor of ten. Fetherstonhaugh et. al. (1997), in a paper entitled "Insensitivity to the Value of Human Life: A Study of Psychophysical Numbing", found evidence that our perception of human deaths, and valuation of human lives, obeys Weber's Law - meaning that we use a logarithmic scale. And indeed, studies of scope neglect in which the quantitative variations are huge enough to elicit any sensitivity at all, show small linear increases in Willingness-To-Pay corresponding to exponential increases in scope. Kahneman et. al. (1999) interpret this as an additive effect of scope affect and prototype affect - the prototype image elicits most of the emotion, and the scope elicits a smaller amount of emotion which is added (not multiplied) with the first amount. Albert Szent-Györgyi said: "I am deeply moved if I see one man suffering and would risk my life for him. Then I talk impersonally about the possible pulverization of our big cities, with a hundred million dead. I am unable to multiply one man's suffering by a hundred million." Human emotions take place within an analog brain. The human brain cannot release enough neurotransmitters to feel emotion a thousand times as strong as the grief of one funeral. A prospective risk going from 10,000,000 deaths to 100,000,000 deaths does not multiply by ten the strength of our determination to stop it. It adds one more zero on paper for our eyes to glaze over, an effect so small that one must usually jump several orders of magnitude to detect the difference experimentally.

#### 7) Extinction is unique because those suffering also are affected along with future generations –

none of their authors assume our impacts

# at: environmental justice

#### Environmental Justice framing of the social inequity means it fails and alienates other populations

**Litman & Brenman 12** [Todd Litman, Victoria Transport Policy Institute, Marc Brenman, Social Justice Consultancy and Senior Policy Advisor to The City Project, “A New Social Equity Agenda For Sustainable Transportation”, <http://www.vtpi.org/equityagenda.pdf>, 8 March 2012] SV

In practice, transportation social equity issues are often addressed using an environmental justicelens, which tends to focus on illegal and measurable harms to certain vulnerable minority groups, as defined in the following box. Political debates, transport agencies, professional organizations (such as TRB)**,** advocacy groups and courts all tend to use this perspective when evaluating social equity issues (Bullard and Johnson 1997; Forkenbrock and Sheeley 2004). This approach is understandable. It addresses what can be considered the worst categories of social inequities (measurable discrimination against vulnerable minorities), and it helps define a reasonable scope of issues that planning organizations can address. For example, to satisfy social equity requirements a planning agency should identify any vulnerable minorities and any impacts that a project will impose on them, and then work with that group to mitigate these impacts. Similarly, social equity advocacy organizations have a reasonably definable constituency with definable concerns and intervention methods, including legal action. However, this approach also has significant limitations**: ** It is ineffective at representing the interests of unorganized and geographically dispersed groups. For example, transit riders and bicyclists are often more politically organized and influential than the much larger group of people who walk. Minority and low-income people tend to be more influential they live close together than if they are dispersed Mobility for teenagers and young adults is generally overlooked as a social equity issue. It relies on often ambiguous classifications, such as race and age,

 as surrogates for functional status such as poverty and physical disability**.** Although African Americans tend to have high poverty rates, it is wrong to assume that all African Americans are poor, and unfair to overlookwhite population poverty. Similarly**,** although seniors tend to have high disability rates, it is wrong to assume that all seniors are disabled, and unfair to overlook the needs of younger disabled people**.** This can alienate people who feel that their interests are undervalued, such as low-income people who lack minority status. **** It tends to consider social equity issues in isolation, and so favors special mitigation actions rather than more integrated solutionsthat may help achieve more total benefits. For example, it is more likely to support special subsidies or transit services intended to help specific groups than to support broader policy and planning reforms that create more diverse transport systems and more accessible land use, which provide economic, environmental and social equity benefits. **** It tends to overlook issues important to physically, economically and socially disadvantaged groups not specifically defined as discrimination, such as planning decision impacts on health**,** affordability, and community livability (Bell and Cohen 2009; CNT 2008; Litman 2007) Environmental justice, as it is currently applied, can therefore be considered a subset of total social equity issues. Environmental justice might be considered to reflect the most extreme and therefore most important issues, but this approach often excludes other impacts and groups.

# 2nc

#### Quit messin’ --- Must defend solely simulation of 1AC

Esberg and Sagan 12 Jane Esberg is special assistant to the director at New York University's Center on. International Cooperation. She was the winner of 2009 Firestone Medal. Scott Sagan is a professor of political science and director of Stanford's Center for International Security and Cooperation, “NEGOTIATING NONPROLIFERATION: Scholarship, Pedagogy, and Nuclear Weapons Policy,” 2/17 The Nonproliferation Review, 19:1, 95-108

These government or quasi-government think tank simulations often provide very similar lessons for high-level players as are learned by students in educational simulations. Government participants learn about the importance of understanding foreign perspectives, the need to practice internal coordination, and the necessity to compromise and coordinate with other governments in negotiations and crises. During the Cold War, political scientist Robert Mandel noted how crisis exercises and war games forced government officials to overcome ‘‘bureaucratic myopia,’’ moving beyond their normal organizational roles and thinking more creatively about how others might react in a crisis or conflict.6 The skills of imagination and the subsequent ability to predict foreign interests and reactions remain critical for real-world foreign policy makers. For example, simulations of the Iranian nuclear crisis\*held in 2009 and 2010 at the Brookings Institution’s Saban Center and at Harvard University’s Belfer Center, and involving former US senior officials and regional experts\*highlighted the dangers of misunderstanding foreign governments’ preferences and misinterpreting their subsequent behavior. In both simulations, the primary criticism of the US negotiating team lay in a failure to predict accurately how other states, both allies and adversaries, would behave in response to US policy initiatives.7

By university age, students often have a pre-defined view of international affairs, and the literature on simulations in education has long emphasized how such exercises force students to challenge their assumptions about how other governments behave and how their own government works.8 Since simulations became more common as a teaching tool in the late 1950s, educational literature has expounded on their benefits, from encouraging engagement by breaking from the typical lecture format, to improving communication skills, to promoting teamwork.9 More broadly, simulations can deepen understanding by asking students to link fact and theory, providing a context for facts while bringing theory into the realm of practice.10 These exercises are particularly valuable in teaching international affairs for many of the same reasons they are useful for policy makers: they force participants to ‘‘grapple with the issues arising from a world in flux.’’11 Simulations have been used successfully to teach students about such disparate topics as European politics, the Kashmir crisis, and US response to the mass killings in Darfur.12 Role-playing exercises certainly encourage students to learn political and technical facts\* but they learn them in a more active style. Rather than sitting in a classroom and merely receiving knowledge, students actively research ‘‘their’’ government’s positions and actively argue, brief, and negotiate with others.13 Facts can change quickly; simulations teach students how to contextualize and act on information.14

## at: c/i

#### The plan only effects one sector of the economy – economic engagement must affect the broad economy – that’s key to limits otherwise the aff could increase aid for any single good imaginable to any of the 3 countries.

Davidsson 3 – Elias Davidsson, Human Rights Researcher and Activist, Reporter for the Arab American News, Contributing Editor for Global Research, “The Mechanism of Economic Sanctions: Changing Perceptions and Euphemisms”, November, www.aldeilis.net/english/attachments/2877\_econsanc-debate.pdf‎

“Economic sanctions”, a mode of coercion in international relations resuscitated in recent years, has prompted renewed and lively scholarly interest in the subject. Why have such measures become so popular? One answer is that they “constitute a means of exerting international influence that is more powerful than diplomatic mediation but lies below the threshold of military intervention”[1]. Another answer is that “they engage comparatively less internal political resistance than other candidate strategies [...]. They do not generate sombre processions of body bags bringing home the mortal remains of the sons and daughters of constituents”[2], in other words, they cost little to the side imposing the sanctions. The notable predilection by the United States for economic sanctions [3], suggests that such a tool is particularly useful for economically powerful states that are themselves relatively immune to such measures. This tool of collective economic coercion, with antecedents such as siege warfare and blockade going back to biblical time [4], was used during most of the 20th Century, particularly in war situations. Although the United Nations Charter, drafted during the later stages of World War II, includes provisions for the imposition of economic sanctions (Article 41), the Security Council - empowered to resort to this tool - only used it twice between 1945 and 1990, against Rhodesia in 1966 and South Africa in 1977. In our discussion we designate economic sanctions as “coordinated restrictions on trade and/or financial transactions intended to impair economic life within a given territory”[5]. To the extent that measures intend to impair “economic life within a given territory” through restrictions on trade and/or finance, they constitute, for our purposes, economic sanctions. Selective or individualized measures, such as restrictions on specific goods (arms, luxury items, some forms of travel), are therefore not considered as *economic* sanctions. Symbolic economic deprivations, such as partial withholding of aid, do not amount to economic sanctions if their intended effect is primarily to convey displeasure, rather than to affect the economy.

#### CP popular with Republicans—it will be passed easily

Esenaro, 13(Alberto Esenaro, 4/7/13, “QUICK WHITE HOUSE RESPONSE COULD MEAN A FOOT IN THE DOOR IN MEXICO’S HYDROCARBONS SECTOR”, http://mexicanlawblog.com/quick-white-house-response-could-mean-a-foot-in-the-door-in-mexicos-hydrocarbons-sector/)//EM

In April of 2012, then Secretary of State Hillary Clinton made an agreement with former president Felipe Calderón allowing joint oil exploration in the Gulf of Mexico, which would give the U.S. access to Mexico’s well-known oil riches. Interestingly, while the deal was approved with lightning speed in the Mexican Senate (where opposition to privatization is quite strong), the current Obama administration in the United States has delayed finalizing the off-shore drilling deal. According to **Republican lawmakers** and industry experts, a quick response is **essential** and foot-dragging could have disastrous consequences for Americans interested in accessing Mexican oil. The reason why consequences could be disastrous according to industry experts is that Mexico could very easily change its mind and call off the deal: public opinion on any foreign investment in the country’s hydrocarbons sector generally tends to be negative and politicians could very well submit to the will of the populace. Rep. Jeff Duncan (R-S.C.) spoke to The Hill recently after a House Foreign Relations committee hearing. Speaking about energy deals with Mexico, he said: “It’s time for the administration to act. All they have to do is send the enacting legislation over here and let us act on it, because we’re sitting on ‘go.’”

#### Magnitude has to be taken in account before risk – it’s not a zero percent risk if it could kill on a large scale

**Shrader 1985** – Professor of Philosophy at the University of Florida, former Professor at UC, Santa Barbara, held an NSF Scholar's Award in History and Philosophy of Science, a Woodrow Wilson Fellowship and an NSF Fellowship (Kristin Shrader-Frechette, Journal of Business Ethics 4, 431-445, “Technological Risk and Small Probabilities”)

Perhaps the strongest reason for believing that the value of risk avoidance ought not to be defined purely in terms of probability is that such a definition ignores the importance of consequences. An extremely low probability of killing one person, for example, might be negligible. It is not clear, however, that if the consequences differed, then the risk would still be negligible. If this same low probability were that 150 000 persons might be killed, then the risk might not be said to be insignificant. This is why the probability-threshold position runs into such difficulties when used to evaluate risks such as those from commercial, nuclear-reactor accidents. Granted, the per-year, per-reactor probability of a nuclear core melt might be only 6 X 10"5, an extremely low probability.^i But if such an accident, according to the US Brookhaven Report, could kill 145 000 people, cause $17 billion in property damage alone, and render an area the size of Pennsylvania uninhabitable,'^ then such a risk is hardly negligible. Perhaps, as Derek Parfit argues, a large number of fatalities "cancels out the smallness of the chance" and, for this reason, "it is not plausible to claim that a very tiny chance is no chance at all."63

#### 3. Turn: consciousness makes calculation inevitable, rejecting it enhances the worst aspects of calculation

**Derrida, 92** (Jaques, “The Force of Law: The ‘Mystical Foundation of Authority’”, Deconstruction and the Possibility of Justice, ed: Cornell, Rosenfeld, and Carlson, p. 28-29)

That justice exceeds law and calculation, that the unpresentable exceeds the determinable cannot and should not serve as an alibi for staying out of juridico-political battles, within an institution or state or between institutions or states and others. Left to itself, the incalculable and giving idea of justice is always very close to the bad, even to the worst for it can always be reapportioned by the most perverse calculation. It’s always possible. And so incalculable justice requires us to calculate. And first, closest to what we associate with justice, namely law, the juridicial field that one cannot isolate within sure frontiers, but also in all the fields from which we cannot separate it, which intervene in it and are no longer simply fields: ethics, politics, economics, psycho-sociology, philosophy, literature, etc. Not only must we calculate, negotiate the relation between the calculable and incalculable, and negotiate without the sort of tule that wouldn’t have to reinvented there where we are cast, there where we find ourselves; but we must take it as far as possible, beyond the place where we find ourselves and beyond the already identifiable zones of morality or politics or law, beyond the distinction between national and international, public and private, and so on. This requirement doesn’t properly belong to either justice or law. It only belongs to either of those two domains by exceeding each one in the direction of the other. Politicization, for example, is interminable even if it cannot and should not ever be total. To keep this from being a truism or a triviality, we must recognize in it the following consequence: each advancement in politicization obliges one to reconsider, and so reinterpret, the very foundations of law such as they had been previously calculated or delimited. This was true for example in the Declaration of the Rights of Man, in the abolition of slavery, in all emanicipatory battles that remain and will have to remain in progress, everywhere in the world, for men and for women.

#### 2. Every barrier imaginable.

Wood et. al., 1ac author, 12, fellow @ Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Department of International Affairs, Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México Senior Advisor, Mexico Institute Renewable Energy Initiative(Duncan Wood, July 2012, “Solar Energy Potential in Mexico’s Northern Border States”, http://www.wilsoncenter.org/sites/default/files/Border\_Solar\_Romero\_0.pdf)

Barriers to Solar Development in Mexico Institutional There are no specific targets for increased solar capacity by the government. Although there are significant subsidies for conventional energy, the tax incentives for investment in solar energy are not sufficient to promote market growth. In addition, environmental externalities are not considered in the economic analysis of energy projects. Financial In general knowledge, there is little understanding of the life cycle of a solar project. It is not clear how a project can be developed, for it does not follow any established local pattern of construction or investment. The development steps are taken according to the situations that the project is currently in; steps, that have specific financial parameters. From the beginning to the conclusion of a project, it is uncertain how much it will cost. Flow analyses are not exact, adding to this, that the number and capacity of government and private financing programs are very limited. There are no mechanisms for “soft” loans or feed in tariffs to promote the use of solar systems in Mexico despite their successful application in other nations. Technical According to several installers consulted within ANES; in autonomous off-the-grid PV systems, lack of maintenance has caused failures to the PV systems after just a few years of operation. There is a need to train technicians to install and maintain systems and provide greater customer satisfaction, furthering development of the market. Finally, low level legislation (operating procedures) is needed to have minimum standards of quality and performance of photovoltaic products and solar projects. An important barrier to the development of the solar industry in Mexico with regards to manufacturing solar panels is that solar panel manufacturers in Mexico currently have to source most of their inputs from abroad. According to the manufacturers, the Mexican industry does not have the sufficient know-how or technology to meet the specific quality requirements and characteristics used in solar panel manufacturing. Some of the unmet requirements include low panel efficiency outputs, low cover glass quality with low useful life expectancy, and inadequate design and dimensions of the panel frames. Social The lack of knowledge and information about PV Solar Energy in Mexico means that many rural consumers do not understand its potential benefits. With respect to energy consumption and costs, households rarely take a long- term perspective and consequently fail to identify the potential savings small- scale solar system would in some cases provide. Moreover, the rural community remembers the failures of the Solidaridad program, which was developed by the administration of former Mexican president Carlos Salinas de Gortari in the late 1980s. The program’s objective was poverty alleviation, and one of the proposals was to install PV Solar Panels in rural communities. The program failed, partially because the solar systems were using car batteries that died just after a few months and were rarely replaced. Still remembered by the rural population, this experience left many rural residents with the impression that PV and other solar solutions are useless and with a strong preference for a grid connection. Political Unfortunately, decision makers are often uninformed about solar energy as well. This has greater consequences because policymakers have made decisions and declarations that have restricted the development and growth of solar energy in the country and given it a negative public image. For instance, when the electric taxi fleet for Mexico City was first announced, the government stated that the energy for recharging the cars would come from solar panels installed in the recharging stations, clearly an overstatement since the stations have an area of only 100 m2. As a result of public policy blunders and a lack of effective educational campaigns, most of the population is not aware that, when properly applied, solar systems can generate substantial financial and energy savings.

# Politics

### 2nc econ overview

#### DA outweighs and turns the case –

#### 1). magnitude—

**economic decline causes all global hotspots to escalate—Iran, North Korea, Russia, China—increases the incentive to challenge competitors with nuclear weapons—that’s Friedberg and Schoenfeld**

#### 2). timeframe—

**debt ceiling is the only instantaneous impact b/c it’s based off of the action of US default—prefer it over their long systemic internal link chains**

**probability is irrelevant—default is a yes/no question**

#### Turns case

#### 1). prevents implementation—

**government shutdown means that they can’t fund/initiate new programs**

**2). economic growth solves their war scenarios—**

**trade ties and interdependence eliminates rational incentives for war**

**Econ decline turns clean tech**

**Richard 8** (Michael Graham, Environmental Activist and Contributor @ HuffPost, "4 Reasons Why Recession is BAD for the Environment," http://www.huffingtonpost.com/michael-graham-richard/4-reasons-why-recession-i\_b\_133564.html)

As a counter-point to Lloyd's tongue-in-cheek post about 10 Ways the Recession Can Help the Environment, here are some eco-reasons why we should wish a speedy recovery (we won't get into non-green reasons here): Firstly, when squeezed, companies will reduce their investments into research & development and green programs. These are usually not short-term profit centers, so that is what's axed first. Some progress has been made in the past few years, it would be sad to lose ground now. Secondly, average people, when money is tight, will look for less expensive products (duh). Right now, that usually means that greener products won't make it. Maybe someday if we start taxing "bads" instead of "goods" (pollution, carbon, toxins instead of labor, income, capital gains) the least expensive products will also be the greenest, but right now that's not the case. Thirdly, there's less money going into the stock markets and bank loans are harder to get, which means that many small firms and startups working on the breakthrough green technologies of tomorrow can have trouble getting funds or can even go bankrupt, especially if their clients or backers decide to make cuts. Fourthly, during economic crises, voters want the government to appear to be doing something about the economy (even if it's government that screwed things up in the first place). They'll accept all kinds of measures and laws, including those that aren't good for the environment. Massive corn subsidies anyone? **Don't even think about progress on global warming**...

**Global economic collapse increases poverty**

**Klare 9** [Michael T. Author and Professor of Peace and World-Security Studies at Hampshire College, March 19, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/michael-t-klare/the-second-shockwave\_b\_176358.html]

While the economic contraction is apparently slowing in the advanced industrial countries and may reach bottom in the not-too-distant future, it's only beginning to gain momentum in the developing world, which was spared the earliest effects of the global meltdown. Because the crisis was largely precipitated by a collapse of the housing market in the United States and the resulting disintegration of financial products derived from the "securitization" of questionable mortgages, most developing nations were unaffected by the early stages of the meltdown, for the simple reason that they possessed few such assets. But now, as the wealthier nations cease investing in the developing world or acquiring its exports, the crisis is hitting them with a vengeance. On top of this, conditions are deteriorating at a time when severe drought is affecting many key food-producing regions and poor farmers lack the wherewithal to buy seeds, fertilizers, and fuel. The likely result: A looming food crisis in many areas hit hardest by the global economic meltdown. Until now, concern over the human impact of the global crisis has largely been focused -- understandably so -- on unemployment and economic hardship in the United States, Europe, and former Soviet Union. Many stories have appeared on the devastating impact of plant closings, bankruptcies, and home foreclosures on families and communities in these parts of the world. Much less coverage has been devoted to the meltdown's impact on people in the developing world. As the crisis spreads to the poorer countries, however, it's likely that people in these areas will experience hardships every bit as severe as those in the wealthier countries -- and, in many cases, far worse. The greatest worry is that most of the gains achieved in eradicating poverty over the last decade or so will be wiped out, forcing tens or hundreds of millions of people from the working class and the lower rungs of the middle class back into the penury from which they escaped. Equally worrisome is the risk of food scarcity in these areas, resulting in widespread malnutrition, hunger, and starvation. All this is sure to produce vast human misery, sickness, and death, but could also result in social and political unrest of various sorts, including riot, rebellion, and ethnic strife. The president, Congress, or the mainstream media are not, for the most part, discussing these perils. As before, public interest remains focused on the ways in which the crisis is affecting the United States and the other major industrial powers. But the World Bank, the Food and Agriculture Organization, and U.S. intelligence officials, in three recent reports, are paying increased attention to the prospect of a second economic shockwave, this time affecting the developing world.Sinking Back Into Penury In late February, the World Bank staff prepared a background paper for the Group of 20 (G-20) finance ministers meeting held near London on March 13 and 14. Entitled "Swimming Against the Tide: How Developing Countries Are Coping with the Global Crisis," it provides a preliminary assessment of the meltdown's impact on low-income countries (LICs). The picture, though still hazy, is one of deepening gloom. Most LICs were shielded from the initial impact of the sudden blockage in private capital flows because they have such limited access to such markets. "But while slower to emerge," the report notes, "the impact of the crisis on LICs has been no less significant as the effects have spread through other channels." For example, "many LIC governments rely on disproportionately on revenue from commodity exports, the prices of which have declined sharply along with global demand." Likewise, foreign direct investment is falling, particularly in the natural resource sectors. On top of this, remittances from immigrants in the wealthier countries to their families back home have dropped, erasing an important source of income to poor communities. Add all this up, and it's likely that "the slowdown in growth will likely deepen the deprivation of the existing poor." In many LICs, moreover, "large numbers of people are clustered just above the poverty line and are therefore particularly vulnerable to economic volatility and temporary slowdowns." As the intensity of the crisis grows, more and more of these people will lose their jobs or their other sources of income (such as those all-important remittances) and so be pushed from *above* the poverty line to *beneath* it. The resulting outcome: "The economic crisis is projected to increase poverty by around 46 million people in 2009."

### 2nc uniqueness wall

#### A clean debt ceiling bill will pass, 2 reasons –

#### The Democratic party is unified, and Obama is rallying them and exploiting GOP divisions – that’s 1nc Bolton. The plan undermines Dem unity by rallying anti-trade and labor groups and splits the party – that’s Magnus

#### Obama is controlling the messaging – our 1nc Milbank evidence says Obama needs to be President One Note. As long as Obama stays focused and on topic, his pressure will cause the GOP to cave. The plan disrupts this strategy by drawing Obama into a new fight – all the time he spends talking about the plan is time he can’t spend on the debt ceiling

#### Obama is winning the messaging war - the GOP is on the defensive and will cave

**Balz, 9/26/13** (Dan, Washington Post, “Looking to block Obamacare, GOP is party in search of a strategy” http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/looking-to-block-obamacare-gop-is-party-in-search-of-a-strategy/2013/09/26/5685281a-26f4-11e3-b75d-5b7f66349852\_story.html)

Obama also was defiant in reasserting that he will not negotiate over raising the federal debt ceiling, as he had told Boehner in a recent telephone call. He said he would not give in to “blackmail” on issues that he said have nothing to do with the budget. “I will not negotiate on anything when it comes to the full faith and credit of the United States of America,” he said to applause. “We’re not going to submit to this kind of total irresponsibility.”

The risks to the Republicans have been clear since they started down the path to defund Obamacare as part of a bill to keep the government funded. They lack the votes in the Senate to defund the act and in any case Obama would never sign anything like it. That is why there was so much consternation in the ranks when House Republicans set their strategy.

It appeared for a time on Wednesday that they might yield to the obvious and that they were setting their sights on a battle over the debt ceiling. That came after Sen. Ted Cruz (R-Tex.) completed a 21-hour talk session on the Senate floor.

Then on Thursday morning, Boehner signaled a double-barreled approach: continuing the fight over the bill to keep the government funded and to defund Obamacare while moving forward on a debt ceiling measure that included various other proposals, such as delaying Obamacare, putting tax reform on a fast track and building the Keystone XL oil pipeline.

Moving quickly on the debt ceiling was aimed in part at creating wiggle room for the final stages of the battle over funding the government or, failing that, entering a partial shutdown. What was clear was that House leaders continue to try to calibrate how much leeway they have, given the insistence and persistence of the most conservative elements of their conference.

Republicans point to some public polling as evidence that they can prevail in a showdown with Obama over the debt ceiling. A Bloomberg News poll showed that about six in 10 Americans believe that because Congress lacks discipline, it’s better to include spending cuts on a bill to raise the borrowing limit, rather than simply pass a clean version of the measure.

Republicans interpret that finding and conclude that Obama will be viewed as the unreasonable partner if there is a default. Perhaps. Last time, both sides ended up with debris on them when the public turned on Washington’s dysfunctional climate. That might be the best Republicans can hope for — but are they willing to take the government over a cliff to test it?

Republicans clearly lack the votes to win the first battle that will play out through the weekend. Whether they have the will and the unity to take the debt ceiling issue to the brink remains unclear. Right now they are scrambling by the hour, with no clear road map to guide them.

#### Messaging matters – party concerns with reputation mean a deal is highly likely, although not guaranteed – our evidence is substantially more qualified

**Binder, 9/25/13 -** professor of political science at George Washington University and a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution(Sarah, “Why the debt limit doomsayers might be wrong” Washington Post,

http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/monkey-cage/wp/2013/09/25/why-the-debt-limit-doomsayers-might-be-wrong/

Brian Beutler at Salon has taken the “debt limit freakout caucus” to task. But I think there’s more to be said about “zones of agreement” and whether they are necessary for making legislative deals. Klein is of course correct about the wide gulf between the parties: Keith Poole and Howard Rosenthal’s standard measures of partisan polarization (which capture lawmakers’ policy views and partisan strategy) show no overlap between the political parties. Still, I think we risk overestimating the odds of breaching the debt ceiling if we focus on zones of policy agreement. An alternative view of deal-making does not eliminate uncertainty about whether the parties will reach an agreement to raise the debt limit. But it does suggest that the prospects for a deal might be stronger than we might otherwise expect based on policy grounds alone.

Some thoughts, culled from ongoing project with Frances Lee:

First, policy and politics are always intertwined. This means that deal making is not merely a matter of finding the ideological sweet spot between competing coalitions. Instead, common ground is typically a joint function of policy views and political calculation. Such calculations are multifaceted. Lawmakers must justify any deals to active supporters back home, knowing that their constituents are unlikely to know what is possible or not in Congress. Lawmakers also worry about their reputations: They will not necessarily vote for a deal that they support on policy grounds if the vote could harm their public image. And vice versa: Lawmakers might support a deal that they object to on policy grounds if their support would be helpful to their image. Party reputations also influence the chances of a deal, particularly if individual lawmakers stand to benefit electorally from a favorable party image that might result from reaching agreement. With policy and politics so tightly intertwined, parties can reach a deal even without an overlapping set of policy views. A zone of agreement might be neither necessary nor sufficient for generating a legislative agreement.

Second, I think it’s important to keep in mind that the jurisdiction of Congress is essentially universal. As former Rep. Barney Frank has said, “anything can be the basis for a deal.” If competing coalitions have different priorities, adding each element to a deal provides different lawmakers with alternative reasons to support a deal. Granted, the White House’s stated unwillingness to negotiate over the debt limit complicates a strategy that capitalizes on crafting a deal from parties’ divergent priorities. Even so, the March deal on raising the debt limit is suggestive: Republicans agreed to suspend the debt limit so long as the Senate passed a budget. Coupling different priorities became the basis for a deal– even in the absence of shared policy ground.

Third, even a party’s decision about whether to negotiate is driven by politics. Party leaders inevitably ask: Which party will suffer more politically if a deal is not done? Anticipation of losing the public blame game can drive partisans to the table, even when they disagree about policy. Senate GOP disagreement over whether to risk shutting down the government over funding for Obamacare is a good example. Deals become possible even in the absence of a zone of agreement if the political costs of saying no are too steep. Whether House GOP leaders can convince sufficient numbers of their rank and file to support a clean CR on those grounds remains to be seen, but is likely.

#### Their evidence is a snapshot of current politics – it doesn’t take into account the tactics of reputational pressure

**Binder, 9/25/13 -** professor of political science at George Washington University and a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution(Sarah, “Why the debt limit doomsayers might be wrong” Washington Post,

http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/monkey-cage/wp/2013/09/25/why-the-debt-limit-doomsayers-might-be-wrong/

Finally, I think it’s helpful to keep in mind that deal-making in Congress is inherently dynamic. Spatial models in political science typically offer a snapshot of legislative decision making, in part because we assume that lawmakers’ policy preferences are fixed. But once we focus on both policy and political bases for a deal, the process seems remarkably fluid. How party leaders and their rank and file come to judge the political costs of failure (here, shutting down government or defaulting on the nation’s debt) ultimately shapes the chances for a deal. To be sure, such calculations do not inexorably lead to legislative deals, as the uncertain fate of immigration reform suggests. Still, the politics of blame might prove more important than shared policy ground in guiding the parties to a debt ceiling agreement this fall.

#### The GOP is highly likely to cave and enough votes exist now for a clean debt ceiling

**Beutler, 9/24/13** - Salon's political writer (Brian, “Ted Cruz’s complaints are meaningless” Salon, http://www.salon.com/2013/09/24/ted\_cruzs\_complaints\_are\_meaningless/)

Several commentators have watched the defund campaign go flaccid and responded by reissuing breathless exhortations that the risk of a debt default next month is much more severe than the risk of a shutdown ever was.

Here’s Steve Benen, Ezra Klein and Jonathan Chait, just today.

But it seems to me the past week’s events set up the following equation — cave on defunding Obamacare + ??? = win the debt limit fight — and it’s up to one of these guys to solve for ???

They all proceed from the same basic premise — the GOP’s demands are so extreme, and the Democrats’ commitment not to negotiating so ironclad, that Congress simply can’t increase the debt limit without one party folding. Parties don’t like to fold, ergo the risk of default is high.

I think this logic is flawed for a few reasons. Parties fold all the time. The GOP’s demands are actually wishes couched as demands. Their insistence on concessions from President Obama isn’t actually as black and white as the doomsayers portray it.

But on top of these misapprehensions, the debt limit freakout caucus also misrepresents a straightforward argument that the fight will be resolved fairly harmlessly as a lazily reductive assumption.

Chait says, “The debt-ceiling showdowns of 2011 and last spring both resolved themselves without triggering an economic meltdown, and so most people have come to assume the same will happen again this fall.”

This is a caricature, which allows doomsayers to grapple with a few basic facts. I and many others are pretty sanguine about this debt limit fight not because everything worked out OK earlier this year and in 2011, but because 1) everyone has said the debt limit will be increased; 2) the votes are there to increase the debt limit; 3) there are multiple procedural avenues that lead to votes on a debt limit increase; 4) at least two of them lead there without Republicans extracting concessions from President Obama.

House Republicans have a whole laundry list of non-starter debt limit “demands,” the most high-profile of which is a rider that would “delay” (as opposed to “defund”) Obamacare. Assuming John Boehner can pass that bill with GOP votes, it’ll come to the Senate, which is currently giving the public an object lesson in how Democrats can strip all of these riders on their own, while Republicans pretend they fought to the bitter end to extort the president. Don’t believe me? See the McConnell quote at the top of this article and replace the word “defund-” with “delay-.”

John Boehner doesn’t want to default on the national debt. He’s said he’s not willing to allow it. And lucky for him, there are enough votes in the House to pass the clean (or nearly entirely clean) debt limit bill that comes back from the Senate.

### shutdown thumper

#### The CR will pass and the fight will be deferred to the debt ceiling

**Brown, 9/27/13** ­ - politics reporter for Politico (Carrie, “How it ends” Politico, http://www.politico.com/story/2013/09/house-republicans-government-shutdown-how-it-ends-97442.html?hp=l6)

The GOP suffers from PTSD when it comes to government shutdowns. It took the political hit for the last one, in 1995-96, and many members worry about history repeating itself.

That’s why Republicans could decide to accept a clean funding bill, keep the government open and move on — demanding to curtail, delay or defund Obamacare in exchange for raising the debt limit next month.

The House Republican leadership’s opening move last week suggests this scenario is quite possible.

They initially floated a plan to pass a government funding bill that would’ve allowed the Senate to strip out the language defunding Obamacare without ever having to send it back to the House for final approval. It was a tacit admission that the Republican leaders wanted to give House members a chance to reject the health care law without the risk of a government shutdown. But the rank and file, well aware that it was a procedural maneuver, refused to go along.

For the tea party wing of the Republican Party to back down now, Boehner would need convince members that the debt limit fight won’t leave them similarly empty-handed. And if Republicans accept a clean CR now, they would likely be forced to pass a full fiscal year 2014 spending plan in mid-November.

Republicans think the debt limit provides better leverage for extracting concessions. For starters, it polls better than shutting down the government over Obamacare.

#### The GOP will cave on the CR – the real fight will be on the debt ceiling

**Stein, 9/25/13 –** politics reporter for the Huffington Post (Sam, Huffington Post, “House Republicans Unlikely To Touch Obamacare In Next Government Funding Offer” http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/09/25/obamacare-2013\_n\_3991186.html)

Now comes the waiting.

With the Senate set to dispatch an always-futile effort to pass government funding legislation that defunds the president's health care law, lawmakers in both chambers of Congress are already considering the options before them.

Lawmakers moved hastily to talks on Wednesday -- just hours after Sen. Ted Cruz (R-Texas) ended a 21-hour-plus speech meant to encourage lawmakers to support the defunding effort -- with attention focused on two offices.

House Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) and Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.) hold most of the power in the remaining few days of a government shutdown showdown before the government runs out of money to operate at the end of September. Republican aides in both chambers feel that Boehner's hand has been strengthened by Cruz's inability to move the debate in the Senate. But they caution that Reid could still gum up any House plans by keeping Senate Democrats united.

That's why four separate senior aides from both chambers say they would be very surprised if Boehner turned around and tried to craft another short-term continuing resolution that sought major changes to the president's health care law.

On Tuesday night, reports emerged that House Republicans were considering adding a one-year delay to the law's individual mandate in their next legislative offer. But sources on the Hill quickly put a stop to the suggestions.

One top GOP aide said putting that provision into the next draft of a continuing resolution (CR) to fund the government was not "at all likely," in part because the party has already decided to make a delay to the mandate a part of their proposal for lifting the debt ceiling in mid-October.

A Senate Republican aide echoed that theory. When asked whether the party would touch Obamacare during the next CR debate, the aide responded, "I seriously doubt it."

Part of the problem is simple math. If Republicans were to turn around and try to tinker with the health care law as part of a continuing resolution deal, it would be defeated in the Senate. One top Democratic aide in that chamber called a mandate-delay "dead on arrival." Even if it got through the Senate, an Obama administration official confirmed that there was zero chance the president would support such a measure.

So how does Boehner deal with this reality as well as the vocal community of House conservatives who demand that he stand firm on defunding or derailing Obamacare? One possibility, speculated on by multiple Hill sources, is that he quickly unveils a debt limit bill to placate that faction of his caucus; or even holds a vote on such a bill next week. After that, he could pass a "clean" continuing resolution.

### AT: Obama won’t negotiate

#### Our disad doesn’t require him to negotiate – the point is that he needs to stand firm and use his political capital to maintain unity with Democrats. The perception of unity and focus will be enough for the GOP to cave – that’s Milbank.

#### Obama’s ‘no negotiation’ strategy is the correct approach, but it’s nuanced – there eventually will be negotiations, but standing firm against holding the debt ceiling hostage has to be red line

**Irwin, 9/27/13** – Washington Post columnist (Neil, “Here’s what Obama was really saying about the debt ceiling” http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2013/09/27/heres-what-obama-was-really-saying-about-the-debt-ceiling/)

We probably shouldn't take the president's claim that he will not negotiate on the debt ceiling at all at face value. There have regularly been negotiations in the past between Congress and the White House over concessions that will accompany a debt ceiling increase. As Glenn Kessler notes, that has even included non-budget-related items.

But the president is arguing something a little more subtle: That he will not engage in debt ceiling negotiations with a gun to his head. If Republicans were to acknowledge up front that they will move legislation to raise the debt ceiling in plenty of time to prevent a new financial crisis, but that they need a few concessions here and there to make the vote palatable, the president would almost certainly play ball.

What he is signaling he won't do is engage in a negotiation where the other side has a combination of utterly unrealistic expectations (undoing the president's greatest legislative victory, less than a year after he won reelection) and a threat to risk global financial chaos to get it (by allowing a default).

Think of it as a negotiation in a different context, over selling a house. Obama has a house for sale, and his asking price is $300,000. He is facing an opponent (the hardline wing of the House Republican party) who is offering $1,000 and threatening to blow up the house if there is no deal.

Obama isn't saying he won't negotiate. He's saying he'll only negotiate once the offering price is something plausible, say $200,000, and the threat to blow up the house is off the table.

#### And capital is key to that effort – it’s not about bargaining – it’s about focus – the plan’s expenditure of capital prevents Obama from maintaining a consistent message on the debt ceiling

**Moore, 9/10/13 -** Guardian's US finance and economics editor.(Heidi, “Syria: the great distraction” The Guardian, http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2013/sep/10/obama-syria-what-about-sequester)

The country will crash into the debt ceiling in mid-October, which would be an economic disaster, especially with a government shutdown looming at the same time. These are deadlines that Congress already learned two years ago not to toy with, but memories appear to be preciously short.

The Federal Reserve needs a new chief in three months, someone who will help the country confront its raging unemployment crisis that has left 12 million people without jobs. The president has promised to choose a warm body within the next three weeks, despite the fact that his top pick, Larry Summers, would likely spark an ugly confirmation battle – the "fight of the century," according to some – with a Congress already unwilling to do the President's bidding.

Congress was supposed to pass a farm bill this summer, but declined to do so even though the task is already two years late. As a result, the country has no farm bill, leaving agricultural subsidies up in the air, farmers uncertain about what their financial picture looks like, and a potential food crisis on the horizon.

The two main housing agencies, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, have been in limbo for four years and are desperately in need of reform that should start this fall, but there is scant attention to the problem.

These are the problems going unattended by the Obama administration while his aides and cabinet members have been wasting the nation's time making the rounds on television and Capitol Hill stumping for a profoundly unpopular war. The fact that all this chest-beating was for naught, and an easy solution seems on the horizon, belies the single-minded intensity that the Obama White House brought to its insistence on bombing Syria.

More than one wag has suggested, with the utmost reason, that if Obama had brought this kind of passion to domestic initiatives, the country would be in better condition right now. As it is, public policy is embarrassingly in shambles at home while the administration throws all of its resources and political capital behind a widely hated plan to get involved in a civil war overseas.

The upshot for the president may be that it's easier to wage war with a foreign power than go head-to-head with the US Congress, even as America suffers from neglect.

This is the paradox that President Obama is facing this fall, as he appears to turn his back on a number of crucial and urgent domestic initiatives in order to spend all of his meager political capital on striking Syria.

Syria does present a significant humanitarian crisis, which has been true for the past two years that the Obama administration has completely ignored the atrocities of Bashar al-Assad.

Two years is also roughly the same amount of time that key domestic initiatives have also gone ignored as Obama and Congress engage in petty battles for dominance and leave the country to run itself on a starvation diet imposed by sequestration cuts. Leon Panetta tells the story of how he tried to lobby against sequestration only to be told:

Leon, you don't understand. The Congress is resigned to failure.

Similarly, those on Wall Street, the Federal Reserve, those working at government agencies, and voters themselves have become all too practiced at ignoring the determined incompetence of those in Washington.

Political capital – the ability to horse-trade and win political favors from a receptive audience – is a finite resource in Washington. Pursuing misguided policies takes up time, but it also **eats up credibility in asking for the next favor.** It's fair to say that congressional Republicans, particularly in the House, have no love for Obama and are likely to oppose anything he supports. That's exactly the reason the White House should stop proposing policies as if it is scattering buckshot and **focus with intensity** on the domestic tasks it wants to accomplish, **one at a time**.

### link debate

#### US investment in Mexico controversial

McAllister, 13 – journalist for Reuters (Edward, “For Obama and Pena Nieto, a delicate 'first dance' around energy”, Reuters, 5-2-13, http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/05/02/us-energy-usa-mexico-idUSBRE9410GN20130502)//KG

(Reuters) - When the conversation between President Barack Obama and his newly elected Mexican counterpart Enrique Pena Nieto turns to the controversial topic of energy during their meeting this week, both are apt to step carefully. The two countries have abruptly changed positions over the past decade: Mexico, once the growing energy power, is struggling to maintain production; the United States, once a guaranteed importer, is enjoying a lucrative energy boom. However, the thorny issues of foreign investment in Mexico's oil production sector or swapping different types of crude oil between the two nations will likely only be brought up in private, if at all. Although Mexico's aging refineries could operate more efficiently using some of the light crude emerging from U.S. oilfields, state oil and gas monopoly Pemex has long avoided incremental imports in order to maintain its reliance on the heavier crude produced domestically. Meanwhile, U.S. pipeline exports of natural gas to Mexico have surged, and could double within a few years as new projects link Latin America's second-largest economy with major U.S. producing regions, despite concerns in the United States that exports could push prices higher at home. Less divisive topics, such as climate change and how to improve cross-border energy efficiency, are expected to be discussed, Sergio Alcocer, Mexico's deputy foreign minister responsible for the United States, told Reuters. "This is more like the first dance of the season," said Bill O'Grady, chief markets strategist at Confluence Investment Management. "You get to see each other, get to know each other. But Mexico is still trying to figure out how to reform its own state oil company." SOME KIND OF A SWAP? Mexican oil and gas output remains flat while national demand increases, creating a dilemma for Pena Nieto, whose opponents vigorously oppose foreign investment in the country's energy sector. Although Mexican crude is a staple for Gulf Coast refineries, crude oil imports from Mexico have dropped a third over the past decade, sinking below 1 million barrels per day last year for the first time since 1994, according to government data. Mexico has duly shifted its focus. A month ago Pemex touted a new two-year deal to boost crude exports to China by 30,000 bpd. Talk of some kind of oil "swap" has also circulated, based on the idea that U.S. producers could get a better price for their light-sweet crude in Mexico while Texas and Louisiana refineries built to run on heavy-sour grades could get more of that type of oil from Mexico, albeit at lesser rates than in the past. There is little indication yet that Pemex is angling for U.S. shale oil, or that U.S. companies are pressing to sell it. GAS BONANZA As lawmakers engage in an increasingly fierce debate in Washington over whether natural gas exports would drive up fuel prices at home, foreign companies are racing to export more to Mexico, where demand is growing fast. U.S. natural gas exports to Mexico rose by 24 percent in 2012 to all-time highs, according to U.S. government data. The capacity to export will double by the end of 2014 as Mexican power plants hook up to pipelines running from the giant Eagle Ford play in Texas and further afield. Companies like Sempra Energy, Japan's Mitsui and Kinder Morgan are all planning to build new pipelines in Mexico, potentially reducing its dependence on imported LNG from overseas. Alejandro Martinez, the top natural gas executive at Pemex, said exports of U.S. gas to Mexico and Mexican oil to the United States present "a natural exchange" for the two countries. "I think we have to have a much greater integration," he said in an interview with Reuters this week. INVESTMENT ESSENTIAL Whether Obama and Nieto will discuss the more delicate matter of Mexico's allowing foreign investment in its struggling oil sector is unclear. Development of the country's large shale formations is still on hold as it considers its options. Mexico has the fourth-largest shale gas resources in the world after the United States, China and Argentina, according to a U.S. government report on global shale deposits in 2011, though it remains to be seen how they will be developed. Pena Nieto has pledged to open up Mexican oil production and exploration to more outside investment in order to ramp up growth. "When push comes to shove, it's U.S. companies that have the technology and experience to help Mexico develop its deepwater and onshore unconventional resources," said Ed Morse, managing director of commodity research at Citi Group. Traditionalists who view Pemex as a symbol of Mexican self-sufficiency strongly oppose the prospect. Jorge Buendia, political analyst and director of polling firm Buendia & Laredo, said Mexico was therefore likely to avoid open talk of oil and gas with the United States for now, though "back-room" discussions would no doubt take place. Raising the subject frankly would lay the new president open to accusations that he was selling Mexico out to those looking "to steal" its oil, and imply that the industry was falling behind, Buendia added. "The current situation doesn't lend itself at all to bringing this subject up in public."

#### Intense partisanship between house and senate tube Obama’s political capital – empirics prove controversy

**Leone 12** (Steve, Associate Editor of Renewable Energy World, "Part 2: Political Reality and the Way Forward for Renewable Energy," 4/3/12, http://www.renewableenergyworld.com/rea/news/article/2012/04/part-2-political-reality-and-the-way-forward-for-renewable-energy)

New Hampshire, U.S.A. -- Political heavyweights know this about their rough-and-tumble game – you project victory long before the results are in. And when you think you've won, you never give your opponent an opening. In Washington, it’s hard enough to craft legislation even in relatively amicable times. In the tense atmosphere on the Hill today, meaningful legislation takes a ringside seat, and the game becomes theater. That’s where we are now. In one corner is the House budget, essentially the Republican Party’s line in the sand that’s been drawn over the size of the federal government. A key component of this is the federal government’s more limited role in supporting a clean energy future. In the other corner is the White House and the Democrat-controlled Senate, which has vowed to stonewall any legislation that it says caters to the super-wealthy and the entrenched fossil fuels industry. Like two tired boxers in the ring, they’re content to leave it in the hands of the judges — in this case the voters, who will in many ways determine the force with which our federal government pursues a national policy built on clean energy. But the real prospects for any meaningful legislation is likely to come after the election, when the rhetoric cools and when political capital comes due. Until then, most industry observers don’t expect much chance of any real federal renewable energy legislation passing through a divided Congress. That means no Clean Energy Standard, no revival of the 1603 Treasury grant program, no extension of the Production Tax Credit until the end of the year at the earliest. There are just too few vehicles that can be used to pass any of the measures, and too little trust between key negotiators to find find common ground. One of the last best hopes — the transportation bill — included an amendment that addressed some of these concerns. Ultimately, the amendment went nowhere, and the renewable industry was left looking months down the road to when something could get resolved. The question now is will it be too late. For 1603 to be brought back to life, it would require a major shift in thinking, especially in the House. The PTC has a better shot, but international players in the wind industry are already indicating that they’ll get out of the market if the credit tied to energy produced expires. Will they wait around until the end of the year to see if it can be revived? It’s increasingly looking like the answer may be no.

#### Even if shielding blame used to be true, Obama is a Velcro – he’ll get blamed for unpopular policies

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

If Ronald Reagan was the classic Teflon president, Barack **Obama is made of Velcro.** Through two terms, Reagan eluded much of the responsibility for recession and foreign policy scandal. In less than two years, Obama has become **ensnared in blame**. Hoping to **better insulate Obama**, White House aides have sought to **give other** Cabinet **officials a higher profile** and additional public exposure. They are also crafting new ways to explain the president's policies to a skeptical public. **But Obama remains the colossus** of his administration — to a point where trouble anywhere in the world is often his to solve. The president is on the hook to repair the Gulf Coast oil spill disaster, stabilize Afghanistan, help fix Greece's ailing economy and do right by Shirley Sherrod, the Agriculture Department official fired as a result of a misleading fragment of videotape What's **not sticking** to Obama is a legislative track record that his recent predecessors might envy. **Political dividends** from passage of a healthcare overhaul or a financial regulatory bill **have been fleeting**

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

### at: fiat solves the link

**1. No it doesn’t**—even if it happens immediately that doesn’t shield blame, if people dislike the plan they would be more upset they didn’t get to debate it.

**2. Hoses neg ground**—politics is a core generic an a measure of the opportunity cost of the plan, actions have political consequences and are perceived in congress

### at: intrinsicness

**Reject the team—create a strategic cost to instrinsicness or they will always make blips that end the round if we drop them, voting neg here deters future abuse**

**Anti-topical**—our disad proves a bill IS an opportunity cost of the plan because they make it politically impossible, means they have to fiat passage of an extra-topical item which crushes all stable offense and makes them a moving target.

**Neg ground**—everything but impact turns can be fiated through, this hoses generic strategies that we need to have a shot even if they aren’t perfectly specific.

**Not reciprocal**—we get to test their internal links as a response to the fiat of the plan, letting them choose a plan AND blow off these disads is more biased towards them.