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### T G2G

#### 1. Interpretation – economic engagement is only *direct aid* and *trade agreements* – the AFF is *third-party* engagement

Daga 13 (Sergio Daga, director of research at Politicas Publicas para la Libertad, Bolivia, visiting senior policy analyst, Heritage Foundation, M.A. Economics, University of Chile, B.A. Economics, Catholic University of Bolivia, also trained at Libertad y Desarrollo, Chile, and the Atlas Economic Research Foundation, United States, “Economics of the 2013-2014 Debate Topic: U.S. Economic Engagement Toward Cuba, Mexico or Venezuela,” National Center for Policy Analysis, Debate Backgrounder No. 7, 5-15-2013, http://www.ncpa.org/pdfs/Message\_to\_Debaters\_6-7-13.pdf)

Economics is the branch of human knowledge concerned with the ¶ satisfaction of human wants through the production of goods and ¶ services, and the exchange of those goods and services between two ¶ or more individuals. Thus, economics encompasses human activities ¶ from simple barter between two individuals to international trade ¶ between firms or governments. Many of these economic activities ¶ are regulated by government, and some are outlawed. Trade and ¶ other economic activities that cross national borders — such as ¶ sales of goods and services, travel, migration or transfers of money ¶ — are regulated by both the government of the originating country ¶ and the government of the destination country. The government ¶ itself could be an economic actor, buying and selling from other ¶ governments or firms in other countries; or the government could ¶ regulate the private economic activities of individuals and firms.¶ Economic engagement between or among countries can take ¶ many forms, but this document will focus on government-to-government engagement through 1) international trade agreements ¶ designed to lower barriers to trade; and 2) government foreign ¶ aid; next, we will contrast government-to-government economic ¶ engagement with private economic engagement through 3) ¶ international investment, called foreign direct investment; and 4) ¶ remittances and migration by individuals. All of these areas are ¶ important with respect to the countries mentioned in the debate ¶ resolution; however, when discussing economic engagement by ¶ the U.S. federal government, some issues are more important with ¶ respect to some countries than to others.

#### *Prefer it* –

#### First, *limits* – any regulation, product, or private action is justified – infinite unpredictable AFFs

#### Second, *ground* – means-focus is key to stable disad and counterplan prep – they create a race to shallow, unpredictable single-sector strategies

### Neolib

#### Movements against neoliberalism are growing in Latin America and spill over -- the plans reifies neoliberalism --- ethics require we de-link to preserve the environment and indigenous culture.

Harris 8 (Richard L Harris: Professor of Global Studies at California State University, Monterey Bay; Managing Editor of the Journal of Developing Societies (SAGE India); and Coordi­ nating Editor of Latin American Perspectives (SAGE USA). “Latin America’s Response to Neoliberalism and Globalization,” http://www.nuso.org/upload/articulos/3506\_2.pdf)

The economic, political and social development of the Latin American and Caribbean countries is obstructed by the power relations and international structures that regulate the world capitalist system. The structures of this system provide a hierarchical political and economic exoskeleton that constrains all national efforts to pursue any significant degree of self-directed, inward-oriented, balanced and environmentally sustainable development. Indeed, the geopolitical power structures that preserve and support the world capitalist system have made it almost impossible for the governments of the core as well as the peripheral countries in this system to pursue a path of inward-oriented, equitable, democratically controlled and environmentally sustainable development (Amin 2001b:20). Since the 1980s, inter-American relations and the economic, political and social development of the Latin American and Caribbean states have been shaped by these geo­ political structures and the neoliberal strategic agenda put forward by the government of the United States of America (USA), the major transnational corporations and the three major international financial institutions (IFIs) that operate in the Latin American and Caribbean region (Harris and Nef, 2008). This later group of IFIs includes the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank, and the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB). The policies of these IFIs based in Washington generally follow the dictates of the government of the USA due to the controlling influence that it exercises over these institutions. Their agenda for the Latin American and Caribbean region gives priority to promoting and protecting the interests of the major investors and transnational corporations that are largely based in the USA and operate in the region. It also serves to maintain and strengthen the geopolitical hegemony of the USA over the Western Hemisphere (Harris and Nef). But conditions are changing. Washington’s neoliberal agenda for controlling the capi­ talist development of the Western Hemisphere and maintaining US hegemony over the region is increasingly threatened by a progressive alternative agenda for the regio­ nal integration of the Latin American and Caribbean countries that has begun to gain widespread support in the region. This alternative agenda for the region calls for the autonomous economic development of the region free of the hegemonic control and influence of the USA and the IFIs based in Washington. Not only does this type of development pose a fundamental threat to the hegemony of the USA in the region, it threatens the dominance of transnational capital throughout the Americas. Moreover, it also poses a significant threat to the global expansion and integration of the world capitalist system in general and to the global hegemonic coalition led by the government and transnational corporations of the USA. Today, political and economic strategies are being developed for moving from the prevailing export-oriented neoliberal model of economic development to new in­ ward-oriented models of sustainable development, tailored to the diverse conditions, economic capacities, political structures, natural endowments and cultural values of the societies involved. Moreover, a growing number of international and regional civil society organizations have emerged in recent years to create such alternatives. What the forums, networks, programs, and activities of these various types of organizations reveal is that there is a growing international network of organizations and social movements committed to promoting new, more equitable forms of international cooperation and regulation that support inward-oriented and sustainable development as well as genuine democracy at the regional and national levels. At the same time, these organizations argue that the present global trading regime that has been erected under the WTO should and can be replaced by a new global trading system that replaces the present system of so-called free but in fact unfair trade, with a sys­ tem that ensures «fair trade» and promotes South-South economic exchange and coo­ peration. Most of the progressive alternatives advocated by these organizations and the new left-leaning governments that have been elected to office in the region give priority to aligning the external relations of the countries in the region to the internal needs of the majority of the population. That is to say, decisions about what to export and what to import should be aligned with the needs of the population rather than the interests of transnational capitalists and transnational corporations or the hegemonic interests of the USA. Some of these alternative strategies involve what Walden Bello (2002) has referred to as «deglobalization.» That is to say, they involve unlinking the economies of these peripheral capitalist societies from the advanced capitalist centers of the world economy, particularly in the USA. They also involve throwing off the constraints that have been imposed upon the economic policies and structures of the­ se countries by the IFIs (IMF, World Bank, and IDB), the WTO and the other agents and regulatory regimes that regulate the world capitalist system. In fact, there appears to be growing interest throughout Latin America in revivifying the Pan-American ideal of unification, currently perhaps best expressed in Hugo Chávez’ Bolivarian dream of turning South America into a regional economic hegemon (DeLong, 2005). The governments of Bolivia, Cuba, Ecuador, Nicaragua and Uruguay have indicated they want to join the government of Venezuela in creating a regional union. It has been proposed that this coalescing continental confederation should shift the region’s extra-continental trade towards Europe, Asia and South Africa and away from North America. The prospect of this happening appears to have alarmed Washington more than the increasing number of electoral triumphs of leftist politicians in the region (Delong). There has also been considerable talk in the region about creating a single currency for the South American countries that would be modeled on and perhaps tied to the Euro rather than the US Dollar. This discussion is symptomatic of what appears to be an emerging desire to create an integrated economic and political community that is strikingly different from the type of hemispheric economic integration scheme being pursued by the Washington and its allies in the region (DeLong). Moreover, there is an increasing tendency in the region to find alternatives to trading with the USA. In particular, several Latin American nations (Brazil, Cuba, Venezuela and Chile) have been strengthening their economic relations with Asia, particularly with China. But the widespread popular opposition to neoliberalism and so-called globalization, and the shift to the Left in the region’s politics, represent much more than a serious challenge to US hegemony, they also represent a serious threat to the existing pattern of capitalist development in the region. Central to Washington’s strategy for the hemisphere has been the imposition of a neoliberal model of capitalist development on the region which involves the increasing integration of the region’s economies into a hemispheric ‘free trade’ area or rather a trade bloc that is dominated by the USA. This project is itself an essential part of the strategy of the USA for the domination of the global economy by its transnational corporations. The restructuring of the economies of the region under the mantra of neoliberalism and the banner of globalization has been aimed at giving the USA-based transnational corporations and investors free reign within the region and a strong hemispheric base from which to dominate the world economy In opposition to the neoliberal, polyarchical and globalizing model of development that has been imposed by the government of the USA and its allies in the region, the growing movement for an alternative form of development that is both genuinely democratic, equitable and environmentally sustainable appears to be gaining ground in various parts of Latin America and the Caribbean. This alternative model of development requires the reorganization and realignment of the existing economies in the region. It also requires the replacement of the existing political regimes, which serve the interests of the transnational bloc of social forces that are behind the integration of the region into the new global circuits of accumulation and production that the major trans­ national corporations and the IFIs have been constructing since the 1970s. In addition to fundamental economic changes, most of the existing pseudo-democratic political regimes in the region need to be thoroughly democratized so that they are responsive to and capable of serving the needs and interests of the majority of the people rather than the ruling polyarchies and the transnational corporations operating in the region. An essential requirement for realigning the region’s economies so that they produce people-centered and environmentally sustainable development is the integration of these economies into a regional economic and political union that has the resources, structures and the power to operate independently of the government of the USA and the transnational corporations based in the USA as well as in the European Union and Japan. If this type of regional integration takes place, it will enable the Latin American and Caribbean states to break free of the hegemonic influence of the USA, and reverse the denationalization (‘globalization’) of the Latin American and Caribbean economies. Instead of the corporate-driven hemispheric integration of the region under the hegemony of the USA, a new system of regional economic cooperation and both equitable as well as environmentally sustainable development is desperately needed to improve the lives of the vast majority of the people living in Latin America and the Caribbean. This type of regional, equitable and sustainable development can only be success­ fully carried out by truly democratically elected political leaders with broad-based popular support who are sincerely committed to achieving this alternative rather than the elitist neoliberal model. It probably will also require democratic socialist political institutions and structures of production and distribution. Regionalism has been the dream of the democratic left for some time. The European Union has its origins in the French socialist dream of ending Franco-German enmity through unifying Europe, and African regionalism was the vision of African socialists such as Julius Nyerere of Tanzania who saw regional integration as the only means to progress beyond tribalism and colonialism and create a united and democratic Africa (Faux, 2001:4). Viewed from the perspective of those who want to create a people-cen­ tered, democratic, equitable and environmentally sustainable social order in the Ame­ ricas, the corporate-dominated process of capitalist pseudo-globalization taking place in the region and around the world urgently needs to be replaced by what Samir Amin has referred to as a new system of «pluricentric regulated globalization» (Amin, 2001a). This alternative form of globalization requires the development of regional economic and political unions in Africa, Asia, Latin America, the Caribbean, the Middle East and elsewhere, which collaboratively promote people-centered, democratic and envi­ ronmentally sustainable forms of development on a regional basis. According to Amin, these regional unions of states are needed to collaborate as partners in collecti­ vely regulating the global restructuring of the world economy for the benefit of the vast majority of humanity rather than the transnational corporations and the northern centers of the world capitalist system in the USA, Europe and Japan. This type of regional-based regulative order is needed to regulate and redirect inter­ national economic, social, and political relations so that these relations serve the inte­ rests and needs of the vast majority of the world’s population. The present power structures and regulatory regime of the world capitalist system support the transna­ tional corporate-driven restructuring and denationalization of the economies of both the societies at the core and in the periphery of this system. The Latin American and Caribbean countries need to ‘de-link’ step-by-step from this exploitative and inequitable system. They need to redirect and restructure their eco­ nomies so that they serve the needs of the majority of their people while also protec­ ting their natural resources and ecosystems. The alternative policies of economic, poli­ tical and social development proposed and in some cases adopted by the new leftist leaders, the progressive civil society organizations and their supporters, combined with the project of regional integration associated with the new Unión de Naciones Suramericanas (UNASUR), are significant indications of unprecedented and pro­ found transformation unfolding in the Americas. A growing number of civil society organizations and social movements throughout the Americas are pressuring the governments of the region to follow what the pro­ gressive civil society networks such as the Alianza Social Continental/ Hemispheric Social Alliance (ASC/HSA) describes as a regional model of integration that supports the environmentally sustainable and democratic development of all the societies in the region (see ASC-HSA, 2006). The ASC/HSA also contends that the UNASUR pro­ ject and the Bolivarian dream of unification is threatened by the so-called free trade agreements that Washington has negotiated with Chile, Colombia, Peru, the Central American countries and the Dominican Republic. As the ASC/HSA makes clear in its documents and public information campaigns, these agreements compromise the national sovereignty, obstruct the local production of medicines, threaten public health, facilitate the profit-driven privatization of water and vital services such as health and sanitation, and threaten the survival of indigenous cultures, biodiversity, food sovereignty, and local control over natural resources. The «Alternatives for the Americas» proposal developed by this inter-American network of progressive civil society organizations and social movements calls on all governments in the region to subordinate trade and investments to sustainability and environmental protection as well as social justice and local democratic control over economic and social development (ASC/HSA 2002:5). The growing number and political influence of these kinds of networks, organizations and movements provide unquestionable evidence of the emergence of the social for­ ces and political conditions that Panitch (1996:89) and others (Harris, 1995:301-302; Jo­ nas and McCaughan, 1994) predicted in the 1990s would arise in opposition to neoli­ beralism, corporate-dominated pseudo globalization and the extension and consolida­ tion of the hegemony of the USA. It now seems increasingly possible that these forces and the political mobilization that they have helped to create will transform the politi­ cal regimes in the region as well as the nature of inter-American relations, bring about the regional integration of the Latin American countries and free these countries from US hegemony and the form of ‘turbo-capitalism’ to which they have been subjected. At this point, we can only speak in general terms about the new model(s) of develop­ ment that will replace the neoliberal model of uneven and inequitable development that has pillaged most of the region.

#### Environment collapse causes extinction – tipping points are coming

**Foster et al., Oregon sociology professor, 2010**

(John, The Ecological Rift: Capitalism’s War on the Earth, pg 14-8, ldg)

It is common today to see this ecological rift simply in terms of climate change, which given the dangers it poses and the intractable problems for capitalism it presents has grabbed all the headlines. But recently scientists—in a project led by Johan Rockstrom at the Stockholm Resilience Centre, and including Crutzen and the leading U.S. climatologist, James Hansen—have developed an analysis of nine "planetary boundaries" that are crucial to maintaining an earth-system environment in which humanity can exist safely. Climate change is only one of these, and the others are ocean acidification, stratospheric ozone depletion, the nitrogen and the phosphorus cycles, global freshwater use, change in land use, biodiversity loss, atmospheric aerosol loading, and chemical pollution. For the last two, atmospheric aerosol loading and chemical pollution, there are not yet adequate physical measures, but for the other seven processes clear boundaries have been designated. Three of the boundaries—those for climate change, ocean acidification, and stratospheric ozone depletion—can be regarded as tipping points, which at a certain level lead to vast qualitative changes in the earth system that would threaten to destabilize the planet, causing it to depart from the "boundaries for a healthy planet." The boundaries for the other four processes—the nitrogen and phosphorus cycles, freshwater use, change in land use, and biodiversity loss—are better viewed as signifying the onset of irreversible environmental degradation. Three processes have already crossed their planetary boundaries: climate change, the nitrogen cycle, and biodiversity loss. Each of these can therefore be seen, in our terminology, as constituting an extreme "rift" in the planetary system. Stratospheric ozone depletion was an emerging rift in the 1990s, but is now stabilizing, even subsiding. Ocean acidification, the phosphorus cycle, global freshwater use, and land system change are all rapidly emerging global rifts, though not yet extreme. Our knowledge of these rifts can be refined, and more plan-etary rifts may perhaps be discovered in the future. Nevertheless, the analysis of planetary boundaries and rifts, as they present themselves today, helps us understand the full scale of the ecological crisis now confronting humanity. The simple point is that the planet is being assaulted on many fronts as the result of human-generated changes in the global environment.4 In the planetary boundaries model developed by Rockstrom and his associates, each ecological process has a preindustrial value (that is, the level reached before the advent of industrial capitalism), a pro-posed boundary, and a current status. In the case of climate change the preindustrial value was 280 parts per million (ppm) of carbon dioxide concentration in the atmosphere; its proposed boundary is 350 ppm (necessary if tipping points such as a catastrophic rise in sea level are to be avoided); and its current status is 390 ppm. Biodiversity loss is measured by the rate of extinction (number of species lost per million species per year). The preindustrial annual rate, referred to as the "natural" or "background" rate of species loss, was 0.1-1 per million; the proposed boundary is 10 per million; whereas the current rate is greater than 100 per million (100-1,000 times the preindustrial back-ground rate). With respect to the nitrogen cycle, the boundary is con-cerned with the amount of nitrogen removed from the atmosphere for human use in millions of tons per year. Before the rise of industrial capitalism (more specifically before the discovery of the Haber-Bosch process early in the twentieth century), the amount of nitrogen removed from the atmosphere was 0 tons. The proposed boundary, to avoid irreversible degradation of the earth system, is 35 million tons per year. The current status is 121 million tons per year. In each of these extreme rifts, the stability of the earth system as we know it is being endangered. We are at red alert status. If business as usual continues, the world is headed within the next few decades for major tipping points along with irreversible environmental degradation, threatening much of humanity. Biodiversity loss at current and projected rates could result in the loss of upward of a third of all living species this century. The pumping of more and more nitrogen into the biosphere is resulting in the creation of dead zones in lakes and ocean regions (a phenomenon also affected by phosphorus). Each one of these rifts by itself constitutes a global ecological crisis. These ruptures reveal that the limits of the earth system are not determined by the sheer physical scale of the economy but by the particular rifts in natural processes that are generated.5 The emerging rifts in the other ecological processes, which have not yet overshot their boundaries, are scarcely less threatening. For the phosphorus cycle (categorized as part of a single planetary boundary together with the nitrogen cycle), the preindustrial quantity flowing into the oceans per year was approximately 1 million tons; the proposed boundary is 11 million tons (based on the assumption that ocean anoxic events begin at ten times the background rate); and its current status is already 8.5 to 9.5 million tons. In regard to ocean acidification, the value refers to a global mean saturation state of arag-onite (a form of calcium carbonate) in surface seawater. A decline in the number indicates an increase in the acidity of the ocean. The preindustrial value was 3.44 (surface ocean aragonite saturation state); the proposed boundary—after which there would be a massive die-down of shell-forming organisms—is 2.75; and the current status is 2.90. In the case of freshwater use, the preindustrial annual consumption of freshwater in km3 (cubic kilometers) was 415; the estimated boundary is 4,000 km3 (marking a threshold beyond which the irreversible degradation and collapse of terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems is likely); and the current rate of consumption is 2,600 km3. For change in land use, the parameters are set by the percentage of global ice-free land surface converted to cropland. In preindustrial times, this percentage was very low. The proposed boundary is 15 percent (after which there is the danger of triggering catastrophic effects on ecosystems), and the current status is 11.7 percent. In each of these emerging rifts, we are faced with an orange alert status, in which we are rapidly moving toward extreme conditions, whereby we will pass the planetary boundaries, undermining the earth system that supports the conditions of life. No measure for chemical pollution has yet been determined, but proposals include measuring the effects of persistent organic pollu-tants (otherwise known as POPs), plastics, endocrine disrupters, heavy metals, and nuclear waste on ecosystems and the earth system in general. Likewise, no measure has yet been determined for atmospheric aerosol loading (the overall particulate concentration in the atmosphere on a regional basis), which can disrupt monsoon systems, lead to health problems, and interact with climate change and freshwater boundaries. Stratospheric ozone depletion is the one previously emerging rift that was brought under control (as far as anthropogenic drivers were concerned) in the 1990s, reducing what was a rapidly growing threat to life on the planet due to an increase in ultraviolet radiation from the sun. The preindustrial value of ozone concentration was 290 (Dobson Units—the measurement of atmospheric ozone columnar density, where 1 Dobson Unit is defined as 0.01 millimeters thick under standard pressure and temperature); the proposed planetary boundary is a concentration of 276 (after which life on the planet would experience devastating losses); and the current status is 283. Between 60°S and 60°N latitude, the decline in stratospheric ozone concentrations has been halted. Nevertheless, it will take decades for the Antarctic ozone hole to disappear, and Arctic ozone loss will likely persist for decades. Life on the planet had a close call.6 The mapping out of planetary boundaries in this way gives us a better sense of the real threat to the earth system. Although in recent years the environmental threat has come to be seen by many as simply a question of climate change, protecting the planet requires that we attend to all of these planetary boundaries, and others not yet determined. The essential problem is the unavoidable fact that an expanding economic system is placing additional burdens on a fixed earth system to the point of planetary overload. It has been estimated that in the early 1960s humanity used half of the planet's biocapacity in a year. Today this has risen to an overshoot of 30 percent beyond the earth's regenerative capacity. Business-as-usual projections point to a state in which the ecological footprint of humanity will be equivalent to the regenerative capacity of two planets by the mid-2030s.7 Rockstrom and his associates concluded their article in Nature by stating: "The evidence so far suggests that, as along as the [planetary boundary] thresholds are not crossed, humanity has the freedom to pursue long-term social and economic development." Although this is undoubtedly true, what is obviously not addressed in this conclu-sion—but is clearly the point of their whole analysis—is that these thresholds have in some cases already been crossed and in other cases will soon be crossed with the continuation of business as usual. Moreover, this can be attributed in each and every case to a primary cause: the current pattern of global socioeconomic development, that is, the capitalist mode of production and its expansionary tendencies. The whole problem can be called "the global ecological rift," referring to the overall break in the human relation to nature arising from an alienated system of capital accumulation without end.'

#### Vote Neg to reject the Aff’s neoliberal economic engagement in favor of a commons-based approach. That solves and creates space to challenge neoliberalism

**De Angelis, East London political economy professor, 2003**

(Massimo, “Reflections on alternatives, commons and communities”, Winter, <http://www.commoner.org.uk/deangelis06.pdf>, DOA: 7-2-12, ldg)

This movement has posed the question of a plurality of “alternatives” to the social processes and arrangements that produce the horrors of modern global capital. In order to take the many calls for and practices of alternatives seriously, we have to make them relevant to the real people at the fringe or outside the movement. In other words, we want to move from movement to society not so much by persuading people to “join” our movement, but through a language and a political practice that by tracing the connections between diverse practices attempts to dissolve the distinctions between inside and outside the movement, i.e., actually moves ‘from movement to society’. To make the possibility of a new world that contains many worlds an actuality, we have to be able to shape our own discourse in such a way as to echo the needs and aspirations coming from below. We have to give coherence to their plurality, without imposing a model or reiterating dead ideologies. We need a discourse that helps to articulate the many alternatives that spring out of the points of crises of neoliberal capital, which seriously threaten to dispossess people of their livelihood and impose on them new or more intensified commodified patterns of life. We need a discourse that builds on the plurality of the many concrete struggles and their methods and help us to articulate a vision – not a plan – of the whole. Then we can better evaluate what are the global implications of our local struggles, as well as the local implications of global struggles for the building of a world that contains many worlds. But most of all, we need a discourse that recognizes the power we have to shape alternatives, at every level in society, that sets out from the simple fact that, contrarily to common belief, alternatives do exist, are everywhere and plural. To clarify, I think that every social node, that is every individual or network of individuals is a bearer of alternatives. This is evident not only when struggles erupt in any of the waged or unwaged local and trans-local nodes of social production. We just need to look around in the relative normality of daily routines to see that every social node “knows” of different ways to do things within its life-world and sphere of action longs for a different space in which things can be done in different ways. Each social node expresses needs and aspirations that are the basis of alternatives. For example: the alternative to working 10 hours a day is working 6; the alternative to poverty is access to the means of existence; the alternative to indignity is dignity; the alternative to building that dam and uprooting communities is not building that dam and leaving communities where they are; the alternative to tomatoes going rotten while transported on the back of an old woman for 20 miles is not GM tomatoes that do not rot, but access to land near home, or a home, or a road and a truck. Since every social node is aware of a spectrum of alternatives, the problem is simply how to make these alternatives actual? What resources are needed? How to coordinate alternatives in such a way that they are not pitted against each other as is the case of the competitive markets’ understanding of alternatives? How to solve the many existing problems without relying on the alienating coordinating mechanism of the market and creating instead social relations of mutual enrichment, dignity, and respect? These are I believe the bottom line questions on which a new political discourse must be based. Once we acknowledge the existence of the galaxy of alternatives as they emerge from concrete needs and aspirations, we can ground today’s new political discourse in the thinking and practice of the actualization and the coordination of alternatives, so as each social node and each individual within it has the power to decide and take control over their lives. It is this actualization and this coordination that rescues existing alternatives from the cloud of their invisibility, because alternatives, as with any human product, are social products, and they need to be recognized and validated socially. Our political projects must push their way through beyond the existing forms of coordination, beyond the visible fist of the state, beyond the invisible hand of competitive markets, and beyond the hard realities of their interconnections that express themselves in today forms of neoliberal governance, promoting cooperation through competition and community through disempowerment. As I will argue, this new political discourse is based on the project of defending and extending the space of commons, at the same time building and strengthening communities through the social fields.

### Debt Ceiling

#### Raising the debt ceiling is likely but uncertain – time is running out

Stuart 9-26 (Jim Stewart, political blogger, Princeton graduate, “Shutdown and/or Default,” 9-26-2013, http://jimstuartnewblog.blogspot.com/2013/09/shutdown-andor-default.html)

After today, four days to go before a possible shutdown. After that, seventeen days to possible default. What's the forecast? Here's what I see, albeit with little clarity:¶ Friday or Saturday the Senate will return a clean CR at sequester spending levels back to the House. Right now, don't think Boehner can pass a clean CR without relying on Democrats. He was hoping to pass an omnibus conditional debt ceiling resolution on Saturday, before the budget vote, to get his caucus to shift focus to the debt ceiling. This afternoon, he found he doesn't have the votes. People want to see what happens on the Budget CR. So Boehner must put a conditional CR back to the Senate, ensuring a Tuesday shutdown, or ask Democrats for help. If Democrats say yes without conditions, there will be no shutdown. If they ask for something, most likely moving the budget target off the sequester levels, we will have shutdown, since the Senate won't have time to respond before the midnight Monday deadline. Best Guess: Boehner will ask for Democratic help and pass a clean CR - so no Shutdown.¶ The debt ceiling could follow a similar trajectory: the House will pass a contingent debt ceiling resolution containing a long list of demands - one year Obamacare delay, the Keystone pipeline, drilling on federal lands and offshore, reverse new EPA carbon capture rules, cut back the wings of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, etc. The Senate will strip all this out and send back a clean 14 month debt ceiling increase resolution. Meanwhile a very high stakes game of chicken will be going on: Obama says he will not negotiate the debt ceiling; Boehner says he has to and ultimately will. Boehner has raised the expectations of the GOP caucus very high - saying the debt ceiling is the maximum point of leverage with the Democrats, and that is where the GOP can make the most progress. I am very clear that Obama will not budge on this, and that the Democratic leadership team in the House and Senate will back him up. Will Boehner realize this in time? In their last big negotiation in 2011, Obama caved to save the country from default. I think Republicans expect him to cave. Will they all realize their mistake in time? And if they do, will they turn back and pass a clean resolution? Best Guess: Boehner will figure it out and decide to move with a clean resolution just in time to get it signed before October 17.¶ This is a highly hopeful forecast and I am basing it mostly on my assessment of Boehner as a person who will do the right thing - not for himself, but for his Party and his country, once he sees there are no good alternatives. Do not think he will take the lead in causing a shutdown; nor will he refuse to take a path that prevents default just to please the base. I am not at all confident, though. I assign just a 50-60% probability to the above scenario - in other words, not very high.¶ And here's another low probability forecast: If the game plays out as above, we will land on October 18 with a very angry and frustrated GOP base, an ecstatic Democratic Party, a deeply wounded Speaker Boehner, and the next budget deadline coming up on November 15, less than 30 days away. I think there's a chance that Boehner, possibly realizing his time is up as Speaker, will lead a Grand Bargain negotiation with Obama (cancel the sequester, replace it with a mix of targeted cuts, new tax revenues from tax reform, and chained CPI for Medicare and Social Security) that will pass the House with Democratic votes and be signed into law.¶ Pretty far out, I admit. I give it a 30% chance. But that's not zero. And wouldn't that be a great day for the country!

#### PC is key

Lillis & Wasson 9-7 (Mike Lillis, and Erik Wasson, The Hill, “Fears of wounding Obama weigh heavily on Democrats ahead of vote,” 9-7-2013, http://thehill.com/homenews/house/320829-fears-of-wounding-obama-weigh-heavily-on-democrats#ixzz2fOPUfPNr)

The prospect of wounding President Obama is weighing heavily on Democratic lawmakers as they decide their votes on Syria. Obama needs all the political capital he can muster heading into bruising battles with the GOP over fiscal spending and the debt ceiling. Democrats want Obama to use his popularity to reverse automatic spending cuts already in effect and pay for new economic stimulus measures through higher taxes on the wealthy and on multinational companies. But if the request for authorization for Syria military strikes is rebuffed, some fear it could limit Obama's power in those high-stakes fights. That has left Democrats with an agonizing decision: vote "no" on Syria and possibly encourage more chemical attacks while weakening their president, or vote "yes" and risk another war in the Middle East. “I’m sure a lot of people are focused on the political ramifications,” a House Democratic aide said. Rep. Jim Moran (D-Va.), a veteran appropriator, said the failure of the Syria resolution would diminish Obama's leverage in the fiscal battles. "It doesn't help him," Moran said Friday by phone. "We need a maximally strong president to get us through this fiscal thicket. These are going to be very difficult votes."

#### Plan costs PC – particularly with Dems – CX

Phil Taylor 13, E&E Reporter, 1/9/13, “E&E: U.S.-Mexico transboundary agreement mired in Congress,” http://www.bromwichgroup.com/2013/01/ee-offshore-drilling-u-s-mexico-transboundary-agreement-mired-in-congress/

It is unclear who in the Senate objected to the agreement’s passage, but sources say it was likely out of concern for the process by which it was being passed rather than the substance of the agreement. ¶ That may stem in part from lingering uncertainty over whether the agreement is a treaty, which would require a two-thirds majority for Senate ratification, or an executive agreement, which would require implementing legislation to be passed by a majority in both chambers. ¶ Regardless, its failure was a surprise to staff on the ENR Committee who had crafted a news release in preparation for its passage but had to delete it after the agreement was blocked. ¶ According to the report by Foreign Relations Republicans, the Obama administration has yet to say whether the agreement is a treaty or an executive agreement but appears to prefer the latter. Mexico’s Senate ratified the agreement, suggesting it was interpreted as a treaty. ¶ If it is a treaty, a formal communication would need to be sent from the president to the Foreign Relations Committee, which would trigger hearings on the matter and allow Congress to interpret any ambiguous language in the agreement. ¶ That is important, because several provisions in the treaty “invite scrutiny and clarification,” according to the committee report. ¶ “The treaty doesn’t have every detail worked out,” said Neil Brown, a former adviser to Sen. Richard Lugar (R-Ind.) who was ranking member of the committee until his retirement earlier this month. ¶ For example, one section of the agreement calls for “common standards,” but it is unclear whether that requires companies to adopt U.S. safety and environmental standards or Mexico’s, which are considered less developed. Another area of the agreement creates a dispute resolution process without saying whether the arbitration is binding, the report said. ¶ The agreement would allow joint inspections by Interior’s BSEE and the Mexican government to ensure compliance with applicable laws. ¶ Some on the Foreign Relations Committee said they were miffed that the administration did not consult with them before pushing the agreement through in the lame duck.

#### Failure collapses global trade, investment and growth

Davidson 9-10 (Adam Davidson, 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.

#### Trigger nuclear wars – and turns multilat and global democracy

Merlini 11 (Cesare, nonresident senior fellow, Center on the United States and Europe, chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Italian Institute for International Affairs, “A Post-Secular World?” Survival, 53(2), 2011, ebsco, ldg)

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**.**

### Dodd-Frank PIC

#### The United States federal government should pass the Transboundary Hydrocarbons Agreement excluding Article 20.

#### The counterplan solves the whole aff and avoids the link to politics

Gary 13 (Ian Gary is the Senior Policy Manager for Extractive Industries at Oxfam America and the author of Oxfam America’s report “Ghana’s Big Test: Oil’s Challenge to Democratic Development.”April 9th, 2013, http://politicsofpoverty.oxfamamerica.org/author/ian-gary/#sthash.F7Bnwsac.dpuf)//moxley

We do have a big problem with an irrelevant provision inserted into the bill designed to weaken the payment disclosure requirements in Section 1504 of the Dodd-Frank Act, also known as the Cardin-Lugar provision. That law provides for the annual disclosure of payments made by oil, gas and mining companies to host governments around the world – final rules were issued by the SEC in August last year. H.R. 1613 would exempt any covered company from reporting payments from in accordance with any transboundary hydrocarbons agreement anywhere in the world.¶ The American Petroleum Institute (API) – backed by companies such as Exxon, Shell, Chevron and BP – is suing the SEC in federal court and is now hoping that its Congressional allies can help weaken this landmark law. Oxfam is intervening to defend the rule. Meanwhile, the European Union has reached agreement to put in place similar reporting requirements.¶ I spoke this week with Neil Brown who was, until very recently, a top Senate Republican aide working on energy issues for Senator Lugar, who was the ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. His response: “this exemption is unnecessary and inclusion would only forestall quick approval of this important agreement.”¶ He should know. As both the co-author of a Senate Foreign Relations Committee minority staff report for Senator Lugar on “Oil, Mexico and the Transboundary Agreement” as well as someone intimately familiar with the “Cardin-Lugar” provision in Dodd-Frank, Mr. Brown would know if the reporting requirements in Dodd-Frank Section 1504 present any issue in approving the US-Mexico TBA. The short answer – they don’t. The minority staff report envisions reporting under Section 1504 and says that under Section 1504 covered companies “would already have to disclose payments” to the SEC if “they invest in Mexico”.¶ The US-Mexico TBA requires that certain information be kept confidential unless disclosure is required by law. The TBA text demonstrates that the US and Mexico have already made the correct policy judgment that the specific confidentiality provisions of the TBA should be subordinated to each country’s commitment to openness and subject to each country’s disclosure requirements. Nothing in the TBA would require the exemption provided by H.R. 1613.¶ Tellingly, the Senate Energy Committee has introduced a bi-partisan bill, S. 812, sponsored by Senators Ron Wyden (D-OR) and Lisa Murkowski (R-AK) to approve the US-Mexico TBA, and it contains no Section 1504 exemption provision. If Congress is truly interested in approving this agreement and providing the “rules of the road” for joint development of oil and gas reserves straddling the US-Mexico maritime boundary, then it should adopt the clean Senate bill without the reporting exemption.¶ Former Senator Jeff Bingaman, past Senate Energy Committee chairman, told Reuters that the exemption proposed by the House “complicates things significantly” for passage of the bill. Referring to the Section 1504 exemption language, he said, “They’ve added in some things that are going to make it difficult to pass in that form.”¶ The Mexican Congress ratified the TBA a year ago, and the Obama administration – and the oil industry – would like to see it approved. The Obama administration, though, has made clear that implementation of Section 1504 is a priority.¶ In a letter to Oxfam, Sec. of State Kerry said, “The Department of State and Administration strongly support transparency in the extractives sectors, as outlined in Section 1504 of Dodd-Frank, and the new rule issued by the SEC. The new SEC standard directly advances our foreign policy interest in increasing transparency and reducing corruption, particularly in the oil, gas and mineral sectors.” ¶ My guess is that the oil industry lobby wants this TBA approved far more than it wants this unnecessary Section 1504 exemption. Surya Gunasekara, a tax and trade counsel with the American Petroleum Institute told me that there is “no doubt” that API cares more about Gulf of Mexico access than the proposed Section 1504 exemption.

### Pemex

Mexican growth is strong – no recession effects left-over

Vardi 12 (Nicholas, Forbes, “The Mexican Miracle: Despite Drug War, Economy Is Booming”, October, 2012, http://www.forbes.com/sites/nathanvardi/2012/10/15/the-mexican-mircale/)

When Vikram Pandit, the chief executive of Citigroup, was asked on Monday to break down the emerging markets that had contributed to some good-looking financial results for the third-biggest U.S. bank, the first country he pointed to was Mexico.¶ Driven by Mexico, Citigroup’s Latin-American consumer banking revenue grew 7% year-over-year in the third quarter to $2.4 billion, while the bank’s revenue in Asia was down. “We think that Mexico is extremely well-poised for growth,” Pandit said on Citigroup’s earnings conference call. “I was just there not too long ago and with the leadership change there in addition to prospects for reforms and what you are seeing on the ground—that is a high spot definitely.” Citigroup’s stock was up 4% on Monday.¶ Not too long ago, the idea that big-shot American CEOs would be touting Mexico would have seemed unlikely. When the financial crisis hit the U.S. in 2008, FORBES predicted a “Mexican Meltdown.” The explosion of the drug war between the Mexican drug cartels and the government, coupled with the sure-to-come drop in exports to the contracting U.S. economy, seemed like it would derail Mexico again and ensure that other emerging markets like Brazil would keep passing it by. The U.S. Joint Forces Command lumped Mexico in the same category as Pakistan and worried it was becoming a failed state.¶ Mexico’s economy was hit very hard by the financial crisis and its recession was severe, but its recovery miraculously has been even stronger. Even with the weak U.S. recovery and the ongoing drug violence, Mexico has boomed. Top officials in the Mexican government predict the country’s economic growth could reach 5% in 2012, after gross domestic product increased by 3.9% and 5.5% in the last two years.¶ At the same time, Brazil’s economy has slowed and Mexico is starting to catch up to its regional rival. The Mexican stock market has performed well, with the benchmark IPC index up nearly 13% in 2012 and more than 20% in the last year. Pemex, the state-owned oil company that dominates the Mexican economy, recently announced deep-water oil discoveries in the Gulf of Mexico, suggesting the company might be able to slow the decline of its production.¶ Enrique Pena Nieto of the PRI has been ratified as the winner of the presidential election and the transfer of power appears to be going on with much less social unrest than when Felipe Calderon was elected in 2006. It’s not just U.S. banks that are benefiting from Mexico’s resurgent economy: Wal-Mart said its important Mexican stores increased monthly sales by 15.3% in September to $2.59 billion. Wal-Mart opened 20 Mexican stores in September alone.¶ Wal-Mart, of course, demonstrates both the opportunity and peril with which foreign investors view Mexico. Wal-Mart’s Mexican unit is the company’s most important foreign subsidiary, but it has been embroiled in an embarrassing and costly bribery controversy that was first exposed by The New York Times. Indeed, foreign direct investment has remained weak. But if the new leadership in Mexico can open Mexico’s energy sector to foreign investment, even that statistic could soon turn around for Mexico.¶ The biggest evidence of Mexico’s recent relative success can probably been seen in the number of Mexicans who are staying or returning to Mexico. As Calderon recently noted in The Wall Street Journal, the net rate of migration of Mexican workers toward the United States has recently been zero. “We are in the middle of the rebirth,” he said.

Corruption and nationalization makes PEMEX collapse inevitable – the plan can’t overcome

Camarena 10 (Rodrigo, is an analyst and consultant on Latin American business, politics and public policy, “Mexico's Energy Reform and the Future of Pemex” October 2010, http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/6759/mexicos-energy-reform-and-the-future-of-pemex)

Mexico's Energy Reform and the Future of Pemex ¶ The ebullient celebration in Brazil over Petrobas' historic $70 billion share-issue last month was bitterly received in Mexico City, where the state-owned oil company Pemex is mired in debt, inefficiency and ongoing political wrangling. ¶ With little having changed since Mexican President Felipe Calderón sought to reform the country's energy sector two years ago, the contrast between Petrobras' successes and Pemex's failures has reignited discussion of Pemex's future and renewed the public's interest in the beleaguered Mexican oil giant.¶ Once Latin America's largest company, Pemex has persistently lost profits and market share to other state-led oil companies, including PetroChina, Russia's Lukoil, and Petrobras. Pemex's inability to expand production and compete internationally stems from decades of mismanagement, corruption and a politically sensitive constitutional provision barring the company from receiving private investment, as most of its state-led competitors already do.¶ Pemex's status as a fully state-owned enterprise has left the company vulnerable to limited financing, a dysfunctional corporate bureaucracy and corrupt public officials. Due to a lack of competitive investment and technology as well as a failure to develop new reserves, Pemex's output has declined by nearly one-third since 2004. If current trends hold, Mexico is on track to becoming a net oil importer by 2020, with some estimates projecting this taking place as early as 2016. ¶ Making matters worse, Mexico's federal government relies on taxes from Pemex's falling profits for roughly 40 percent of the total national budget, from which it funds not only Pemex itself but also the country's development and its expensive war against organized crime. ¶ In 2008, seeking to reverse the country's fortunes, Calderón's government passed one of the country's most significant energy-sector reforms since Mexico nationalized its oil industry in 1938. The reforms aimed to give Pemex greater budgetary authority, update its statist corporate structure, and allow the company to contract foreign firms to improve production and exploit untapped resources in the depths of the Gulf of Mexico -- where most of the country's hydrocarbon deposits lie.¶ To Calderón's displeasure, implementation of the 2008 law has been slow and largely unsuccessful. The law's stipulation that industry experts be added to the company's boards -- formerly made up entirely of political appointees -- has led to friction in the chain of command and to delayed decision-making. The provision allowing Pemex to contract foreign firms is currently undergoing a lengthy Supreme Court review following complaints from opposition legislators.

#### PEMEX not key to the Mexican economy-overall increases despite PEMEX failures

FT, 2013 (Financial Times, 2/1/13, “Pemex blast puts onus on energy reforms,” http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/eb947824-6c88-11e2-953f-00144feab49a.html#axzz2NSCSJswg)

While the Mexican stock market has hit record highs recently and the economy is forecast to grow more than 3.5 per cent in 2013, faster than Brazil for the third year in a row, output at Pemex has slumped. From a peak of 3.4m barrels of oil a day in 2004, production has fallen to about 2.6m bpd. Experts say that without greater foreign investment and technology Mexico could cease to be a major energy exporter within six years, even though it sits on promising deepwater reserves in the Gulf of Mexico. “So what will the Pemex explosion mean for the national debate on energy reform? It puts Pemex firmly in the spotlight for a start,” tweeted Duncan Wood, director of the Mexico Institute at the Woodrow Wilson centre in Washington. “Pemex needs to be modernised from top to bottom, from exploration and production to basic practices ... Will legislators [now] recognise that Pemex has fallen behind the times?” The contrast between Pemex and the rest of Mexico’s export sector is stark. While foreign car and electronic goods manufacturers have poured investment into the country, boosting national exports to a record, under the Mexican constitution Pemex is only allowed to offer limited service contracts with private companies.

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

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

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

#### Competitiveness theory is flawed

**Porteous 6** 2/26, \*RUCE PORTEOUS is currently Head of Financial Risk with Standard Life Bank in Edinburgh, Scotland. He has a degree in Mathematical Statistics from Edinburgh University, Scotland, and postgraduate degrees, including a PhD, in Mathematical Statistics from Cambridge University, England, “The Coming Economic Collapse,” http://www.rense.com/general69/econm.htm, AJ

It has become popular by American politicians to blame China for the decline in America's production base. This is totally unfair, and shows both their ignorance and a failure to accept responsibility by the American leadership. Actually, it is through China being able to supply America with cheap consumer goods, and lend the capital to purchase these goods which has allowed the US to contain inflation, benefiting the American consumer. Germany, which is now the world's number one export nation and which has a wage structure higher than the US, has had to cope with a rising currency, but has still been able to expand its exports between 10-20% per annum, and continues to have an expanding large trade and current account surpluses. German manufactures also have to compete with their Asian competitors just as those from America, yet have a 160.5 billion trade surplus. So it would appear in the short-term, the loose monetary policies of America and Japan appear to have benefited everyone. Expanding the money supply has provided the capital to support the growth of the expanding Asian economies, especially those of India and China. Inflation (if you exclude property) has been contained (normally a consequences of a loose money policy) because of China and India being able to produce consumer goods and services cheaply for the global markets, preventing manufactures in the Anglo-Saxon economies from raising their prices.

### Spills

Drilling in the gulf causes oil spills – uniquely disastrous to BioD

Greenpeace 13 (Greenpeace, February 22, 2013, “Transboundary agreement spells disaster for the Gulf”, http://www.greenpeace.org/usa/en/media-center/news-releases/Transboundary-agreement-spells-disaster-for-the-Gulf/)//moxley

In response to the United States and Mexico signing an agreement to develop oil and gas reservoirs that cross the international maritime boundary between the two countries in the Gulf of Mexico Greenpeace United States and Mexico have signed their own transboundary agreement.¶ Greenpeace US and Mexico signed the agreement concerning their governments continued obsession with helping the gas and oil industry profit off polluting the climate and devastating the Gulf of Mexico. “The US and Mexican governments say their agreement is “designed to enhance energy security in North America,” an impossibility given the continued support for fossil fuel production over secure, renewable energy sources. President Obama's failure to permanently reject the Keystone XL pipeline, his expanding coal mining on public lands, and approval of oil exploration in the Arctic lay the groundwork for this new policy,” said Greenpeace US Climate Campaigner Kyle Ash.¶ “This agreement opens new areas to dangerous, expensive, and controversial offshore drilling techniques. This is what led to the deaths of eleven workers and over 200 million gallons of oil spewing into the Gulf just two years ago,’ said Mr Ash. “The US-Mexican joint statement called for “the highest degree of safety and environmental standards,” which the US Congress has failed to improve since the Deepwater disaster. A recent report from the National Research Council reaffirmed that deepwater drilling remains unsafe.”¶ Drilling could take place in the Gulf at depths typically greater than 8,500 feet, deeper than at any drilling site in the world. The BP Deepwater Horizon catastrophe occurred in water 5,000 feet deep¶ “Deepwater exploration is a huge risk to the environment and a waste of resources for the country. Each oil spill at sea disrupts the ecosystem, causing ecological disturbances, some temporary, others permanent. State-owned oil company Pemex has a history of oil spills off the coast of Tamaulipas, Veracruz, Tabasco and Campeche and now with plans for deepwater exploration in the Gulf of Mexico, the potential for disaster increases exponentially,” said Greenpeace Mexico Climate Campaigner Beatriz Olivera.

Non-unique – spill just happened – our evidence post dates

Skaggs 7-9-13 (Christina, “US Coast Guard confirms natural gas leak in Gulf of Mexico”, July 9th, 2013, http://www.wlox.com/story/22797968/us-coast-guard-confirms-natural-gas-leak-in-gulf-of-mexico)

The U.S. Coast Guard confirmed a natural gas leak in the Gulf of Mexico has forced the evacuation of a gas production platform 74 miles southwest of Port Fourchon, LA. According to the Coast Guard, the leak began Sunday at Ship Shoal Block 225 platform B, which is a natural gas and crude oil platform owned by Energy Resources Technology (ERT).¶ The Coast Guard and Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement (BSEE) are responding to what the Coast Guard calls "the loss of well control".¶ Once ERT learned of the leak, the company began work to temporarily plug the well and contacted the Coast Guard and BSEE, according to Coast Guard officials.¶ The Coast Guard and BSEE inspectors conducted overflights early Tuesday. Coast Guard officials said rainbow sheen runs more than four miles wide by three quarters of a mile long. Coast Guard and BSEE will conduct an investigation of the incident to determine the cause of the loss of well control.

Gulf is resilient

Berywn 13 (Bob, Summit County Voice, “Environment: Is the Gulf of Mexico resilient to oil spills?”, April 9th, 2013, http://summitcountyvoice.com/2013/04/09/environment-is-the-gulf-of-mexico-resilient-to-oil-spills/)

Nearly three years after the Deepwater Horizon drill rig exploded and the busted Macondo Well spewed millions of gallons of crude into the Gulf of Mexico, scientists are still trying to figure out to what happened to all the oil.¶ Only a tiny amount was captured or burned at the surface, and vast quantity — nobody knows exactly how much — was “dispersed” with chemicals injected directly into the stream of oil streaming out of the broken pipes, but a surprisingly large percentage of the oil may have been broken down by microbes.¶ Some of the oil settled to the seafloor, damaging coral miles from the site of the disaster. There’s also evidence that the oil damaged Gulf of Mexico oysters growing in coastal areas, and sickened dolphins in Barataria Bay. And in Florida, researchers found remnants of the oil lingering in “scary high” concentrations in the splash zone along Gulf beaches.¶ But overall, the Gulf may be more resilient than previously believed, according to Terry Hazen a bioremediation expert at the University of Tennessee-Oak Ridge National Laboratory.¶ Hazen and his research team used a powerful new approach for identifying microbes in the environment to discover previously unknown and naturally occurring bacteria that consume and break down crude oil. They concluded that there was a population explosion among those bacteria already adapted to using oil as a food source.¶ “It was surprising how fast they consumed the oil,” Hazen said. “In some locations, it took only one day for them to reduce a gallon of oil to a half gallon. In others, the half-life for a given quantity of spilled oil was six days … “The Deepwater Horizon oil provided a new source of nutrients in the deepest waters,” he said.¶ Rather than culturing the microbes in a lab, the researchers combined genetic data and other analyses of the DNA, proteins and other footprints of bacteria to provide a more detailed picture of microbial life in the water.¶ Their findings suggest that a great potential for intrinsic bioremediation of oil plumes exists in the deep sea and other environs in the Gulf of Mexico. Oil-eating bacteria are natural inhabitants of the Gulf because of the constant supply of oil as food.¶ “The bottom line from this research may be that the Gulf of Mexico is more resilient and better able to recover from oil spills than anyone thought,” Hazen said. “It shows that we may not need the kinds of heroic measures proposed after the Deepwater Horizon spill, like adding nutrients to speed up the growth of bacteria that break down oil or using genetically engineered bacteria. The Gulf has a broad base of natural bacteria, and they respond to the presence of oil by multiplying quite rapidly.”¶ Hazen recently presented his Deepwater Horizon disaster research findings at the 245th National Meeting and Exposition of the American Chemical Society, the world’s largest scientific society.

#### Status quo solves environmental cooperation

Quinn 12 [Andrew Quinn, director of the fellowship at the Aspen Institute—an international nonprofit dedicated to fostering enlightened leadership and open- minded dialogue, “Mexico, U.S. sign cross-border deep water oil deal”, February 20, 2012, http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/02/20/us-mexico-oil-us-idUSTRE81J1G020120220]

(Reuters) - Mexico and the United States signed an agreement on Monday to help U.S. firms and Mexican oil monopoly Pemex exploit deep water oil resources in the Gulf of Mexico that straddle the countries' maritime boundaries.¶ The deal, negotiated last year, will lift the moratorium on oil and gas exploration and production for 1.5 million acres in the Gulf and sets up legal guidelines for companies to jointly develop any trans-boundary reservoirs.¶ "These reservoirs could hold considerable reserves ... but they don't necessarily stop neatly at our maritime boundary. This could lead to disputes," U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said at a ministerial meeting of Group of 20 nations in Los Cabos Mexico. "The agreement we are signing today will help prevent such disputes."¶ Both the U.S. Senate and its Mexican counterpart have to approve the agreement before it goes into effect.¶ Interior Secretary Ken Salazar called the region an "area of high interest" to oil companies.¶ "I think there is a very good chance ... the trans-boundary area will be developed in the short term," he told reporters from a call in Washington.¶ Mexico - the world's No. 7 oil producer - is far behind the United States in exploring for deep water oil reserves and has drilled less than 20 wells in its territorial waters in the Gulf. Pemex estimates there are more than 29 billion barrels of crude equivalent in the area, or 58 percent of the country's prospective resources.¶ Carlos Morales, Pemex's director of exploration and production, told Reuters in an interview on Monday that the company plans to drill six or seven new deep water wells this year and plans eight new wells annually over the next five years.¶ So far most of the discoveries in Mexico's deep waters have been natural gas.¶ DANGERS IN DEEP WATER¶ Mexico's oil industry regulator worries Pemex does not have the capability or the safeguards in place to move into ultra-deep drilling.¶ One of the wells Pemex plans to drill this year will be at depths of nearly 10,000 feet, more than 3,000 feet deeper than it had gone before.¶ Safety concerns loom large after the explosion on BP's Deepwater Horizon rig in April 2010 that killed 11 workers and spewed more than 4 million barrels of oil into the Gulf.¶ The U.S.-Mexico agreement covers oil spill and safety rules, an U.S. Interior Department official said.¶ Mexico is hoping to attract help from private companies to explore for oil in the region with a 2008 oil reform that allows for incentive based operating contracts, but no projects have yet been announced¶ "This agreement also creates new opportunities for our businesses. American energy companies will be able - for the first time - to collaborate with Pemex, their Mexican counterpart," said Clinton.¶ Mexico, which relies on oil revenues to fund a third of the federal budget, closely guards its oil resources nationalized since 1938.¶ "This agreement was negotiated invariably under the principle of respecting sovereign rights. Mexican oil wealth is and will continue to be of the Mexicans," President Felipe Calderon said at the event.¶ Pemex - a major oil exporter to the United States - saw oil output decline dramatically at its largest, aging fields but has managed to stabilize production at around 2.55 million barrels per day (bpd).¶ The state-oil company has been slow to replace lost reserves with new discoveries.¶ Last August, however, Pemex announced the discovery of a new light crude oil deposit in the Gulf of Mexico offshore from the southern Mexican state of Campeche.¶ The Kinbe-1 find has 150 million barrels of proven, probable and possible (3P) reserves, part of the Tsimin and Xux fields that hold a total of 2 billion barrels of crude, Pemex's Morales said.¶ "We are talking about a giant oil field," Morales said. "These areas will start producing in 2014."

#### **No regulations – TBA doesn’t solve spills – doesn’t solve existing deficits in safety procedures**

US News ’12 [4/24/12, US News is an information distributer to the misguided masses, “Interior's Ken Salazar: No Promises on Oil Prices”, <http://www.usnews.com/news/blogs/washington-whispers/2012/04/24/interiors-ken-salazar-no-promises-on-oil-prices>]

Salazar outlined a few "low-hanging fruits" he would like to see Congress tackle this election year, but offered little optimism. "I am not trying to give a laundry list of 100 things, because I am not sure they can get it done," Salazar said. He criticized Congress for failing to pass a single piece of legislation relating to offshore oil and gas safety since the disastrous BP Gulf of Mexico oil spill of 2010. The secretary also criticized Congress for not supporting the U.S. and Mexico's Transboundary Hydrocarbons Agreement, which allows both countries to expand joint drilling operations in the Gulf of Mexico.

### Relations

Drug violence is declining – most recent ev

WSJ 6-28-13 (Wall Street Journal, “Mexico Sees Decline in Drug-Related Killings”, June 28th, 2013, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887324328204578573760968965312.html)

Drug-related killings that turned parts of Mexico into the bloodiest spots on the globe appear to have decreased in recent months - a welcome trend in a nation exhausted by years of violence associated with organized crime, even if the reasons behind it are hard to pin down.¶ The bloodshed is still alarmingly high, as the northern border and even the Acapulco beach resort continue to suffer from cartel turf wars.¶ In his first six months in office, around 6,300 people died in killings seen as linked to organized crime. But that is a drop of about 18% compared with an estimated 7,700 in the previous six months.¶ A separate study by a nonprofit group, the Mexican Institute of Competitiveness, used all reported murders, not just those classified as organized crime-related. It then seasonally adjusted the murder rates - since summer months tend to see a spike - and came up with a less-pronounced drop of 6% to around 10,000 murders, compared with about 10,600 in the six months before Mr. Peña Nieto took office.¶ The study's lead author, Alejandro Hope, a former government intelligence official, said the seasonally adjusted decline seems to have flattened out in recent months, suggesting further gains may be hard to come by.¶ "The situation is improving at a very slow rate," said Mr. Hope. "My nightmare scenario is that we get used to 20,000 or 25,000 people getting killed every year."

#### Drug cooperation is high now and will continue to grow – Nieto and Obama’s meetings

FNL 7/5 [July 5, 2013. Fox News Latino. “U.S. Wants More Intelligence Cooperation With Mexico, White House Report States” <http://latino.foxnews.com/latino/news/2013/07/05/us-wants-more-intelligence-cooperation-with-mexico-white-house-report-states/#ixzz2aos85oqW>]

#### A newly released White House report on the U.S. border with Mexico highlights the Obama administration's strategic shift toward forgoing a closer working relationship with its southern neighbor. This, despite recent restrictions by Enrique Peña Nieto's government on who American intelligence services can contact in Mexico. The White House's 2013 National Southwest Border Counternarcotics Strategy illustrated nine points that focus on interdiction, tackling drug cartels along the border, halting money laundering, building up stronger communities and strengthening ties between the two nations in terms of counternarcotics. “The U.S.-Mexican bilateral relationship continues to grow based on strong, multi-layered institutional ties,” the report stated. “Based on principles of shared responsibility, mutual trust, and respect for sovereign independence, the two countries’ efforts have built confidence that continues to transform and strengthen the bilateral relationship in 2013 and beyond.” While the U.S. report touts a need for greater cooperation, new Mexican security policies could hamper that. A recent decision by the Mexican government has ordered a halt in direct communications between American intelligence agencies and their counterparts south of the border. Now instead of directly consulting local law enforcement, agencies like the DEA and FBI will have to contact Mexico's Interior Ministry before being passed along through the proper channels. Intelligence sharing, however, was a major talking point when President Barack Obama met with his Mexican counterpart back in May. Despite scarce details about the meeting, the two leaders discussed border security and the use of drones along the 1,954-mile shared border. Peña Nieto downplayed the notion that the new, more centralized arrangement would damage its security partnership with the United States. He said Obama agreed during their private meeting earlier in the day to "cooperate on the basis of mutual respect" to promote an efficient and effective strategy. "I think the U.S. government wants to make sure that Peña Nieto is on the same page as Obama, that he wants to pursue the cartels as consistently and aggressively as [former Mexican President] Calderón did during his presidency," Alex Sanchez, a security analyst at the Council on Hemispheric Affairs, told ABC News. Even as the Obama administration hopes that Peña Nieto will continue to go on the offensive against the drug cartels in Mexico, the report suggests a more humanitarian approach to the drug war. Besides counternarcotics efforts, a solid portion of the report concerns community building measures along the border, ways to deal with substance abuse and violence, as well as health and education programs. “The crime and breakdown in public health and safety that affect many border communities has a close nexus with substance use —including abuse of alcohol and other drugs— can have a far-reaching effect on the resilience of communities,” the report stated. “Heavily Hispanic communities along the border have been particularly hard hit.” The report’s focus on community building seems to go along with Peña Nieto’s strategy in combating the drug war. Instead of the “kingpin” approach that his predecessor Felipe Calderón took, which focused on apprehending or killing high-ranking cartel members, Peña Nieto has moved to a plan to reduce the levels of violence in the country and bolster trust of law enforcement among the populace. The report has some analysts hopeful that there will be better working relations between the U.S. and Mexico, especially in light of the new rules concerning U.S. intelligence agencies. “The election of Peña Nieto sparked vocal concerns among U.S. political leaders over his stated desire to move priorities away from arrests and drug seizures, and towards violence reduction, and there have also been reports of tensions between the incoming government and U.S. officials over the level of U.S. involvement in Mexican security policies,” the Latin American intelligence website Insight Crime stated. “However, the U.S. strategy displays no sign of this friction, only expressing a desire to increase cooperation, which despite the public murmuring is likely to be the case.”

Latin American stability growing – Brazil leading

Xinhau 1-26-13 (Xinahu Times, “News Analysis: Latin America's economic stability arouses envy of EU”, January 26th, 2013, http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/indepth/2013-01/26/c\_132129380.htm)

Meanwhile, Latin America, led by Brazil, has experienced years of steady growth, though at lower levels than expected. Brazil had just two quarters of shrinking gross domestic product, both in 2008, when the world entered an economic tailspin following the financial crisis in the United States. It reported 0.6-percent growth in the last quarter of 2012.¶ Brazil has done a better job of supporting potentially fragile neighbors than Germany, whose demands of austerity have caused political turmoil in Greece and an unemployment spiral in Spain. Through its state banks, such as the National Development Bank, Brazil has been providing loans to shaky southern neighbor Argentina to keep its financial system stable and businesses in motion.¶ Chile, host nation of the first summit between the Community of Latin American and Caribbean States (CELAC) and the European Union, has done even better, ending last year with a 5.5-percent GDP growth, thanks in large part to high prices for copper, its major export.

#### No I/L to heg – doesn’t broadly the broader effects of Mexican growth

#### Lots of factors prevent great power conflict without hegemony

Fettweis 10 (Christopher J. Professor of Political Science at Tulane, Dangerous Times-The International Politics of Great Power Peace, pg. 175-6)

If the only thing standing between the world and chaos is the US military presence, then an adjustment in grand strategy would be exceptionally counter-productive. But it is worth recalling that none of the other explanations for the decline of war – nuclear weapons, complex economic interdependence, international and domestic political institutions, evolution in ideas and norms – necessitate an activist America to maintain their validity. Were American to become more restrained, nuclear weapons would still affect the calculations of the would be aggressor; the process of globalization would continue, deepening the complexity of economic interdependence; the United Nations could still deploy peacekeepers where necessary; and democracy would not shrivel where it currently exists. More importantly,the idea that war is a worthwhile way to resolve conflict would have no reason to return. As was argued in chapter 2, normative evolution is typically unidirectional. Strategic restraint in such a world be virtually risk free.

**Multilateralism fails – organizations fail and exclusion of countries is inevitable – the US is not key**

**Gallagher 10 –** leading Australian consultant on trade and public policy (Peter, “Plurilateralism… get used to it,” 12/20/10, <http://www.petergallagher.com.au/index.php/site/article/plurilateralism...-get-used-to-it)//AY>

Those Orga­ni­za­tions will go on. So will mul­ti­lat­er­al­ism. This week is only another reminder that col­lab­o­ra­tive man­age­ment of the global com­mons (peace, trade… pos­si­bly emis­sions) is, and always has been, very dif­fi­cult to achieve. The ‘one-world, one vision’ approach endorsed by the U.N. in its cur­rent form and backed for sixty years by the U.S. and Europe (chiefly) may be too hard to sus­tain for the next lit­tle while. Dur­ing the past decade, the veil of mul­ti­lat­eral col­lab­o­ra­tion thrown over the inner-workings of the U.N./Bretton-Woods man­age­ment frame­work has grown thin­ner and thin­ner. **There has always been a cer­tain amount of stiff-arming** behind the veil. But, with appro­pri­ate restraint—including by Japan—it worked for a long time to deliver effec­tive global col­lab­o­ra­tion. After this week, it will never be quite the same. But there’s no need for panic. It’s a shame but no emer­gency that a U.N. meet­ing turns out to be another expen­sive dud. Just relax and try to enjoy the ride. Enjoy the rich­ness of greater global diver­sity, for one thing. The extra­or­di­nary thing about this week in Copen­hagen is not what we didn’t see (an agree­ment on emis­sions) but what we *did* see, clearly for the first time. The veil of mul­ti­lat­er­al­ism has fallen long enough to show the world the present real­i­ties behind it. First, of course, the expen­sive, chaotic sham of 192 nations in at least as many lim­ou­sines, from Tuvalu to the United States, try­ing to agree on 1 text with at least 2 tar­gets lubri­cated by a $100billion bribe (that turned out to be only a $10billion i.o.u.) Sec­ond, and more impor­tant, The Pres­i­dent of the United States being intro­duced to a meet­ing to which he not been invited—*at which he did not even have a seat*—to nego­ti­ate a nar­row deal, sav­ing the appear­ance of col­lab­o­ra­tion, with Brazil, China, India and South Africa. To enter the room, Obama had to leave Europe and Japan out in the cold. He had to work out a deal with four giant economies that col­lec­tively hold quite a few mark­ers on the future of the global com­mons, but most of whom are by any mea­sure still poor coun­tries. The [account](http://bit.ly/8172r2) of this meet­ing is a vision of the global frame­work for col­lab­o­ra­tion now and in the next few decades. What we now have as a frame­work for global orga­ni­za­tion is a roil­ing, argu­men­ta­tive, pluri­lat­er­al­ism where alliances and coali­tions slip and slide along a dozen dif­fer­ent planes of inter­na­tional endeav­our. Farewell to the old two-handed back-room brawls and staged con­sen­sus of the *pax atlantica*. In the new frame­work broad, top-down ‘solu­tions’ like Kyoto’s tar­gets and the WTO’s ‘Sin­gle Under­tak­ing’ cannnot be made to work by a fly­ing visit from the U.S. Pres­i­dent or alter­nate hand-wringing and blus­ter from Brussels. The bad news—if you’d like the world to be a set­tled place ruled by, say, a benef­i­cent dic­ta­tor (oxy­moron) from Wash­ing­ton or even Beijing—is that ‘global gov­er­nance’ now becomes a tricky mat­ter of rec­on­cil­ing and align­ing many dif­fer­ent, prob­a­bly autonomous, or at best regional attempts to deal with the man­age­ment of global com­mons. **Guar­an­teed to be messy.**

#### Nieto has to credibility to follow through with his reform efforts now – but he has to tread carefully

Thomson 4-24 - Adam Thomson is the FT's Mexico and Central America correspondent (Adam, “President Enrique Peña Nieto works to soothe Mexico tensions”, April 24 of 2013, Financial Times, <http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/628aabae-acfa-11e2-9454-00144feabdc0.html#axzz2YVlziShn>)

Mexico’s four-month-old administration on Wednesday appeared to overcome its first political crisis after opposition leaders said that they had largely settled their differences with the government.¶ The agreement, which came after an emergency meeting of party heads, appears to put the government’s economic reform back on track in a turnaround that will doubtless ease investor concerns.¶ Billions of dollars have flowed into Mexico in recent months on hopes that centrist President Enrique Peña Nieto of the Institutional Revolutionary Party will push a series of reforms aimed at transforming Latin America’s second-largest economy into a more vibrant emerging market.¶ The inflows have pushed the local stock market index to record highs. In one clear sign of investors’ new-found fascination with Mexico, the local currency this month strengthened against the US dollar, reaching an 18-month high.¶ Speaking after the meeting on Wednesday, Jesús Zambrano, leader of the leftwing Democratic Revolution Party, suggested that things were getting back to normal after a tense week. “At least we have laid the foundations for continuing along the reform path,” Reforma, the Mexican daily, quoted him as saying.¶ A statement by Mexico’s interior ministry, which organised the meeting, confirmed that the parties had agreed to keep working together to further the so-called Pact for Mexico, a list of economic, social and political reform pledges signed in December by party leaders.¶ “Everyone reaffirmed their conviction that the reform agenda laid out in the Pact comes before party interests,” said the statement.¶ In Lima, Luis Videgaray, Mexico’s finance minister, expressed optimism that a banking-reform bill, which the government had planned to unveil this week but postponed because of the political tension, would get back on track.¶ “I haven’t the slightest doubt the financial reform will be presented in the next few days,” he told Reuters. “I’m sure it’ll have strong support from the political forces and representatives in the Pact for Mexico.”¶ The latest events come after Democratic Revolution Party members and the conservative National Action Party, both signatories to the Pact, recently accused government officials of using social-assistance programmes in the state of Veracruz to gain an advantage in forthcoming elections.¶ Almost half of Mexico’s 31 states go to the polls in the coming months, and political rivalries have already started to surface in the run-up to voting day.¶ Roy Campos, a pollster in Mexico City, argues that Mr Peña Nieto’s swift and energetic response to the building storm – after initially underestimating the problem – went a long way to resolving what could have become much worse.¶ Not least, on Tuesday Mexico’s leader gave a rousing speech in the state of Puebla where he asked all the political parties to join him in helping to ensure that social programmes were protected from the threat of use for political gain “Let’s bulletproof them,” he said.¶ That, says Mr Campos, allowed everyone involved to claim some sort of victory – the opposition parties that they brought the administration to task, and Mr Peña Nieto that he was able to pull in the opposition in a joint crusade against corruption.¶ “Peña Nieto has recovered very quickly,” says Mr Campos. “The pact is far from broken.”¶ Yet it seems clear that the Veracruz scandal serves as a reminder of how carefully Mr Peña Nieto must tread in the coming months as he seeks to bring his economic reform agenda to fruition.¶

#### Overwhelming opposition to the AFF – the plan is an insurmountable obstacle which kills Nieto’s credibility

Starr 12 - Director, U.S.-Mexico Network Associate Professor (NTT) University Fellow, Center on Public Diplomacy University of Southern California (Pamela, “U.S.-Mexico Relations and Mexican Domestic Politics”, October 6 of 2012, <https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=3&cad=rja&ved=0CD4QFjAC&url=http%3A%2F%2Fcollege.usc.edu%2Fusmexnet%2Fwp-content%2Fuploads%2F2010%2F10%2FCamp-Oxford-paper-final.doc&ei=mTLYUZTDMbOLyQGT14GwCQ&usg=AFQjCNH_cqiYTQRo7SFmpfWugH9ABshhCg&sig2=_M2KmLNnt3e8v4vVshc_fQ>)

The final implication of Mexican nationalism for U.S.-Mexico relations is the nearly insurmountable obstacle it erected to political alliances between Mexican actors and their U.S. counterparts, which has broken down only gradually and incompletely since the mid-1990s. For decades, the fear of being tarred as a traitor to the nation prevented Mexican leaders from seeking allies to their cause in the United States and thereby deprived U.S. actors of an easy point of entry into Mexican politics. Mexicans who ignored this taboo paid the price even in the final years of the twentieth century. In the 1980s, the then opposition National Action Party openly elicited U.S. backing for its charges of electoral fraud and associated actions of civil disobedience, producing a nationalist backlash in Mexico that sharply undercut the legitimacy of its claims. In the early 1990s, Mexican opponents of the North American Free Trade Agreement formed an alliance with their U.S. and Canadian counterparts, leading to accusations of having organized traitorous “campaigns against Mexico in the United States.” ¶ Carlos Salinas’ 1990 decision to summon U.S. assistance to lock in his domestic economic reform agenda through a bilateral trade treaty and his active lobbying to gain U.S. congressional approval of the treaty dealt a blow to this long-standing taboo. As a result, cross-border alliances are now increasingly common and accepted, but they are heavily concentrated among civil society actors. Mexico’s continuing anxiety about U.S. political domination, however, means that tolerance for cross-border political alliances is much less developed. While Mexican policy makers and analysts of the bilateral relationship have significantly more freedom of action to work with their U.S. counterparts in the early twenty-first century than did their predecessors, they still must watch their step or risk having their reputation sullied for being excessively “pro-gringo.” Mexicans remain uneasy living next door to a superpower; they continue to worry that the United States might get the notion to translate its power into domination of Mexico, its politics, policy, and culture, and they thus still approach their neighbor with trepidation. As a result, Mexican politicians and policy makers still must take care to avoid the appearance of being too willing to accept support and guidance from north of the border.

#### Nieto key to the drug war – new strategy stops the root cause of cartels and empirics prove – turns the case

Grillo et al 13 - journalist and author of the book El Narco: Inside Mexico's Criminal Insurgency, has been reporting on the Mexican Drug War and the Latin American illegal drug trade since 2001 (Ioan, Dolly Mascarenas, “Mexico Goes After the Narcos — Before They Join the Gangs”, February 25 of 2013, Time, <http://world.time.com/2013/02/25/mexico-goes-after-the-narcos-before-they-join-the-gangs/>)

Recently installed President Enrique Peña Nieto hopes to reverse this trend with a new anticrime strategy — transforming poor neighborhoods like Nezahualcóyotl where cartels make their bastions and preventing young people from joining their criminal armies. On Feb. 12, Peña Nieto announced there would be more than $9 billion for crime prevention aimed at 57 hot spots. “We must put special emphasis on prevention, because we can’t only keep employing more sophisticated weapons, better equipment, more police, a higher presence of the armed forces in the country as the only form of combating organized crime,” Peña Nieto said. Rather than just shooting or incarcerating the seemingly endless ranks of cartel gunmen, the President hopes to stop young people from becoming assassins in the first place.¶ The 57 target areas include traditional hotbeds of violence such as cities on the U.S. border and Acapulco, on the Pacific Coast. But they also include places where cartels have been encroaching more recently, such as Nezahualcóyotl, commonly referred to as Neza. Named after an Aztec poet king, Neza was populated by squatters who built shantytowns in the 1970s and has since grown to more than 1 million people on the rim of Mexico City’s urban sprawl — growth that has attracted the attention of investors like billionaire Carlos Slim. Cartels like La Familia have moved into its slums from marijuana-growing mountains to sell drugs, extort businesses and kidnap for ransom. Some of their new members hail from Neza’s streets.¶ Roberto Campa, who has been named to run the national prevention program, says there is a clear link between conditions in these ghettos and the rise of cartels. “When you see the circumstances tha,t young people live in in many of these communities, you can easily explain why they are involved in these [criminal] activities,” Campa tells TIME. “You find young people suffer violence in the home, in many cases are from broken homes, where there is presence of alcohol or drugs, in communities where they have no chance to enjoy their free time. They form groups in the barrio, and then they are in gangs and then they are openly involved with organized crime. Yes, without a doubt, we have to work with containing [crime], with all the issues of police, prisons, prosecutors and the presence of armed forces. But on the other side, we have to start systematically confronting the causes of these problems.”¶ The plan includes gang-outreach schemes, community centers and employment projects to try to steer the young away from criminal life. There will also be construction programs aimed at transforming chaotic urban jungles into prettier spaces where people will feel inspired to say no to crime mobs. Mexican officials cite Ciudad Juárez as an example of where prevention programs have worked. In 2010, Juárez suffered over 3,000 homicides, making it the most murderous city on the planet by some counts. In response, the Mexican government poured money into social work, including tripling the number of community centers. This helped reduce homicides by three-quarters, to less than 750 last year. Medellín, Colombia, is also a case study in urban renewal. It was named the most violent city in the world in 1993, when it was the virtual fiefdom of cocaine king Pablo Escobar. But murders declined enormously as mayors erected state-of-the-art buildings in its slums and cable cars transporting residents up its hills to increase economic opportunity.
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### 2nc a2 wm – hydrocarbons

#### The plan is commercial – economic engagement broadly establishes the framework for individual transactions – the AFF targets hydrocarbons

Woolcock 13 – Stephen Woolcock, Lecturer in International Relations at The London School of Economics, and Sir Nicholas Bayne, Fellow at the International Trade Policy Unit of the London School of Economics, The Oxford Handbook of Modern Diplomacy, p. 387

Before suggesting some ways in which economic diplomacy could be seen as a distinct branch of diplomacy it is helpful to limit the scope of the term by saying what it is not. Our definition of economic diplomacy does not include the use of economic leverage, either in the form of sanctions or inducement, in the pursuit of specific political or strategic goals. This we would define as sanctions or perhaps economic statecraft.2 Economic diplomacy is about the creation and distribution of the economic benefits from international economic relations. Clearly political and strategic interests will be a factor in economic negotiations, whether in terms of promoting a liberal, capitalist world order or in choosing negotiating partners tor trade agreements. 'I he conclusion of a trade or economic agreement can be seen as a means of promoting economic stability, growth, and employment and thus political stability in a country, such as in the countries of North Africa that have undergone reform since the spring of 2011. But the means remain the economic agreement, the substance of which will be shaped by a range of domestic sectoral and other interests. In other words, political objectives will not infrequently be a factor in decisions to initiate negotiations, but the concrete agenda, content, and conduct of the negotiations will be largely determined by economic factors and interests. We include international environment negotiations in our definition of economic diplomacy because of the close interdependence between economic and environmental objectives. By extension we also see economic diplomacy as an integrated part of a grand strategy combining political, military, and economic relations. Nor does our definition of economic diplomacy include the promotion of exports or investment, whether outward or inward. While governments have always intervened to promote their national industries, there has been a trend towards more active involve­ment of foreign services or even diplomatic services in seeking markets for national companies in recent decades.\* This differs from more traditional industrial policy or mercantilist trade policies. As traditional forms of intervention such as tariffs, subsidies, and other instruments that used to promote national champions have been disciplined by WTO and other trade regimes, governments have used diplomatic links, trade fairs, or visits of heads of state to promote commercial interests. Such activities are better cap­tured by the term commercial diplomacy, which contrasts with economic diplomacy; the latter facilitates trade and investment by establishing the framework of rules and disciplines within which markets and such commercial diplomacy function.4

### 2nc a2 c/i – generic

#### intent to define

Lederach 12 – John Paul Lederach, Professor of International Peacebuilding at the University of Notre Dame and Ph.D. in Sociology from the University of Colorado, “From Isolation to Engagement: Strategies for Countering Violent Extremism”, Peace Policy, 1-25, http://peacepolicy.nd.edu/2012/01/25/from-isolation-to-engagement-strategies-for-countering-violent-extremism/

The U.S. government’s list of “Foreign Terrorist Organizations” is a central part of a counter-terrorism strategy based on the isolation of individuals and groups who espouse violence defined as terrorism. This strategy makes it illegal to provide material support to those individuals and groups, which increasingly is interpreted to prohibit any contact or consultation with groups on the list.

Peacebuilding, on the other hand, proposes a strategy of *engagement*. Engagement requires contact and deliberative dialogue, inclusive of all views. It develops processes that focus on accurately understanding the sources of violence and addressing them through a range of nonviolent change strategies.

#### direct contact is key to limits – they don’t solve

Capie 2 – David H. Capie, and Paul M. Evans, Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, The Asia-Pacific Security Lexicon, p. 118

Second, engagement is sometimes used in a slightly narrower sense to describe the political relationship between specific states. Here there are two distinctive usages: first, engagement can be described as a kind of loosely defined informal association or relationship. The example that has received the most attention in the literature on Asia-Pacific security is that of the United States' engagement of China. In this sense, engagement connotes a relationship of dialogue and involvement, and is often contrasted with "containment" or "isolation".'3 Joseph Nye has said "the attitude that 'engagement' implies is important." He claims the United States' decision to engage China "means that [it] has rejected the argument that conflict is inevitable"." A related use of engagement is to describe formal state policies or strategies. For example, the Clinton administration's "Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement" and policy of "Comprehensive Engagement" with China. Different parts of the government often take very differing attitudes to engagement. Robert Sutter notes that under the George VV. Bush administration, there has been "an institutional gap between the Department of Defense and other US departments as far as interaction and engagement with China is concerned".'5

#### relying on “economic” is bad – makes debate impossible

Posner 93 – Richard A. Posner, Judge of the U.S. Court Appeals for the Seventh Circuit and Senior Lecturer at the University of Chicago Law School, The Problems of Jurisprudence, p. 367-368

Some arguments against applying economics to nonmarket behavior are particularly interesting from the perspective of this book because they are based on stubborn philosophical fallacies, in particular that of essentialism, the idea that everything has a property that defines it and is, indeed, its metaphysical essence, so that if this property is missing, the thing to which it is supposed to be attached is a different thing from what we thought it was. (Laingdell was an essentialist.) Thus it is argued that economics *means* the study of markets, so the study of nonmarket behavior is simply outside its scope, is not—cannot be—economics. In fact, "economics," like "law" (or "philosophy," or "democracy," or "religion"), has neither a fixed intension nor a fixed extension; that is, it cannot be defined or the complete set of things to which it applies enumerated. It is not like "rabbit," a word that can be defined and then "attached" unambiguously to each member of a finite set of real-world objects that satisfy the definition. (Well, not quite, because the word is not misused when it is applied to Harvey or the Easter Bunny, or to a timid human being.) Definitions of economics are hopeless. One cannot say that economics is what economists do, because many noneconomists do economics—or do they become economists by doing so? One cannot, at least when attempting to speak precisely, call economics the science of rational choice. There are theories of rational choice that do not resemble economics, either because they assume unstable preferences, which alters many of the predictions of economics, or because they assume a plurality of rational actors within each human being—for example, an impulsive self and a future-regarding self. And there are theories of economics that are nonrational or not consistently rational. These include survival theories in industrial organization (firms that happen to hit on more efficient methods of doing business will grow relative to less efficient firms) and the many macroeconomic theories in which people are assumed to have propensities (to save, to consume, to hold a fixed fraction of their assets in cash) that arc not derived from the rational model ot human behavior. One cannot call economics the study of markets, because other disciplines study markets—for example, sociology and anthropology—and because it begs the question of the proper domain of economics to define economics as the study of markets and refuse to defend the definition.

What is true is that historically the emphasis of economics has been on studying markets. This is partly because data of the sort useful for economic analysis have been abundant, partly because (unlike such areas of human behavior as law. religion, education, statecraft, love, and madness) the study of markets has been of only marginal interest to practitioners of other human sciences, partly because economic theory has many applications to the understanding of markets, partly (related to the last point) because rational behavior seems more pervasive in markets than in most other arenas of social interaction, and partly because money offers a measuring rod for the study of markets comparable to the role of mass and velocity in physics. But the history of a field—even the character of its greatest triumphs—does not determine its future or delimit its scope.

### 2nc limits xt

#### destroys participation

Rowland 84 (Robert C., Debate Coach – Baylor University, “Topic Selection in Debate”, American Forensics in Perspective, Ed. Parson, p. 53-54)

The first major problem identified by the work group as relating to topic selection is the decline in participation in the National Debate Tournament (NDT) policy debate. As Boman notes: There is a growing dissatisfaction with academic debate that utilizes a policy proposition. Programs which are oriented toward debating the national policy debate proposition, so-called “NDT” programs, are diminishing in scope and size.4 This decline in policy debate is tied, many in the work group believe, to excessively broad topics. The most obvious characteristic of some recent policy debate topics is extreme breath. A resolution calling for regulation of land use literally and figuratively covers a lot of ground. Naitonal debate topics have not always been so broad. Before the late 1960s the topic often specified a particular policy change.5 The move from narrow to broad topics has had, according to some, the effect of limiting the number of students who participate in policy debate. First, the breadth of the topics has all but destroyed novice debate. Paul Gaske argues that because the stock issues of policy debate are clearly defined, it is superior to value debate as a means of introducing students to the debate process.6 Despite this advantage of policy debate, Gaske belives that NDT debate is not the best vehicle for teaching beginners. The problem is that broad policy topics terrify novice debaters, especially those who lack high school debate experience. They are unable to cope with the breadth of the topic and experience “negophobia,”7 the fear of debating negative. As a consequence, the educational advantages associated with teaching novices through policy debate are lost: “Yet all of these benefits fly out the window as rookies in their formative stage quickly experience humiliation at being caugh without evidence or substantive awareness of the issues that confront them at a tournament.”8 The ultimate result is that fewer novices participate in NDT, thus lessening the educational value of the activity and limiting the number of debaters or eventually participate in more advanced divisions of policy debate. In addition to noting the effect on novices, participants argued that broad topics also discourage experienced debaters from continued participation in policy debate. Here, the claim is that it takes so much times and effort to be competitive on a broad topic that students who are concerned with doing more than just debate are forced out of the activity.9 Gaske notes, that “broad topics discourage participation because of insufficient time to do requisite research.”10 The final effect may be that entire programs either cease functioning or shift to value debate as a way to avoid unreasonable research burdens. Boman supports this point: “It is this expanding necessity of evidence, and thereby research, which has created a competitive imbalance between institutions that participate in academic debate.”11 In this view, it is the competitive imbalance resulting from the use of broad topics that has led some small schools to cancel their programs.

## PEMEX

### SQ solves

#### PEMEX is doing deep water drilling joint ventures now

Penn Energy, 2013 (“Petrofac wins PEMEX deepwater drilling contract offshore Mexico,” 3/12/13, http://www.pennenergy.com/articles/pennenergy/2013/03/petrofac-wins-pemex-deepwater-drilling-contract-offshore-mexico.html)

Petrofac's Engineering and Consulting Services business has won a contract by Petroleos Mexicanos (PEMEX) for a deepwater drilling project offshore Mexico. The project was awarded in conjunction with Doris Engineering of Houston. Under the contract, Petrofac will complete specialized technical assistance and supervision for a deepwater subsea well for the Lakach project, located in the Gulf of Mexico. The contract also includes construction, installation, commissioning, testing and startup of the well and infrastructure, as well as tie-ins to existing onshore facilities. The project is scheduled for completion near the end of 2015, according to Petrofac. "I am delighted that Petrofac's Engineering & Consulting Services business has been selected to support such a significant project for PEMEX with this its first major deepwater development," said Craig Muir, managing director of Petrofac. "PEMEX will benefit from the full breadth of Petrofac's specialist subsea pipeline consulting and engineering services in addition to our well management capabilities. We look forward to working closely with PEMEX on this significant project and further building Petrofac's presence in Mexico."

#### U.S. involvement isn’t key- other countries are already filling in

Barnes, 2011 (Joe, the Bonner Means Baker Fellow, James A. Baker III Institute for Public Policy, Rice University, 4/29/11, “Oil and U.S.-Mexico Bilateral Relations,” http://www.bakerinstitute.org/publications/EF-pub-BarnesBilateral-04292011.pdf)

But we should not exaggerate the commercial advantages to U.S. firms were Mexico to open up its petroleum sector to more foreign involvement. U.S. firms would face competition from elsewhere—notably Brazil's state-controlled Petrobras, which already has extensive experience in the Gulf of Mexico. Moreover, the most important economic stake in reviving Mexican production—volume and diversity of world supply—does not require the extensive participation of U.S. companies. Indeed, from a long-term perspective, it might be best for the United States were Mexico to open up first to non-U.S. firms. Such an approach could diminish political obstacles; assuage the fears of the Mexican public; demonstrate that foreign participation can work to Mexico's advantage; and set a precedent for later, major U.S. participation. Needless to say, no U.S. administration would ever publicly support such an idea. But Washington would be wise, indeed, to restrain its response to any Mexican moves in the direction of increasing its cooperation with firms such as Petrobras.

### Pemex not key

#### PEMEX isn’t key to the economy and no collapse-Homex checks

Rieff, 2011 (David, Senior Fellow at the World Policy Institute at the New School for Social Research, a Fellow at the New York Institute for the Humanities at New York University, and a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, 3/17/11, “The Struggle for Mexico,” http://www.newrepublic.com/article/world/magazine/85337/mexico-calderon-clinton-obama-drug-cartels#)

On the economic side, while Mexico remains heavily dependent on the remittances of the millions of immigrants now working, legally or illegally, in the United States, the country also has a rising middle class. It is common to associate the Mexican economy with Pemex, the state oil company, which the government has tended to loot—in the process, depleting oil revenue that should have been put to work on modernization of drilling infrastructure, particularly offshore, which, if Mexico is to continue as a major petroleum exporter, is where it must hunt for new resources. (The contrast with the much better-run, state-controlled Brazilian oil giant, Petrobras, or Malaysia’s Petronas, is painful.) But, increasingly, there is also the Mexico of Homex, a company started in Sinaloa in 1989. Homex is now one of the leading global firms involved in the building of low- and middleincome housing, with large operations in Brazil and India as well as in 20 Mexican states. And yet, the only thing most non-Mexicans who are drawn to the failed-state hypothesis seem to know about Sinaloa is that it gave its name to a powerful drug cartel. If one takes the long view, the clash between the Mexico of Pemex and the Mexico of Homex may be as important as the war between the cartels and the government. And, unless the Mexican economy implodes, which is highly unlikely, there is an excellent chance that the Mexico of Homex will prevail. In any case, it is a contest in which the narco-traffickers—even narco-traffickers operating right alongside the Homexes of Mexico—do not now have, and will never have, a say.

#### Increasing openness in the rest of the economy means it’s decoupled from oil

Economist, 2012 (The Economist, “Señores, start your engines,” 11/24/12, http://www.economist.com/news/special-report/21566782-cheaper-china-and-credit-and-oil-about-start-flowing-mexico-becoming?zid=298&ah=0bc99f9da8f185b2964b6cef412227be)

Once shuttered off by tariffs and trade controls, Mexico has opened up to become a place where the world does business. The North American Free-Trade Agreement (NAFTA), which in 1994 eliminated most tariffs between Mexico, the United States and Canada, was only the beginning: Mexico now boasts free-trade deals with 44 countries, more than any other nation. In northern and central Mexico German companies turn out electrical components for Europe, Canadian firms assemble aircraft parts and factory after factory makes televisions, fridge-freezers and much else. Each year Mexico exports manufactured goods to about the same value as the rest of Latin America put together. Trade makes up a bigger chunk of its GDP than of any other large country’s. Normally that would be a good thing, but after the 2007-08 financial crisis it meant that Mexico got a terrible walloping. Thanks to its wide-open economy and high exposure to the United States it suffered the steepest recession on the American mainland: in 2009 its economy shrank by 6%. The country had already had a rocky decade. When China joined the World Trade Organisation in 2001, it started undercutting Mexico’s export industry. In the ten years to 2010 Mexico’s economy grew by an average of just 1.6% a year, less than half the rate of Brazil, which flourished in part by exporting commodities to China. But now changes are under way, in Mexico’s factories, its financial sector and even its oil and gas fields, that augur well for a very different decade. Latin America’s perennial underachiever grew faster than Brazil last year and will repeat the trick this year, with a rate of about 4% against less than 2% in Brazil. Mr Peña is aiming to get annual growth up to 6% before his six-year presidency is over. By the end of this decade Mexico will probably be among the world’s ten biggest economies; a few bullish forecasters think it might even become the largest in Latin America. How did Mexico achieve such a turnround?

### Mex Econ not key to US

## OIL

Oceans resilient

Kennedy 2 - Environmental science prof, Maryland. Former Director, Cooperative Oxford Laboratory. PhD. (Victor, Coastal and Marine Ecosystems and Global Climate Change, http://www.pewclimate.org/projects/marine.cfm)

#### There is evidence that marine organisms and ecosystems are resilient to environmental change. Steele (1991) hypothesized that the biological components of marine systems are tightly coupled to physical factors, allowing them to respond quickly to rapid environmental change and thus rendering them ecologically adaptable. Some species also have wide genetic variability throughout their range, which may allow for adaptation to climate change.

Alt causes to overfishing

Edmonton Journal 8 (Elaine O’Connor, “World's oceans at risk of becoming soupy swill; Rising temperatures, runoff toxins creating 'dead zones'” 9/15/2008, www.canada.com/edmontonjournal/news/story.html?id=3c40fbee-40e4-443a-b736-c70c6072649e)

#### VANCOUVER - Sally Cole came home from a sailing trip in August looking forward to a hot shower. But when she turned on her tap, all she got was slime. "I turned on the tap and it just flooped. Just a bit of viscous gloop came out. It was really horrible," said the resident of B.C's Saltspring Island between the mainland and Vancouver Island. The culprit was an algae bloom on the nearby lake that had choked the water pipes of hundreds of the area's residents. It took three days to clear. The incident is one example of how seas and lakes are suffocating in slime. That toxic slime -- algae feasting on pollutants and fertilizers, and starving the ocean of oxygen -- is killing off sea life at an alarming rate. A new study published in August reveals the world's "dead zones" have doubled in size every decade since 1960. Coastal waters with once rich marine life -- Chesapeake Bay, the Baltic Sea, the Black Sea and off Peru, Chile and Namibia -- are rapidly losing species. According to the report by two U.S. scientists, there are 405 asphyxiating dead zones in our oceans. The cause, predictably, is pollution. The culprits are fertilizer runoff in estuaries, sewage, global warming, overfishing and industrial waste. Millions of tonnes of "nutrient pollution" -- chemical fertilizer that adds phosphates and nitrogen to the water -- feed algae blooms. Some zones are vast -- the Baltic Sea's 70,000-square-kilometre aquatic graveyard is the largest. The Gulf of Mexico harbours North America's giant dead zone: A 22,000-square-km sea morgue, or something roughly the size of New Jersey. Other dead zones have been discovered off California, in Lake Erie, around the Florida Keys, in North and South Carolina creeks and in Washington's Puget Sound. Together, they have turned 246,048 square kilometres of the seas -- an area the equivalent of all five of the Great Lakes -- into marine wastelands. Robert Diaz, a Virginia Institute of Marine Science professor and co-author of the study, says the problem is already evident in Canadian waters. In B.C., a dead zone was first spotted in the Saanich Inlet in 1960. Dead zones have been recorded in P.E.I. fish-farming bays since 2000. If fish swim into a dead zone, they often become unconscious and cannot escape. Shellfish and bottom-dwellers move too slowly, so a stew of rotting marine life is left behind. Even when fish survive in low-oxygen water, research shows their reproduction suffers, which could jeopardize wild fish stocks. Diaz says this could be catastrophic for our local marine life and aquaculture. He says zones are likely to intensify as their contributing factors of algal blooms and intensive fish-farming are "problems that will continue into the future." Already, the impact of ocean deterioration is being felt all along the Pacific coast. Fishermen are bringing up cages of dead Dungeness crabs and salmon researchers have found low oxygen from the Columbia River on Oregon border's to northern Washington. As fish stocks fall, seabird populations are dying of starvation. Deadly algae are also becoming common on the Pacific West Coast. They have been blamed for the erratic behaviour and mass die-offs of sea mammals since some algae act as neurotoxins and impair brain function. Some 14,000 seals, sea lions and dolphins have washed up sick or dead in California in the last 10 years, and 650 grey whales have beached. Deadly algae have been a problem in the region since the 1980s, but scientists say they're increasingly frequent and intense. Algae is also storming international seas and claiming human victims. Near Sweden, cyanobacteria blooms at times turn the Baltic Sea into a brown slush that makes residents' eyes burn. On Florida's Gulf Coast, toxic tides have killed hundreds of manatees and caused breathing problems for area residents. Algae has smothered 80 per cent of coral reefs in the Caribbean and ruined 75 per cent of California's fish-rich kelp forests. Poison day-glo-green caulerpa algae is killing fish off the coasts of 11 countries. What will become of our oceans? One U.S. oceanographer has a succinct answer: slime. Jeremy Jackson, a Scripps Institution of Oceanography professor, released a report in August warning of "mass extinction" in oceans due to dead zones, global warming, overfishing, pollution, ocean acidification, ecosystem destruction and invasive species.

#### No impact to the environment

Holly Doremus 2k Professor of Law at UC Davis, "The Rhetoric and Reality of Nature Protection: Toward a New Discourse," Winter 2000 Washington & Lee Law Review 57 Wash & Lee L. Rev. 11, lexis

Reluctant to concede such losses, tellers of the ecological horror story highlight how close a catastrophe might be, and how little we know about what actions might trigger one. But the apocalyptic vision is **less credible today than it seemed in the 1970s.** Although it is clear that the earth is experiencing a mass wave of extinctions, n213 the **complete elimination of life on earth seems unlikely.** n214 **Life is remarkably robust**. **Nor is human extinction probable** any time soon. Homo sapiens is **adaptable to nearly any environment**. Even if the world of the future includes far fewer species, it likely will hold people. n215 One response to this credibility problem tones the story down a bit, arguing not that humans will go extinct but that ecological disruption will bring economies, and consequently civilizations, to their knees. n216 But this too may be **overstating the case**. Most ecosystem functions are **performed by multiple species**. This **functional redundancy** means that **a high proportion of species can be lost without precipitating a collapse**. n217 Another response drops the horrific ending and returns to a more measured discourse of the many material benefits nature provides humanity. Even these more plausible tales, though, suffer from an important limitation. They call for nature protection only at a high level of generality. For example, human-induced increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide levels may cause rapid changes in global temperatures in the near future, with drastic consequences for sea levels, weather patterns, and ecosystem services. n218 Similarly, the loss of large numbers of species undoubtedly reduces the genetic library from which we might in the future draw useful resources. n219 But it is difficult to translate these insights into convincing arguments against any one of the small local decisions that contribute to the problems of global warming or biodiversity loss. n220 It is easy to argue that **the** material **impact of any individual decision to increase** carbon **emissions slightly or to destroy a small amount of habitat will be small.** It is difficult to identify the specific straw that will break the camel's back. Furthermore, **no unilateral action at the local or even national level can solve these global problems**. Local decisionmakers may feel paralyzed by the scope of the problems, or may conclude that any sacrifices they might make will go unrewarded if others do not restrain their actions. In sum, at the local level at which most decisions affecting nature are made, the material discourse provides little reason to save nature. Short of the ultimate catastrophe, the material benefits of destructive decisions frequently will exceed their identifiable material costs. n221

## PTX
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#### Link turns the case – relations

Cardenas and Noriega, 12

Roger F. Noriega, José R. Cárdenas, American Enterprise Institute, 12/5/12

Roger F. Noriega (rnoriega@aei.org) was a senior US State Department official from 2001 to 2005. He is currently a visiting fellow at AEI and managing director of Vision Americas LLC, which represents foreign and domestic clients. José R. Cárdenas (jrc@visionamericas.com) is a contributor to AEI’s Venezuela-Iran Project and a director with Vision Americas, http://www.aei.org/outlook/foreign-and-defense-policy/regional/latin-america/an-action-plan-for-us-policy-in-the-americas/

In the final year of the George W. Bush administration, Mexico and the United States agreed on a $1 billion counter-narcotics assistance package. Yet, despite the enormous opportunity this presented to bring Mexico and the United States into a closer and mutually beneficial security cooperation, the aid was so slowly delivered that Mexicans have been left to wonder if their raging drug war is a priority for the United States. Conservative lawmakers who were the driving force behind Plan Colombia a decade ago have been less active on Mexico, focusing instead on border security as a means to fight illegal immigration and leaving Mexicans to square off with bloodthirsty cartels on their own. It is time for the United States to more fully recognize that “Mexico’s drug war” is more accurately “America’s drug war” that Mexico is fighting. The US Department of Justice says that Mexico’s drug-trafficking organizations are the greatest organized crime threat in the United States. The US must suppress demand for illicit drugs through education, treatment, and law enforcement, but helping Mexico sustain this fight is an indispensable responsibility as well. Moreover, increased US bipartisan political support may encourage the Mexican people and their new president, Enrique Peña Nieto, to sustain their antidrug efforts to advance the two countries’ common security, stability, and prosperity. The United States should also provide robust and innovative material support for these efforts and institutionalize law-enforcement cooperation and information sharing that are essential to the common fight against transnational criminal groups. In Central America, the institutions of government and the rule of law have been overwhelmed by the onslaught of criminal gangs that have been displaced by Mexico’s stepped-up law enforcement. Guatemala’s state apparatus has been underfunded for decades, and the institutions of Honduras have been weakened by a succession of populist caudillo presidents, systematic corruption, and the expanding presence of organized crime. El Salvador confronts the unique challenge of hardened gang members deported from the United States maintaining their ties to criminal networks in US urban centers. A public-security crisis in these countries has undermined popular confidence in elected officials and overwhelmed poorly trained and equipped security forces. Unless the United States and neighboring countries organize an international response, several of these countries may soon become ungovernable territories, producing economic failure, civil strife, and refugee crises. This challenge requires a regional rescue plan (led by the United States, Mexico, Colombia, Europe, and the multilateral development banks). The United States should encourage interested nations to organize a summit of governments and institutions to develop such a plan and agree on how it should be implemented and funded. But by far the greatest threat to security and stability in the Americas is the narco-state that has taken root in Venezuela under the unaccountable regime of Hugo Chávez. This hostile regime is managed by Cuba’s security apparatus, funded by China, armed by Russia, and partnered with Iran, Hezbollah, and Colombian and Mexican narco-traffickers. US law enforcement and federal prosecutors have gathered fresh, compelling evidence implicating senior Venezuelan officials and Chávez himself in narcotics trafficking in collusion with Colombian terrorist groups. Chávez has also forged an important strategic alliance with Iran to allow it to evade international sanctions and carry its asymmetrical threat against the United States to the country’s doorstep. Even as the international community implements new financial sanctions to deny Teheran the means to sustain a uranium enrichment program, the regime has established dozens of shadowy commercial enterprises and banks in Venezuela to launder as much as $30 billion through its petro-economy. Certainly the drug kingpins managing Venezuela today have everything to lose when Chávez succumbs to cancer. Several ruthless, anti-United States governments have a stake in trying to engineer a chavista succession, even as the government struggles with an unsustainable fiscal situation, a collapsing economy, social polarization, and a public-security crisis. In short, within the next several years, Venezuela will become a manmade disaster that will impact regional security and energy supply. America’s current policy of evading responsibility for the implosion in Venezuela is untenable and dangerous. Every serious government in the Americas has a stake in addressing these issues before they become unmanageable. The crises in Central America and Venezuela will require US leadership, intelligent diplomacy, and resources to organize an effective multilateral response. The following are recommendations for addressing these issues, listed by country or region. The Americas: Renew emphasis on intelligence capabilities and mission to confront extraregional threats and cross-border criminality; Increase dialogue with regional and European military, intelligence, and security agencies on common threats; Direct US Northern and Southern Commands, the US Coast Guard, and the US Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) to provide “surge” engagement plans for additional funding and other support; Ensure better cooperation from the US State Department with law enforcement and intelligence efforts. Mexico: Develop strong bipartisan support in the US Congress for Mexican counternarcotics efforts and for treating Mexico as not just an “enforcer” but an ally against drug trafficking cartels, and emphasize common “North American” strategies; Set up an interagency US-Mexico financial crimes unit based at the US Treasury to improve targeting of organized-crime money-laundering operations to cripple the financial solvency of the cartels.

#### Turns private investment -- Failure to raise the debt ceiling causes investor uncertainty and collapses the economy

Masters 13 (Jonathan, Deputy Editor at the Council on Foreign Relations, Backgrounder, jan 2 2013"US Debt Ceiling. Costs and Consequences")

Most economists, including those in the White House and from former administrations, agree that the impact of an outright government default would be severe. Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke has said **a U.S. default could be a** [**"recovery-ending event"**](http://blogs.wsj.com/economics/2011/03/01/bernanke-warns-on-debt-limit-chaos/) **that would likely spark another financial crisis**. Short of default, officials warn that legislative delays in raising the debt ceiling could also inflict significant harm on the economy.¶ Many analysts say congressional gridlock over the debt limit will likely sow significant uncertainty in the bond markets and place upward pressure on interest rates. Rate increases would not only hike future borrowing costs of the federal government, but would also raise capital costs for struggling U.S. businesses and cash-strapped homebuyers. In addition, rising rates could divert future taxpayer money away from much-needed federal investments in such areas as infrastructure, education, and health care.¶ The protracted and politically acrimonious debt limit showdown in the summer 2011 prompted Standard and Poor's to take the unprecedented step of downgrading the U.S. credit rating from its triple-A status, and **analysts fear such brinksmanship** in early 2013 could bring about similar moves from other rating agencies.¶ A 2012 study by the non-partisan Government Accountability Office estimated that [delays in raising the debt ceiling](http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-12-701) in 2011 cost taxpayers approximately $1.3 billion for FY 2011. BPC estimated the ten-year costs of the prolonged fight at roughly $19 billion.¶ The stock market also was thrown into frenzy in the lead-up to and aftermath of the 2011 debt limit debate, with the [Dow Jones Industrial Average](http://www.bizjournals.com/nashville/news/2011/08/08/slideshow-dows-10-worst-days-ever.html) plunging roughly 2,000 points from the final days of July through the first days of August. Indeed, the Dow recorded one of its worst single-day drops in history on August 8, the day after the S&P downgrade, tumbling 635 points.¶ Speaking to the [Economic Club of New York](http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/11/20/idUSW1E8KA00A20121120) in November 2012, Fed Chairman Ben Bernanke warned that congressional inaction with regard to the fiscal cliff, the raising of the debt ceiling, and the longer-term budget situation **was creating uncertainty** that "appears already to be affecting private spending and investment decisions and may be contributing to an increased sense of caution in financial markets, with adverse effects on the economy."

#### Failure to raise the debt ceiling causes debt downgrade, stock market collapse, low consumer confidence and spending

Barro 9/18 (Josh, Business Insider, "Two Charts That Show Why Another Debt Ceiling Fight is a Very Bad IDea")

Since Republicans in Congress seem intent on flirting (again) with hitting the debt ceiling, the Joint Economic Committee's Democratic staff is out with a report reminding us that doing so is a terrible, horrible, no good, very bad idea.¶ Here's what happens when you lead the financial markets to think the U.S. government might fail to pay its obligations:¶ Your debt gets downgraded (Standard & Poors cut the U.S. sovereign bond rating to AA+ as a result of the last crisis).¶ The stock market plunges (down 16% in three weeks during the last debt ceiling crisis).¶ Consumer confidence falls, which means people don't buy as much and the economy slows down. Last time, a deal to raise the debt ceiling was reached in August, but consumer confidence didn't reach pre-crisis levels until January 2012.¶ People arguing about economic policy talk a lot about "uncertainty," and usually they're B.S.ing. But the debt ceiling is one of the few topics where uncertainty is really the big deal.¶ When the government risks creating a payment crisis, people start to wonder whether they're going to get their Social Security checks or their paychecks or their bond interest. And they wonder what broader effects a payment crisis may have on the economy.¶ All that causes people to stop spending and prepare for crisis. It slows down the economy. And it makes us look stupid, as a country. We shouldn't do it.
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#### He’s winning because he’s using capital to unify Democrats and exploit GOP divisions

**Allen, 9/19/13** (Jonathan, Politico, “GOP battles boost Obama” <http://www.politico.com/story/2013/09/republicans-budget-obama-97093.html>)

There’s a simple reason President Barack Obama is using his bully pulpit to focus the nation’s attention on the battle over the budget: In this fight, he’s watching Republicans take swings at each other.

And that GOP fight is a lifeline for an administration that had been scrambling to gain control its message after battling congressional Democrats on the potential use of military force in Syria and the possible nomination of Larry Summers to run the Federal Reserve.

If House Republicans and Obama can’t cut even a short-term deal for a continuing resolution, the government’s authority to spend money will run out on Oct. 1. Within weeks, the nation will default on its debt if an agreement isn’t reached to raise the federal debt limit.

For some Republicans, those deadlines represent a leverage point that can be used to force Obama to slash his health care law. For others, they’re a zero hour at which the party will implode if it doesn’t cut a deal.

Meanwhile, “on the looming fiscal issues, Democrats — both liberal and conservative, executive and congressional — are virtually 100 percent united,” said Sen. Charles Schumer (D-N.Y.).

Just a few days ago, all that Obama and his aides could talk about were Syria and Summers. Now, they’re bringing their party together and shining a white hot light on Republican disunity over whether to shut down the government and plunge the nation into default in a vain effort to stop Obamacare from going into effect.

The squabbling among Republicans has gotten so vicious that a Twitter hashtag — #GOPvsGOPugliness — has become a thick virtual data file for tracking the intraparty insults. Moderates, and even some conservatives, are slamming Texas Sen. Ted Cruz, a tea party favorite, for ramping up grassroots expectations that the GOP will shut down the government if it can’t win concessions from the president to “defund” his signature health care law.

“I didn’t go to Harvard or Princeton, but I can count,” Sen. Bob Corker (R-Tenn.) tweeted, subtly mocking Cruz’s Ivy League education. “The defunding box canyon is a tactic that will fail and weaken our position.”

While it is well-timed for the White House to interrupt a bad slide, Obama’s singular focus on the budget battle is hardly a last-minute shift. Instead, it is a return to the narrative arc that the White House was working to build before the Syria crisis intervened.

#### Obama will win on debt ceiling if he maintains his position of strength

**Liasson, 9/21/13** (Mara, “Have Obama's Troubles Weakened Him For Fall's Fiscal Fights?” NPR, <http://www.npr.org/blogs/itsallpolitics/2013/09/21/224494760/have-obamas-troubles-weakened-him-for-falls-fiscal-fights>)

"[Obama] had some missteps within the caucus," Manley says, but "now that he has those situations behind him ... he can turn his attention to the debt limit and the spending issues." Manley says the president will be well-positioned to take on Republicans in those fiscal fights, "if only because ... their policies are so out of the mainstream that they won't enjoy any support on the Hill and/or with the American people." The plan to bomb Syria was extremely unpopular. But on budget issues, the president is on firmer footing with the public, who may not like Obamacare but don't want it repealed or defunded. So, in the House at least, Republicans are making demands the president cannot and will not meet. "You have never seen, in the history of the United States, the debt ceiling or the threat of not raising the debt ceiling being used to extort a president or a governing party, and trying to force issues that have nothing to do with the budget and have nothing to do with the debt," Obama has said. White House officials say Democrats will always have internal divisions, but right now they are nothing compared with the fights inside the GOP. "There is essentially a civil war brimming in the Republican Party right now," says Dan Pfeiffer, the president's senior adviser. Pfeiffer points to open warfare between Tea Party conservatives and moderates, and even between House and Senate conservatives, as Republicans struggle to settle on a viable budget strategy. "The important thing is, as we head into these budget battles this fall, Democrats ... are in lock-step about the way to approach this," he says, "which is that we are not going to negotiate on the debt ceiling — we're not going to allow the full faith and credit of the United States to be held hostage by the Republicans, who want to ... deny health insurance to millions of Americans. We're in lock-step and they're divided, so I feel pretty good about that." Despite the setbacks of the spring and summer, the Obama team is counting on the latent power of the presidency — one of the most resilient institutions in American life. Unlike on Syria, Obama seems to have a budget strategy. He's hanging tough on his two red lines: no negotiations on the debt ceiling and no changes to Obamacare. The president is willing for now to let the Republicans flirt with the unpopular and dangerous possibilities of a government shutdown and a debt default. It's a high-stakes game of chicken, and one where the White House feels confident it has the upper hand.

#### He just needs to stay the course

**Robinson, 9/20**/13 – Washington Post columnist (Eugene, “Obama Needs to Stand His Ground” <http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2013/09/20/obama_needs_to_stand_his_ground_120003.html>)

Obama is by nature a reasonable and flexible man, but this time he must not yield. Even if you leave aside what delaying or defunding Obamacare would mean for his legacy -- erasing his most significant domestic accomplishment -- it would be irresponsible for him to bow to the GOP zealots' demands.

The practical impact of acquiescing would be huge. Individuals who have been uninsured are anticipating access to adequate care. State governments, insurance companies and health care providers have spent vast amounts of time and money preparing for the law to take effect. To suddenly say "never mind" would be unbelievably reckless.

The political implication of compromising with blackmailers would be an unthinkable surrender of presidential authority. The next time he said "I will do this" or "I will not do that," why should Congress or the American people take him seriously? How could that possibly enhance Obama's image on the world stage?

Obama has said he will not accept a budget deal that cripples Obamacare and will never negotiate on the debt ceiling. Even if the Republicans carry through with their threats -- and this may happen -- the president has no option but to stand his ground.

You don't deal with bullies by making a deal to keep the peace. That only rewards and encourages them. You have to push back.

The thing is, this showdown is a sure political loser for the GOP -- and smart Republicans know it. Boehner doesn't want this fight, and in fact should be grateful if Obama hangs tough and shows the crazies the limits of their power. Republicans in the Senate don't want this fight. It's doubtful that even a majority of House Republicans really, truly want this fight, no matter what they say publicly.

But irresponsible demagogues -- I mean you, Sen. Ted Cruz, R-Texas -- have whipped the GOP base into a frenzy of unrealistic expectations. House members who balk at jumping off the cliff risk being labeled "moderate," which is the very worst thing you can call a Republican -- and the most likely thing to shorten his or her political career.

The way to end this madness is by firmly saying no. If Boehner won't do it, Obama must.

### a2 won’t pass – reps

#### Obama’s debt ceiling strategy ensures deal – avoiding unified GOP attacks is key

Corn 9/24 David, Mother Jones' Washington bureau chief, “Slate Pitch: Obama Is the Shrewdest Political Tactician Since LBJ”, <http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2013/09/slate-pitch-obama-shrewd-political-strategist>, CMR

Obama may start talking with congressional Republicans later this week, but he's given the Rs plenty of time and room for their internecine squabbling. In past years, Obama eschewed standing by while GOPers engaged in reckless behavior that could result in a shutdown or a financial crisis. At those times, he argued, reasonably, that he had a responsibility to ensure government operations would continue and the debt ceiling would be lifted to avert what could be serious blows to the economic recovery. And he devoted significant energy toward cutting deals with the Republicans, even endeavoring to use those occasions as opportunities to reach a so-called grand bargain on spending and taxes. But at the same time, he resolved to limit the openings for future GOP hostage-taking.¶ After the debt ceiling showdown of 2011, Obama repeatedly stated he would no longer negotiate future boosts in the debt ceiling. With another debt ceiling tussle coming in weeks, Obama has continued to stick to this red line. And with the government due to run out of money for its operations at the end of the month, he has not rushed to draw Boehner (or Senate GOP leader Mitch McConnell) into budget talks. He's craftily letting the Republicans brawl amongst themselves—bickering over who's a real conservative or not—as polls repeatedly suggest that the GOPers can expect to receive most of the public's scorn should the government come to a congressionally inflicted standstill. ¶ Syria and Washington's budget woes are problems that are far from being solved. And Obama still has not demonstrated how he can overcome the serious challenges he confronts in achieving other parts of his agenda: immigration, gun safety, raising the minimum wage, expanding Head Start, and boosting employment. Moreover, implementing and selling Obamacare—with the new health insurance exchanges coming on line October 1—remains a priority and tough task for the White House, which has not figured out how to win over the public on this front. Obama's skills as a strategist have often been discounted by the politerati—in part because Obama and his team have done a poor job of promoting his successes, which sometimes are nuanced and complicated. But in recent weeks, the president has displayed his ability to outmaneuver opponents. In the days ahead, he will have plenty of opportunity to do so again.

#### Reps divided – Obama has upper hand

Reuters 9/11/13 (Delay in Syria Vote frees Obama to Shift to Hefty Domestic Agenda")

Among Obama's most immediate challenges are two looming budget fights. By September 30, Congress and the president must agree on legislation to keep federal agencies funded or face a government shutdown.¶ Two weeks later, Congress must raise the limit on the country's ability to borrow or risk a possible debt default that could cause chaos in financial [markets](http://www.reuters.com/finance/markets?lc=int_mb_1001).¶ On the first budget showdown, Obama may be at a strategic advantage because of divisions among opposition Republicans about whether to use the spending bill to provoke a fight over Obama's signature health care law, known as Obamacare.¶ House Republican leaders are trying to rally the party around a temporary spending measure that would keep the government funded until December 15 but are facing resistance within their own caucus from some conservatives who want to cut off funding for Obamacare, even if it means a government shutdown.¶ The debt limit fight could end up going down to the wire and unnerving financial [markets](http://www.reuters.com/finance/markets?lc=int_mb_1001). Republicans want to use that standoff to extract concessions from the Democratic president, such as spending cuts and a delay in the health law. But Obama has said he has no intention of negotiating over the borrowing limit.

#### Their uniqueness ev says that one route to success is if Republicans cave – here’s ev saying they will –

Allen 9/12 Jonathan, Politico, White House determined not to give ground on Obamacare, 9/12/13, http://dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=73E5268E-11F6-4056-B961-28B3CE23A8B2

Don’t blink first.¶ That’s the strategy President Barack Obama and Capitol Hill Democrats are pursuing as the nation faces a government shutdown, a historic default on its debt and the final phase of Obamacare.¶ Obama’s domestic agenda — headed up by infrastructure spending, gun control and immigration reform — has long since stalled. Now, with the basic functions of government on the line again, he’s defining his goal as not giving any more ground to House Republicans — no budget cuts and no concessions on the Affordable Care Act or the debt limit.¶ Obamacare, the crown jewel of the president’s legislative legacy, is truly non-negotiable for the administration, according to Democrats privy to conversations behind closed doors at the White House and on Capitol Hill.¶ Rob Nabors, Obama’s deputy chief of staff for policy, told that to House Democratic leaders during a closed-door session on Thursday, according to a Democratic source on Capitol Hill.¶ “They’re willing to negotiate, but not on ACA,” the source said of Nabors’s message. The bigger problem, the source said, is that “Republicans can’t get their s—t together to sit down and talk.”¶ With the exception of a Wednesday meeting on the debt limit with Treasury Secretary Jack Lew, Boehner and his aides haven’t talked fiscal matters with the White House recently, according to Boehner spokesman Brendan Buck. Nabors told House Democrats that there have been no back channel conversations with the speaker.¶ The White House position is a defensive posture struck as much out of necessity as from choice, and one that remains unchanged after Washington lost more than two weeks on domestic matters while it was fixated on the Syria crisis. The idea is to prevent further damage to party priorities. Administration officials also believe that Republicans will back down to avoid economic catastrophe and the ensuing political fallout.¶ “The combination of those two incentives will compel them to come up with a solution,” White House press secretary Jay Carney said Thursday. “We have drawn the lines we have drawn, and we’ll see what they produce.”\

### a2 energy policy link

#### Link outweighs the link turn – even if popular, it’s not a priority for the GOP and not important enough to switch votes on immigration anyway

Cardenas and Noriega, 12

Roger F. Noriega, José R. Cárdenas, American Enterprise Institute, 12/5/12

Roger F. Noriega (rnoriega@aei.org) was a senior US State Department official from 2001 to 2005. He is currently a visiting fellow at AEI and managing director of Vision Americas LLC, which represents foreign and domestic clients. José R. Cárdenas (jrc@visionamericas.com) is a contributor to AEI’s Venezuela-Iran Project and a director with Vision Americas, http://www.aei.org/outlook/foreign-and-defense-policy/regional/latin-america/an-action-plan-for-us-policy-in-the-americas/

A Security and Stability Agenda Shared land and maritime borders make security in Western Hemisphere countries a permanent priority for the US government. The security challenges confronting Mexico, Central America, and Venezuela are more dramatic today than in recent memory. In the final year of the George W. Bush administration, Mexico and the United States agreed on a $1 billion counter-narcotics assistance package. Yet, despite the enormous opportunity this presented to bring Mexico and the United States into a closer and mutually beneficial security cooperation, the aid was so slowly delivered that Mexicans have been left to wonder if their raging drug war is a priority for the United States. Conservative lawmakers who were the driving force behind Plan Colombia a decade ago have been less active on Mexico, focusing instead on border security as a means to fight illegal immigration and leaving Mexicans to square off with bloodthirsty cartels on their own.

#### Plan is popular with the wrong group – obstructionism is ideological – keeping Dems on board is the only way to overcome it – solves their non-uniques and takes out their turns

Benen 9-12 (Steve Benen, analyst, “Republican leaders vs. the GOP's 'Neanderthals'” The Maddow Blog, 9-12-2013, http://maddowblog.msnbc.com/\_news/2013/09/12/20454025-republican-leaders-vs-the-gops-neanderthals?lite)

A significant, outcome-changing contingent within the House GOP caucus is driven by such irrational hatred of the Affordable Care Act that it won't accept anything short of everything. Party leaders realize this approach would trigger a shutdown that the public would blame on Republicans. But if Boehner crafted a far-right spending measure to make extremists happy, this would quickly be rejected by the Senate and White House, again leading to a shutdown that the public would blame on Republicans. The best way out is for the Speaker to give up on the radical wing of his party and strike a deal with House Democrats by scrapping the destructive sequestration policy. The shutdown would be averted; the economy would get a boost (remember when Congress occasionally thought about the economy?); and the Speaker would win plaudits for bipartisan cooperation and governing.

#### Dem unity key – only way Boehner can pass anything

Weisman 9-12 (Jonathan Weisman, political analyst, 9-12-2013, “Boehner seeks help on deficit discussions”, NYT, http://www.twincities.com/national/ci\_24084222/boehner-seeks-help-deficit-discussions?source=rss)

With Congress momentarily freed from the Syrian crisis, lawmakers plunged back into their fiscal standoff Thursday as Speaker John Boehner appealed to the Obama administration and Democratic leaders to help him resolve divisions in the Republican ranks that could lead to a government shutdown by month's end.¶ In meetings with Democratic and Republican congressional leaders Thursday after a session with Treasury Secretary Jacob Lew on Wednesday, Boehner sought a resumption of negotiations that could keep the government running and yield a deficit-reduction deal that would persuade recalcitrant conservatives to raise the government's borrowing limit.¶ Much of the federal government will shut down Oct. 1 unless Congress OKs new spending bills to replace expiring ones, and by mid-October, the Treasury Department will lose the borrowing authority to finance the government and pay its debts.¶ "It's time for the president's party to show the courage to work with us to solve this problem," said Boehner, who argued that budget deals have been part of past agreements to raise the debt limit.¶ But a bloc of 43 House Republicans undercut the speaker's deficit-reduction focus, introducing yearlong funding legislation that would increase Pentagon and veterans' spending and delay President Barack Obama's health care law for a year -- most likely adding to the budget deficit. That bloc is large enough to thwart any compromise that does not attract Democratic support.

### a2 no link u

#### Debt ceiling needs all remaining floor time to pass – and it’s getting it now – thumpers don’t apply

Gerson 9/18/13 - served as a senior adviser to President George W. Bush (Michael, Virginian Pilot, “The politics of paralysis” lexis)

The remainder of legislative time and attention that hasn't been spent on Syria this year will now be consumed by the budget and debt-ceiling debates - in which the best possible outcome is the avoidance of self-inflicted wounds.¶ Republican leaders seem prepared to combine the continuing resolution and debt-ceiling increase, extend both for a year with the budget at level spending, and impose a one-year delay in implementing Obamacare. They won't get the last part - Obama would veto anything including it - but the Republican base insists.¶ The Obama administration, in return, offers nothing. It is continuing the practice of starting a negotiation process by refusing to negotiate.¶ Coming to an eventual compromise between one side that demands the moon and the other side that demands and offers nothing at all won't be easy. The protection of Obamacare is the one "red line" the administration holds absolutely sacred.¶ But conservatives sense opportunity in a weakened president and a deeply unpopular law. And Speaker John Boehner's room to maneuver is extremely limited by a small faction of his party that is just big enough to paralyze him. It is a recipe for confidence-shaking, market-spooking, down-to-the-wire confrontation.¶ In the shadow of this conflict, little else will grow. According to Yuval Levin of the Ethics and Public Policy Center, "only things that have to pass - or else the government shuts down or the economy crashes - are going to pass this year."

#### Only the plan crowds it off the agenda

Ornstein 9-1 (Norm Ornstein, resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, 9/1/13, Showdowns and Shutdowns, www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2013/09/01/showdowns\_and\_shutdowns\_syria\_congress\_obama)

Then there is the overload of business on the congressional agenda when the two houses return on Sept. 9 -with only nine legislative days scheduled for action in the month. We have serious confrontations ahead on spending bills and the debt limit, as the new fiscal year begins on Oct. 1 and the debt ceiling approaches just a week or two thereafter. Before the news that we would drop everything for an intense debate on whether to strike militarily in Syria, Congress-watchers were wondering how we could possibly deal with the intense bargaining required to avoid one or more government shutdowns and/or a real breach of the debt ceiling, with devastating consequences for American credibility and the international economy. Beyond the deep policy and political divisions, Republican congressional leaders will likely use both a shutdown and the debt ceiling as hostages to force the president to cave on their demands for deeper spending cuts. Avoiding this end-game bargaining will require the unwavering attention of the same top leaders in the executive and legislative branches who will be deeply enmeshed in the Syria debate. The possibility -even probability -of disruptions caused by partial shutdowns could complicate any military actions. The possibility is also great that the rancor that will accompany the showdowns over fiscal policy will bleed over into the debate about America and Syria.

### a2 lobbies link

#### Non controversial energy legislation requires PC to overcome poison pill riders

Chemnick, 12

Jean Chemnick, E&E reporter, E&E Daily: Wednesday, February 1, 2012, http://www.eenews.net/public/EEDaily/2012/02/01/1

Kerry conceded that it would be difficult to pass almost anything in an election year, "but we're going to do stuff that's not controversial." Sen. Joe Lieberman (I-Conn.), who with Kerry introduced comprehensive climate change legislation in the last Congress, said supporters of action on global warming remain disappointed that it failed. "But if we get some energy independence, alternative energy, energy efficiency legislation adopted, I think we will thereby also diminish carbon pollution, which I think it's all about," he said. Sen. Lindsey Graham (R-S.C.), who worked with Kerry and Lieberman on the climate bill but was not ultimately a co-sponsor, said that he saw opportunities for bipartisan collaboration, especially on efficiency measures. "I think there's a market now for energy efficiency and a market for domestic energy production," he said. In particular, Graham singled out his Home Star bill, which would have provided incentives for residential efficiency retrofits that he sponsored last Congress with Sen. Mark Warner (D-Va.). "I think there would be bipartisan support for that," Graham added. But it is unclear whether Home Star would be a candidate for any proposed package this year. The Warner-Graham bill has not been reintroduced, and while a version passed the House in 2010, when the Democrats were in the majority, the Senate version was never approved by the Finance Committee. The bills the Energy and Natural Resources Committee has approved this Congress with bipartisan support include an industrial energy efficiency bill co-sponsored by Sens. Jeanne Shaheen (D-N.H.) and Rob Portman (R-Ohio), a measure to establish a new carbon capture and sequestration program at the Energy Department and bills to promote solar energy and geothermal. Aside from the goal of producing legislation, the Tuesday group also provides an opportunity for its members to talk about climate and energy issues. Energy Secretary Steven Chu addressed the senators in November. Daniel Weiss of the Center for American Progress Action Fund said that any of the bills approved by the energy committee would have a good chance of making it to the floor of the Senate. But while Kerry and his colleagues may succeed in crafting a bill that would garner broad bipartisan support, Senate Republicans might move to attach amendments to it that would roll back U.S. EPA pollution restrictions, approve the Keystone XL pipeline or open new areas along the West Coast or in Alaska to petroleum production, Weiss said. Similar attempts are likely in the Republican-controlled House. "The challenge would be to keep poison-pill amendments off of the bill without getting it pulled," he said.

#### Oil Lobby power exaggerated

Mearsheimer and Walt, ‘7

John J. Mearsheimer and Stephen M. Walt, Israel Lobby and Foreign Policy, p. 143, http://www.thirdworldtraveler.com/Israel/US\_Israel\_Lobby\_2\_ILUSFP.html

If Arab petrodollars or energy companies were driving American policy, one would expect to see the United States distancing itself from Israel and working overtime to get the Palestinians a state of their own. Countries like Saudi Arabia have repeatedly pressed Washington to adopt a more evenhanded position toward the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, but to little avail, and even wielding the "oil weapon" during the 1973 October War had little effect on U.S. support for Israel or on overall American policy in the region. Similarly, if oil companies were driving U.S. policy, one would also have expected Washington to curry favor with big oil producers like Saddam Hussein's Iraq, Muammar Gaddafi's Libya, or the Islamic Republic of Iran, so that U.S. companies could make money helping them develop their energy resources and bringing them to market. Instead, the United States imposed sanctions on all three of these countries, in sharp opposition to what the oil industry wanted: Indeed in some cases the U.S. government deliberately intervened to thwart business deals that would have benefited U.S. companies. If the oil lobby were as powerful as some critics believe, such actions would not have occurred

#### Even the credible possibility of default will destroy the economy

**Davis, 9/18/13 -** professor of political science at Brigham Young University(Richard, Deseret News, “Raise the debt ceiling, then talk about spending less” <http://www.deseretnews.com/article/865586538/Raise-the-debt-ceiling-then-talk-about-spending-less.html>)

This is a strategy popular with the Republican right wing, but it is bad policy for the nation. Paying the nation’s bills is not about politics. It sends the wrong signal to investors that U.S. political leaders are not serious about the consequences of default. The nation’s bond rating was lowered after the last near-default. That would happen again if the government defaulted. Even the possibility of default makes investors jittery and undermines our reputation as a nation that always lives up to its promise to pay its bills. A lower bond rating costs taxpayers more money because borrowing comes at a heavier price, just as a lower credit score for failure to pay bills hurts an individual.

### a2 thumper

#### Yes capital- position of Obama is relative to republican strength- which is non-existent

Mardell 9/18/13 (Mark, North America Editor, BBC News, "Obama Presidency: Decline in the Fall?")

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

**Issue specific uniqueness first – assumes the thumper– only the plan will derail it**

**Debt ceiling is at the top of the agenda**

**Moran, 9/18**/13 (Andrew, “Dollar collapse inevitable as CBO warns of unsustainable debt levels,” http://economiccollapsenews.com/2013/09/18/dollar-collapse-inevitable-as-cbo-warns-of-unsustainable-debt-levels/, bgm)

**The United States national debt has taken a backseat over the past couple of months due to the potential war with Syria. Over the next few weeks, though, it is expected that the federal debt and budget deficit will capture headlines again because of the looming debt ceiling fight between President Obama and Republican lawmakers.** At the present time, the U.S. faces a $17 trillion national debt and a near $1 trillion budget deficit. The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) published a report Tuesday that warned the U.S. public debt could account for more than 100 percent of the country’s economic output within the next 25 years unless action is taken.

**Debt ceiling will be raised – top priority, no thumpers**

**Houston Chronicle 9/10**

“How Long Can We Continue Without a Congress?”, <http://blog.chron.com/goplifer/2013/09/how-long-can-we-continue-without-a-congress/>, CMR

By a large margin, the **last Congress got less accomplished than any in modern history**. The current Congress may actually do less. There is almost no Congressional action too trivial or uncontroversial to catch the eye of the Tea Party watchdogs protecting us from socialism.¶ So, how long can this continue? **Apart from the debt ceiling**, **Congress doesn’t face any scheduled do-or-die events**. **Although the Tea Party is itching to force** a **doom**sday **over the debt ceiling, they are alone in their urge to wreak havoc** on global capitalism. **They will** probably **fail and the debt ceiling will be raised**.

### a2 syria

#### Syria doesn’t thump

Greg Sargent, political analyst for The Plum Line, 9-12-2013, “Syria won’t make GOP’s immigration problem go “poof” and disappear”, http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/plum-line/wp/2013/09/12/syria-wont-make-gops-immigration-problem-go-poof-and-disappear/

When looked at through the prism of specific issues — such as immigration reform or the budget arguments to come — the notion that the Syria mess somehow diminishes the chances for key items on Obama’s agenda, or somehow changes the calculus for Republicans with regard to how to approach them, is plainly absurd on its face.

#### Doesn’t thump – wasn’t a huge fight

**Lerer 9/12**

Lisa, “Obama Syria Reversal Sets Stage for Fights With Congress”, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-09-12/obama-syria-reversal-sets-stage-for-fights-with-congress.html,

The White House and its allies argue that the debate over Syria won’t hurt Obama on other issues, simply because the fight didn’t break along traditional party lines and is unlikely to resonate in the 2014 congressional elections. A coalition of small-government Republicans wary of U.S. involvement overseas and Democrats who warned of the risk of entering another Middle Eastern war lined up against Obama’s Syria plan, likely killing its chances of passage if there had been a vote in the House.¶ Those Democrats, Obama supporters say, will stick with the president on economic issues, while many of those Republicans will always be lined up against him.
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### a2 not negotiating

#### Not willing to negotiate doesn’t mean not involved – he’s using PC and it’s key

Blake 9/18/13 (Aaron, Covers National Politics for the Washington Post, The Washington Post, Post Politics, Carney Assures That Obama 'Has Twisted Arms')

White House press secretary Jay Carney on Wednesday fought back against criticism that President Obama has been disengaged from legislative battles on Capitol Hill.¶ "He has twisted arms," Carney said. "He has used the powers that are available to him to try to convince, persuade, cajole Republicans into doing the sensible thing...."¶ Pressed on Obama's role in the current budget debate and his refusal to negotiate over the debt ceiling, Carney rebuffed the idea that the president isn't involved.¶ “You’re assuming he’s above the fray," Carney said. "He’s not. He’s in the fray. And he was in the fray today, and he'll be in the fray until Congress does the right thing.”

#### Even if he isn’t now – he will

Feldmann 9/18/13 (Linda, Christian Science Monitor, "Government shutdown coming? Boehner raises stakes on defunding Obamacare")

As for Obama, even before Boehner’s capitulation to the tea party wing of his caucus, efforts to woo the Republicans into a budget deal have born no fruit, and so he has opted for verbal slaps. On Monday, the president took to a [White House](http://www.csmonitor.com/tags/topic/The+White+House) stage to mark the five-year anniversary of the 2008 financial crisis, and he spewed vitriol at his most ardent opponents – even though a mass shooting had just taken place a few miles from the White House.¶ "I cannot remember a time when one faction of one party promises economic chaos if it doesn't get 100 percent of what it wants," Obama said.¶ At Wednesday’s briefing, White House press secretary [Jay Carney](http://www.csmonitor.com/tags/topic/Jay+Carney) suggested that the president’s past charm offensive with Republicans – including taking some out to dinner at an expensive restaurant (on his dime) – hadn’t completely failed.¶ “What we discovered is that there is a sincere desire by Republican lawmakers, some of them, anyway ... to make budget policy that ... reduces the deficit responsibly, but invests responsibly as well,” Mr. Carney said.¶ And, he said, the president will still try “all manner of ways to get to yes with Republican leaders.”