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**CP Text: The United States Federal Government should substantially increase its short sea shipping capability for NAFTA trade opportunities towards Mexico.**

**SSS leads to new job growth**

**MARAD ‘11** [U.S. Department of Transportation Maritime Administration], America’s Marine Highway Report to Congress, Prepared in Consultation with the Environmental Protection Agency, April 2011, p. 12-13]

Expanded use of Marine Highway services has the potential to generate orders for new vessels. These orders could help to revitalize the U.S. shipbuilding industry and support the nation’s skilled shipyard labor base through the construction of self-propelled vessels specifically designed for container and trailer freight movement and passenger trades, such as roll-on/roll-off (RoRo) trailer ships and ferries (see section below on The Marine Highway and National Defense). The direct number of jobs created per vessel constructed would vary by vessel size and type. Building a larger self-propelled coastal ship to transport trailers and containers might generate up to 600 job years of direct labor at the shipyard35 Indirect jobs (jobs at steel producers and other suppliers to the shipyard) and induced jobs (jobs supported in the general economy due to spending of workers’ wages) would add significantly to the overall employment impact. Construction of Marine Highway vessels built to a standard design and in serial production runs would also reduce per vessel costs and could lead to more vessel orders and jobs over the longer term. Growth in Marine Highway activity will also support land-based job opportunities – such as short-haul truck drivers and logistical business positions at Marine Highway ports. Job creation on vessels and in ports due to the growth of the America’s Marine Highway system depends largely on the numbers and locations of Marine Highway corridors and services that eventually emerge, future growth of domestic freight movements, future funding of infrastructure in water- and land-based transportation modes, and the complex tradeoff of jobs among these modes as one modal system gains proportionately more traffic than another. Ultimately, however, the principal source of new employment from America’s Marine Highway will be its contribution to the efficiency and flexibility of the nation’s supply chain, as described in the following sections of this report. By having access to a reliable transportation alternative that can be expanded at modest cost when compared to surface transportation services, U.S. businesses can better react to changing supply chain circumstances, such as rising fuel costs, and thereby realize productivity gains and improved profitability. Profitable and productive businesses experiencing growth are the chief sources of new demand for workers throughout the economy.

**Solves trade- SSS can solve congestion and leads to reliable transfer of cargo**

**MARAD ‘11** [U.S. Department of Transportation Maritime Administration], America’s Marine Highway Report to Congress, Prepared in Consultation with the Environmental Protection Agency, April 2011, p. 17]

America’s Marine Highway can play a role in alleviating this congestion on some of our surface transportation corridors, with its abundant capacity to carry freight to and from many locations across the country. This is particularly true because many of the areas of greatest land-based congestion, as shown in Figure 1, are also those areas that Marine Highway operators could best serve through ocean, inland waterway, and lake access. While important at a national level, the Marine Highway can be especially effective in reducing congestion for all users along certain coastal surface corridors (e.g., the I-5 (Pacific), I-95 (Atlantic), and I-10 (Gulf) highway corridors), including at border crossings into Canada, and in urban areas with large ports.¶ The Government Accountability Office (GAO) has identified congestion around large urban ports as a major source of inefficiency in the national transportation system. The GAO notes the following:¶ The major challenges to freight mobility share a common theme – congestion. National studies point to such problems as overcrowded highways and freight-specific ‘chokepoints’ that stifle effective intermodal transfer of cargoes. All 10 ports GAO studied faced similar congestion-related problems. For example, many of the ports are in dense urban areas, limiting the ability to expand rail yards, roadways, and other infrastructure.41 The Marine Highway system has existing capacity to transfer containers and trailers away from congested highways and rail systems that serve ports to less congested ports and inland terminals. In 2000, FHWA estimated that each vehicle-mile traveled by trucks adds between $0.18 and $0.33 (reflecting typical or average conditions) to the cost of congestion on urban roadways; this value will only increase as congestion becomes more severe.42 Reducing this source of congestion can therefore have significant value to the public. In addition to reducing surface congestion, the movement of cargo to inland terminals can benefit exporters and importers, many of which have found that their businesses are made easier if they can assemble export shipments or deploy imports at points free from the congestion.43 Perhaps most importantly, it can offer shippers reliable and predictable service that is essential to just-in-time inventory systems. The America’s Marine Highway Program is designed to identify the most promising water corridors for the movement of passengers and freight to help relieve surface congestion and to facilitate the transition to greater use of this underutilized national asset.
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#### Interpretation – economic engagement requires expanding bilateral economic relations – the plan has to be government to government

**Daga, 13** - director of research at Politicas Publicas para la Libertad, in Bolivia, and a visiting senior policy analyst at the Heritage Foundation (Sergio, “Economics of the 2013-2014 Debate Topic:

U.S. Economic Engagement Toward Cuba, Mexico or Venezuela”, National Center for Policy Analysis, 5/15, <http://www.ncpa.org/pdfs/Message_to_Debaters_6-7-13.pdf>)

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.

Violation: they engage through the NADBank

#### **A) limits – a government limit is the only way to keep the topic manageable – otherwise they could use any 3rd party intermediary, lift barriers to private engagement, or target civil society – it makes topic preparation impossible**

#### **B) negative ground – formal governmental channels are key to predictable relations and trade disads and counterplans that test ‘engagement’**

## 1NC

#### **US economic engagement with Mexico is a vehicle for neoliberal exploitation for the entire region – the plan becomes a tool for military intervention and US security interests while strengthening its economic grip over Latin America**

Jacobs, 04 – Assistant Prof of Polisci at West Virginia University (Jamie Elizabeth, "Neoliberalism and Neopanamericanism: The View from Latin America," Latin American Politics & Society 46.4 (2004) 149-152, MUSE)//VP

The advance of neoliberalism suffers no shortage of critics, both from its supporters who seek a greater balance in the interests of North and South, and from its opponents who see it as lacking any real choice for developing states. The spread of neoliberalism is viewed by its strongest critics as part of the continuing expression of Western power through the mechanisms of globalization, often directly linked to the hegemonic power of the United States. Gary Prevost and Carlos Oliva Campos have assembled a collection of articles that pushes this debate in a somewhat new direction. This compilation addresses the question from a different perspective, focusing not on the neoliberal process as globalization but on neoliberalism as the new guise of panamericanism, which emphasizes a distinctly political overtone in the discussion. The edited volume argues that neoliberalism reanimates a system of relations in the hemisphere that reinforces the most negative aspects of the last century's U.S.-dominated panamericanism. The assembled authors offer a critical view that places neoliberalism squarely in the realm of U.S. hegemonic exploitation of interamerican relations. This volume, furthermore, articulates a detailed vision of the potential failures of this approach in terms of culture, politics, security, and economics for both North and South. Oliva and Prevost present a view from Latin America that differs from that of other works that emphasize globalization as a general or global process. This volume focuses on the implementation of free market capitalism in the Americas as a continuation of the U.S. history of hegemonic control of the hemisphere. While Oliva and Prevost and the other authors featured in this volume point to the changes that have altered global relations since the end of the Cold War—among them an altered balance of power, shifting U.S. strategy, and evolving interamerican relations—they all view the U.S. foreign policy of neoliberalism and economic integration essentially as old wine in new bottles. As such, old enemies (communism) are replaced by new (drugs and terrorism), but the fear of Northern domination of and intervention in Latin America remains. Specifically, Oliva and Prevost identify the process through which "economics had taken center stage in interamerican affairs." They [End Page 149] suggest that the Washington Consensus—diminishing the state's role in the economy, privatizing to reduce public deficits, and shifting more fully to external markets—was instead a recipe for weakened governments susceptible to hemispheric domination by the United States (xi). The book is divided into two main sections that emphasize hemispheric and regional issues, respectively. The first section links more effectively to the overall theme of the volume in its chapters on interamerican relations, culture, governance, trade, and security. In the first of these chapters, Oliva traces the evolution of U.S. influence in Latin America and concludes that, like the Monroe Doctrine and Manifest Destiny in the past, the prospect of hemispheric economic integration will be marked by a dominant view privileging U.S. security, conceptualized in transnational, hemispheric terms, that is both asymmetrical and not truly integrated among all members. In this context, Oliva identifies the free trade area of the Americas (FTAA) as "an economic project suited to a hemispheric context that is politically favorable to the United States" (20). The chapters in this section are strongest when they focus on the political aspects of neoliberalism and the possible unintended negative consequences that could arise from the neoliberal program. Carlos Alzugaray Treto draws on the history of political philosophy, traced to Polanyi, identifying ways that social inequality has the potential to undermine the stable governance that is so crucial a part of the neoliberal plan. He goes on to point out how this potential for instability could also generate a new period of U.S. interventionism in Latin America. Treto also analyzes how the "liberal peace" could be undermined by the "right of humanitarian intervention" in the Americas if the NATO intervention in Yugoslavia served as a model for U.S. involvement in the hemisphere. Hector Luis Saint-Pierre raises the issue of "democratic neoauthoritarianism," responsible for "restricting citizenship to the exercise of voting, limiting its voice to electoral polls of public opinion, restraining human rights to consumer's rights, [and] shutting down spaces to the citizens' participation" (116). While these critiques are leveled from a structuralist viewpoint, they often highlight concerns expressed from other theoretical perspectives and subfields (such as the literature on citizenship and participation in the context of economic integration). These chapters also emphasize the way inattention to economic, social, and political crisis could damage attempts at integration and the overall success of the neoliberal paradigm in the Americas. In general, the section on hemispheric issues offers a suspicious view of the U.S. role in promoting integration, arguing that in reality, integration offers a deepening of historical asymmetries of power, the potential to create new justifications for hegemonic intervention, and the further weakening of state sovereignty in the South. [End Page 150] If the first section of the book is joined with skepticism of integration as panamericanism and chooses to focus broadly on the negative effects of the implementation of these policies, part 2 links these regional issues with the politics of specific countries. This section offers articles that speak to country-specific issues in a regional context and to ways that bilateral relations with the United States shape the overall context of regional and hemispheric integration. The regional issues range from CARICOM's evolution to the different approaches to balancing human security and globalization in Central America, the special relationship of Mexico and the United States, and the disincentives for political parties to embrace the Mercosur process. Again, the authors offer continued pessimism about the process of integration unless Latin American states can exercise more control over its evolution. Key to this idea of alternative integration are Brazil and Mexico, the former more successful in asserting its independence than the latter, in the authors' view. Jaime Preciado Coronado singles out the geopolitics of U.S.-Mexican relations and their magnified effect in the region, where the United States has collaborated in Mexico's insertion into the world networks of interdependence and, in return, Mexico promotes the idea of the Washington Consensus intensely and its model of the promotion of free trade with the United States for the rest of Latin America, in order to achieve the consolidation of the continental bloc that maintains American hegemony through the use of the advantages of the international division of labor.

#### Neoliberalism causes extinction

Darder, 10 – Professor Antonia Darder, Distinguished Professor of Education, University of Illinois, Urbana Champaign (“Preface” in *Critical Pedagogy, Ecoliteracy, & Planetary Crisis: The Ecopedagogy Movement* by Richard V. Kahn, 2010, pp. x-xiii)//VP

GENDER MODIFIED

It is fitting to begin my words about Richard Kahn’s Critical Pedagogy, Ecoliteracy, and Planetary Crisis: The Ecopedagogy Movement with a poem. The direct and succinct message of The Great Mother Wails cuts through our theorizing and opens us up to the very heart of the book’s message—to ignite a fire that speaks to **the ecological crisis** at hand; a crisis orchestrated by the inhumane greed and economic brutality of the wealthy. Nevertheless, as is clearly apparent, none of us is absolved from complicity with the devastating destruction of the earth. As members of the global community, we are all implicated in this destruction by the very manner in which we define ourselves, each other, and all living beings with whom we reside on the earth. Everywhere we look there are glaring signs of political systems and social structures that propel us toward **unsustainability and extinction**. In this historical moment, the planet faces some of the most horrendous forms of “[hu]man-made” devastation ever known to humankind. Cataclysmic “natural disasters” in the last decade have sung the environmental hymns of planetary imbalance and reckless environmental disregard. A striking feature of this ecological crisis, both locally and globally, is the **overwhelming concentration of wealth** held by the ruling elite and their agents of capital. This environmental malaise is characterized by the staggering loss of livelihood among working people everywhere; gross inequalities in educational opportunities; an absence of health care for millions; an unprecedented number of people living behind bars; and trillions spent on fabricated wars fundamentally tied to the control and domination of the planet’s resources. The Western ethos of mastery and supremacy over nature has accompanied, to our detriment, the unrelenting expansion of capitalism and its unparalleled domination over all aspects of human life. This hegemonic worldview has been unmercifully imparted through a host of public policies and practices that conveniently gloss over gross inequalities as commonsensical necessities for democracy to bloom. As a consequence, the liberal democratic rhetoric of “we are all created equal” hardly begins to touch the international pervasiveness of racism, patriarchy, technocracy, and economic piracy by the West, all which have fostered the erosion of civil rights and the unprecedented ecological exploitation of societies, creating conditions that now threaten our peril, if we do not reverse directions. Cataclysmic disasters, such as Hurricane Katrina, are unfortunate testimonies to the danger of ignoring the warnings of the natural world, especially when coupled with egregious governmental neglect of impoverished people. Equally disturbing, is the manner in which ecological crisis is vulgarly exploited by unscrupulous and ruthless capitalists who see no problem with turning a profit off the backs of ailing and mourning oppressed populations of every species—whether they be victims of weather disasters, catastrophic illnesses, industrial pollution, or inhumane practices of incarceration. Ultimately, these constitute ecological calamities that speak to the inhumanity and tyranny of material profiteering, at the expense of precious life. The arrogance and exploitation of neoliberal values of consumption dishonor the contemporary suffering of poor and marginalized populations around the globe. Neoliberalism denies or simply mocks (“Drill baby drill!”) the interrelationship and delicate balance that exists between all living beings, including the body earth. In its stead, values of individualism, competition, privatization, and the “free market” systematically debase the ancient ecological knowledge of indigenous populations, who have, implicitly or explicitly, rejected the fabricated ethos of “progress and democracy” propagated by the West. In its consuming frenzy to gobble up the natural resources of the planet for its own hyperbolic quest for material domination, the exploitative nature of capitalism and its burgeoning technocracy has dangerously deepened the structures of social exclusion, through the destruction of the very biodiversity that has been key to our global survival for millennia. Kahn insists that this devastation of all species and the planet must be fully recognized and soberly critiqued. But he does not stop there. Alongside, he rightly argues for political principles of engagement for the construction of a critical ecopedagogy and ecoliteracy that is founded on economic redistribution, cultural and linguistic democracy, indigenous sovereignty, universal human rights, and a fundamental respect for all life. As such, Kahn seeks to bring us all back to a formidable relationship with the earth, one that is unquestionably rooted in an integral order of knowledge, imbued with physical, emotional, intellectual, and spiritual wisdom. Within the context of such an ecologically grounded epistemology, Kahn uncompromisingly argues that our organic relationship with the earth is also intimately tied to our struggles for cultural self-determination, environmental sustainability, social and material justice, and global peace. Through a carefully framed analysis of past disasters and current ecological crisis, Kahn issues an urgent call for a critical ecopedagogy that makes central explicit articulations of the ways in which societies construct ideological, political, and cultural systems, based on social structures and practices that can serve to promote ecological sustainability and biodiversity or, conversely, lead us down a disastrous path of unsustainability and extinction. In making his case, Kahn provides a grounded examination of the manner in which consuming capitalism manifests its repressive force throughout the globe, disrupting the very ecological order of knowledge essential to the planet’s sustainability. He offers an understanding of critical ecopedagogy and ecoliteracy that inherently critiques the history of Western civilization and the anthropomorphic assumptions that sustain patriarchy and the subjugation of all subordinated living beings—assumptions that continue to inform traditional education discourses around the world. Kahn incisively demonstrates how a theory of multiple technoliteracies can be used to effectively critique the ecological corruption and destruction behind mainstream uses of technology and the media in the interest of the neoliberal marketplace. As such, his work points to the manner in which the sustainability rhetoric of mainstream environmentalism actually **camouflages** wretched neoliberal policies and practices that left unchecked **hasten the annihilation of the globe’s ecosystem**. True to its promise, the book cautions that any anti-hegemonic resistance movement that claims social justice, universal human rights, or global peace must contend forthrightly with the deteriorating ecological crisis at hand, as well as consider possible strategies and relationships that rupture the status quo and transform environmental conditions that threaten disaster. A failure to integrate ecological sustainability at the core of our political and pedagogical struggles for liberation, Kahn argues, is to blindly and misguidedly adhere to an anthropocentric worldview in which emancipatory dreams are deemed solely about human interests, without attention either to the health of the planet or to the well-being of all species with whom we walk the earth.

#### The alternative is to reject the 1ac to interrogate neoliberal economic engagement with latin America from the starting point of knowledge production- that is a prerequisite to breaking down neoliberalism

**Walsh, 12** – Estudios Culturales Latinoamericanos de la Universidad Andina Simón Bolívar (Catherine, “The Politics of Naming”, Cultural Studies, 26.1, Project Muse)//VP

Cultural Studies, in our project, is constructed and understood as more than a field of ‘study’. It is broadly understand as a formation, a field of possibility and expression. And it is constructed as a space of encounter between disciplines and intellectual, political and ethical projects that seek to combat what Alberto Moreiras called the impoverishment of thought driven by divisions (disciplinary, epistemological, geographic, etc.) and the socio-political-cultural fragmentation that increasingly makes social change and intervention appear to be divided forces (Moreiras 2001). As such, Cultural Studies is conceived as a place of plural-, inter-, transand in-disciplinary (or undisciplined) critical thinking that takes as major concern the intimate relationships between culture, knowledge, politics and economics mentioned earlier, and that sees the problems of the region as both local and global. It is a space from which to search for ways of thinking, knowing, comprehending, feeling and acting that permit us to intervene and influence: a field that makes possible convergence and articulation, particularly between efforts, practices, knowledge and projects that focus on more global justice, on differences (epistemic, ontological, existential, of gender, ethnicity, class, race, nation, among others) constructed as inequalities within the framework of neo-liberal capitalism. It is a place that seeks answers, encourages intervention and engenders projects and proposals. It is in this frame of understanding and practice in our Ph.D. programme in Latin-American Cultural Studies at the Universidad Andina Simo´n Bolı´var, that this broad description-definition continues to take on more concrete characteristics. Here I can identify three that stand out: the inter-cultural, the inter-epistemic and the de-colonial. The inter-cultural has been and still is a central axis in the struggles and processes of social change in the Andean region. Its critical meaning was first affirmed near the end of the 1980s in the Ecuadorian indigenous movement’s political project. Here inter-culturality was positioned as an ideological principal grounded in the urgent need for a radical transformation of social structures, institutions and relationships, not only for indigenous peoples but also for society as a whole. Since then, inter-culturality has marked a social, political, ethical project and process that is also epistemological;6 a project and a process that seek to re-found the bases of the nation and national culture, understood as homogenous and mono-cultural. Such call for re-founding does not to simply add diversity to what is already established, but rather to rethink, rebuild and inter-culturalize the nation and national culture, and with in the terrains of knowledge, politics and life-based visions. It is this understanding of the inter-cultural that is of interest. Concretely, we are interested in the spaces of agency, creation, innovation and encounter between and among different subjects, knowledges, practices and visions. Referring to our project of Cultural Studies as (inter)Cultural Studies, enables and encourages us to think from this region, from the struggles, practices and processes that question Eurocentric, colonial and imperial legacies, and work to transform and create radically different conditions for thinking, encountering, being and coexisting or co-living. In a similar fashion, the inter-epistemic focuses on the need to question, interrupt and transgress the Euro-USA-centric epistemological frameworks that dominate Latin-American universities and even some Cultural Studies programmes. To think with knowledges produced in Latin America and the Caribbean (as well as in other ‘Souths’, including those located in the North) and by intellectuals who come not only from academia, but also from other projects, communities and social movements are, for us, a necessary and essential step, both in de-colonization and in creating other conditions of knowledge and understanding. Our project, thus, concerns itself with the work of inverting the geopolitics of knowledge, with placing attention on the historically subjugated and negated plurality of knowledge, logics and rationalities, and with the political-intellectual effort to create relationships, articulations and convergences between them. The de-colonial element is intimately related to the two preceding points. Here our interest is, on one hand, to make evident the thoughts, practices and experiences that both in the past and in the present have endeavoured to challenge the colonial matrix of power and domination, and to exist in spite of it, in its exterior and interior. By colonial matrix, we refer to the hierarchical system of racial civilizational classification that has operated and operates at different levels of life, including social identities (the superiority of white, heterosexual males), ontological-existential contexts (the dehumanization of indigenous and black peoples), epistemic contexts (the positioning of Euro-centrism as the only perspective of knowledge, thereby disregarding other epistemic rationalities), and cosmological (the control and/or negation of the ancestral-spiritual-territorial-existential bases that govern the life-systems of ancestral peoples, most especially those of African Diaspora and of Abya Yala) (see Quijano 1999). At the centre or the heart of this matrix is capitalism as the only possible model of civilization; the imposed social classification, the idea of ‘humanity’, the perspective of knowledge and the prototype life-system that goes with it defines itself through this capitalistic civilizational lens. As Quijano argues, by defending the interests of social domination and the exploitation of work under the hegemony of capital, ‘the ‘‘racialization’’ and the ‘‘capitalization’’ of social relationships of these models of power, and the ‘‘eurocentralization’’ of its control, are in the very roots of our present problems of identity,’ in Latin America as countries, ‘nations’ and States (Quijano 2006). It is precisely because of this that we consider the de-colonial to be a fundamental perspective. Within our project, the de-colonial does not seek to establish a new paradigm or line of thought but a critically-conscious understanding of the past and present that opens up and suggests questions, perspectives and paths to explore. As such, and on the other hand, we are interested in stimulating methodologies and pedagogies that, in the words of Jacqui Alexander (2005), cross the fictitious boundaries of exclusion and marginalization to contribute to the configuration of new ways of being and knowing rooted not in alterity itself, but in the principles of relation, complement and commitment. It is also to encourage other ways of reading, investigating and researching, of seeing, knowing, feeling, hearing and being, that challenge the singular reasoning of western modernity, make tense our own disciplinary frameworks of ‘study’ and interpretation, and persuade a questioning from and with radically distinct rationalities, knowledge, practices and civilizational-life-systems. It is through these three pillars of the inter-cultural, the inter-epistemic and the de-colonial that we attempt to understand the processes, experiences and struggles that are occurring in Latin America and elsewhere. But it is also here that we endeavour to contribute to and learn from the complex relationships between culture-politics-economics, knowledge and power in the world today; to unlearn to relearn from and with perspectives otherwise. Practices, experiences and challenges In this last section, my interest is to share some of the particularities of our doctorate programme/project, now in its third cycle; its achievements and advancements; and the challenges that it faces in an academic context, increasingly characterized regionally and internationally, by disciplinarity, depolitization, de-subjectivation, apathy, competitive individualism and nonintervention. Without a doubt, one of the unique characteristics of the programme/ project is its students: all mid-career professionals mainly from the Andean region and from such diverse fields as the social sciences, humanities, the arts, philosophy, communication, education and law. The connection that the majority of the students have with social and cultural movements and/or processes, along with their dedication to teaching or similar work, helps to contribute to dynamic debate and discussion not always seen in academia and post-graduate programmes. Similarly, the faculty of the programme stand out for being internationally renowned intellectuals, and, the majority, for their commitment to struggles of social transformation, critical thinking and the project of the doctorate itself. The curriculum offering is based on courses and seminars that seek to foment thinking from Latin American and with its intellectuals in all of their diversity comprehend, confront and affect the problems and realities of the region, which are not only local but global. The pedagogical methodological perspective aforementioned works to stimulate processes of collective thought and allow the participants to think from related formations, experiences and research topics and to think with the differences disciplinary, geographical, epistemic and subjective thereby fracturing individualism by dialoguing, transgressing and inter-crossing boundaries. Trans-disciplinarity, as such, is a fundamental position and process in our project. The fact that the graduate students come from an array of different backgrounds provides a plurality in which the methodologicalpedagogical practice becomes the challenge of collectively thinking, crossing disciplinary backgrounds and creating new positions and perspectives, conceived and formed in a trans-disciplinary way. The majority of courses, seminars and professors, also assume that this is a necessary challenge in today’s world when no single discipline and no single intellectual is capable alone of analyzing, comprehending or transforming social reality. Nevertheless, trans-disciplinary gains continue to be a point of criticism and contention, especially given the present trend to re-discipline the LatinAmerican university. As Edgardo Lander has argued (2000a), this tendency reflects the neo-liberalization of higher education, as well as the increasing conservatism of intellectuals, including those that previously identified as or to continue to identify themselves as progressives and/or leftists. To establish oneself in a discipline or presume truth through a discipline, a common practice today, is to reinstall the geopolitics of knowing. This, in turn, strengthens Euro-USA-centrism as ‘the place’ of theory and knowledge. As such, the subject of dispute is not simply the trans-disciplinary aspect of Cultural Studies but also its ‘indisciplinary’ nature, that is, the effort central to our project to include points of view that come from Latin America and thinkers who are not always connected to academia (see Walsh et al. 2002). Our interest is not, as some claim, to facilitate the agendas or cultural agency of subaltern groups or social movements, promote activism or simply include other knowledge forms, but instead to build a different political-intellectual project a political-intellectual project otherwise. Such project gives centrality to the need to learn to think from, together and with Latin American reality and its actors, thereby stimulating convergences, articulations and inter-culturalizations that aim at creating an academia that is committed to life itself. Such a perspective does not eliminate or deny knowledge conceived in Europe or North America usually named as ‘universal’ or its proponents and thinkers. Instead, it incorporates such knowledge as part of a broader canon and worldview that seeks pluriversality, recognizing the importance of places and loci of enunciation. For our project, all of this serves to highlight the doubly complicated situation that is still in flux. On one hand, there is the negative association with trans-disciplinarity and the academic suppositions that accompany it, particularly in the area of research; this requires that our theses be doubly rigorous. And, on the other hand, there is the geopolitical limitation not only of disciplines but also of academic disciplining. To argue, as we do, that knowledge and thought are also produced outside of universities and, in dialogue with Hall, that political movements also produce and provoke theoretic moments and movements, is to question and challenge the academic logic and the authority of a universal and singular reasoning and science. We will, through such questioning and challenges, always be marginalized, placed on the fringe, under a microscope, criticized and disputed. Because of this, the challenges that we have encountered have been many. On one hand, there are those challenges that many face in the Latin-American academic context: the real difficulties of financing, infrastructure and research support. On the other hand, are the challenges that come with the traditional academic disciplinary structure, its de-politization and de-subjectification. Here the challenge is to transgress the established norms of neutrality, distance and objectivity. It is also to confront the standards that give little relevance to historically subjugated groups, practices and knowledges, and to the interlinking of race, ethnicity, gender and sexuality with the structures and models of power and knowledge. It is to make evident past and present struggles that give real meaning to the arguments of heterogeneity, decoloniality and inter-culturality. Here the criticism and dispute comes from many sides: from those who describe these efforts as too politicized (and, as such, supposedly less ‘academic’), uni-paradigmatic (supposedly limited to only one ‘line of thought’), fundamentalist (supposedly exclusionary of those subjects not marked by the colonial wound) and as obsessed with conflict (and therefore far from the tradition of ‘culture’, its letters and object of study). These challenges together with the tensions, criticisms and disputes that they mark often times make the path more difficult. Still, and at the same time, they allow us to clarify the distinctive and unique aspects of our project and its motivations to continue with its course of construction, insurgence and struggle. Our concern here is not so much with the institutionalizing of Cultural Studies. Better yet, and in a much broader fashion, we are concerned with epistemic inter-culturalization, with the de-colonialization and pluriversalization of the ‘university’, and with a thinking from the South(s). To place these concerns, as argued here, within a perspective and a politics of naming: ‘(inter)Cultural Studies in de-colonial code,’ is to open, not close, paths. Conclusion In concluding the reflections I have presented here, it is useful to return to a fundamental point touched by Stuart Hall: ‘intervention’. In particular and with Hall, I refer to the will to intervene in and transform the world, an intervention that does not simply relate to social and political contexts and fields, but also to epistemology and theory. That is to an intervention and transformation in and a de-colonization of the frameworks and logics of our thinking, knowing and comprehending. To commit oneself in mind, body and spirit as Frantz Fanon argued. To consider Cultural Studies today a project of political vocation and intervention is to position and at the same time build our work on the borders of and the boundaries between university and society. It is to seriously reflect on whom we read and with whom we want and/or need to dialogue and think, to understand the very limits or our knowledge. And precisely because of this, it is to act on our own situation, establishing contacts and exchanges of different kinds in a pedagogicalmethodological zeal to think from and think with, in what I have elsewhere called a critical inter-culturality and de-colonial pedagogy (Walsh 2009). In universities and societies that are increasingly characterized by nonintervention, auto-complacency, individualism and apathy, intervention represents, suggests and promotes a position and practice of involvement, action and complicity. To take on such a position and practice and to make it an integral part of our political-intellectual project is to find not only ethical meaning in work on culture and power, but also to give this work some heart. That is to say, to focus on the ever-greater need and urgency of life. To call these Cultural Studies or critical (inter)Cultural Studies is only one of our options, and part of the politics of naming.

## 1NC

#### Obama is winning the fight on Iran sanctions now – sustained pressure is key to prevent new attempts at sanctions

PressTV 2/14 Congress hawks looking for new paths against Iran diplomacy, 2/14/14, http://www.presstv.ir/detail/2014/02/14/350620/us-hawks-scheming-anew-against-iran/

Republican hawks and the strong pro-Israel lobby in Washington came together to pass the so-called Nuclear Weapon Free Iran Act, only to see Congressional Democrats (after initially caving) respond to President Obama’s pressure and not allow for it to come to a vote on the Senate floor.¶ The chances of the bill passing at this point seems remote and many journalists and commentators have already declared the effort dead and called it a defeat for hawks in the Senate from both sides of the isle and the hawkish pro-Israel lobby in Washington.¶ However, they would likely be mistaken if they saw this as a complete defeat for the aforementioned politicians and institutions rather than a tactical retreat. As has been reported, the focus in Congress regarding Iran has now shifted to a different piece of legislation.¶ Not assuaged by the requests of the Obama Administration that they simply do nothing as to allow Secretary of State John Kerry to proceed with negotiations, they have now set their sights on a non-binding resolution aimed at defining what they believe the final agreement should involve.¶ As early as December of last year Senator Robert Menendez, a Democrat from New Jersey who Chairs the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and was a principal sponsor of the previously mentioned Iran sanctions legislation, said that he would consider drafting a non-binding resolution that would look to the final agreement and allow the Senate to have a hand in molding that agreement.¶ “I’m beginning to think… that maybe what the Senate needs to do is define the end game and at least what it finds as acceptable as the final status,” said Menendez to US officials who testified on the Iran deal before the Senate Banking committee. “Because I’m getting nervous about what I perceive will be acceptable to [the administration] as the final status versus what …the Congress might view as acceptable,” he added.¶ Though this resolution has not yet been introduced, one need only to look back two months to see what the contours of such a resolution would be. In December, while the new Iran sanctions bill had yet to be introduced, two Republicans, Majority Leader Eric Cantor and Foreign Affairs Comsmittee Chairman Ed Royce along with their Democratic counterparts Steny Hoyer and Elliot Engle introduced a non-binding resolution in the House of Representatives that they claimed would add the input of Congress to help mold the final agreement.¶ The resolution they drafted claimed that sanctions are the only reason Iran is willing to negotiate and that it is US policy that no country has a right to enrich. The resolution called on Iran to "suspend all enrichment-related and reprocessing activities" and allow for inspections of "all suspect sites, including military facilities, and full access to all Iranian personnel, scientists, and technicians associated with Iran's nuclear program."¶ The resolution goes on to become a grab bag for any gripes and complaint the Congressmen have against Iran and would like to see addressed in the context of the negotiations. They make a number of claims against Iran involving international agreements and resolutions as well as human rights. They call Iran a state sponsor of terror and demand American citizens who they claim are “unjustly detained in Iran” to be released, including Robert Levinson who was recently revealed to be a CIA operative.¶ The purpose of the resolution was to allow Cantor and the House Republican leadership, who have repeatedly criticized the idea of diplomatic conflict resolution between Iran and the US in general, to look for ways to express opposition to negotiations that President Obama is perusing and to put obstacles in its path.¶ Many of the demands made regarding the Iranian nuclear energy program contradict the positions of the Obama Administrations and the many non-nuclear issues raised have never been discussed by the President in the context of these negotiations. The resolution would create the strictest possible parameters for the American negotiators to the point that it would either significantly harm sensitive international negotiations or derail the process all together. ¶ That resolution eventually lost Democratic support under heavy pressure from the White House and was abandoned by the Republicans in favor of the new sanctions legislation. However, Members of the House involved with crafting the new resolution discussed in recent days have already indicated their interest in many of the provisions of the previous resolution.¶ “I want this administration to know that the Congress believes in dismantling, removing and stopping” the Iranian nuclear program said Senator Lindsey Graham, a noted Senate hawk.¶ Therefore, having lost the battle to impose new sanctions and directly violate the terms of the interim agreement, those in Congress and their allies in the pro-Israel and hawkish lobby groups have simply shifted their strategy, rather than accept defeat in their efforts to stand against diplomatic conflict resolution between Iran and the P5+1 countries.

**Democrats hate the plan – theyre key**

**Hirschfeld, 13** (Julie, Politics for Bloomberg Business Week, 3-22-13, “Guest Worker Visas a Sticking Point on Immigration Rewrite,” Bloomberg, ln //GBS-JV]

With Senate Republicans and Democrats moving closer to an agreement to grant a chance at U.S. citizenship to 11 million undocumented immigrants, a long- simmering dispute between organized labor and the business lobby risks sapping the measure’s momentum. The two constituencies are at odds over a new program to provide U.S. work visas to low-skilled foreign workers, placing pressure on lawmakers poised for a compromise. Unions are pressing for a limited visa system that guarantees better wages for future immigrant workers, while businesses seek a broader program more responsive to their hiring needs. It’s the thornier side of what is otherwise a broadening consensus in both parties around an immigration plan, whose centerpiece is a path to U.S. citizenship for undocumented immigrants. A bipartisan group of eight senators is nearing a deal to bolster border security and workplace verification while revamping the legal immigration system. Republican Senator Marco Rubio of Florida, a member of the group, called the guest-worker issue “one of the more difficult parts” of the negotiations. “I’m not going to be part of a bill that doesn’t create a process whereby people can come to this country temporarily in the future if we need them,” Rubio said yesterday. “There’s no secret that the broader labor movement, with some exceptions, would rather not even have an immigration bill.” Political Consequences The disagreement carries significant political consequences for Republicans and Democrats alike, essentially making them choose between their strongest constituencies -- organized labor for Democrats and big business for Republicans -- and achievement of an overriding policy goal that both parties increasingly see as an electoral imperative. Hispanics accounted for 10 percent of voters in the 2012 presidential election. President Barack Obama won 71 percent of their votes, and just 27 percent backed Republican nominee Mitt Romney, who had proposed “self-deportation” for undocumented immigrants. Since then, a growing chorus of Republicans has publicly backed legal status for undocumented immigrants. Meanwhile, a group of Republican officials who unveiled a top-to-bottom review this week called for the party to back “comprehensive immigration reform” or see its appeal shrink. “It is in neither party’s interest for one group within a party to stop this, because it is bad for the economy if we don’t have immigration reform,” former Mississippi Governor and Republican National Committee Chairman Haley Barbour said this week, referring to labor unions’ objections to a guest-worker program. Worker Program Former Pennsylvania Governor Ed Rendell, a Democrat co- chairing an immigration task force with Barbour at the Bipartisan Policy Center in Washington, said it is ultimately up to Obama to persuade Democrats not to abandon the bill if the immigrant-worker program doesn’t match the unions’ agenda. “If we don’t get guest-worker provisions that are exactly in line with what labor wants, we can’t hold up the bill because of that,” Rendell said. “We’ve got to do the best we can to preserve and protect the interests of organized labor, but in the end you can’t always get what you want.” Obama, he added, has “his work cut out for him**.”**

#### Our link is reverse causal and uniqueness doesn’t overwhelm – a loss of political capital causes Democrats to abandon Obama on Iran

Kraushaar 11/22 Josh, National Interest, The Iran Deal Puts Pro-Israel Democrats in a Bind, 11/22/13, http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/the-iran-deal-puts-pro-israel-democrats-in-a-bind-20131122

All of this puts Democrats, who routinely win overwhelming support from Jewish Americans on Election Day, in an awkward position. Do they stand with the president on politically sensitive foreign policy issues, or stake their own course? That difficult dynamic is currently playing out in Congress, where the Obama administration is resisting a Senate push to maintain tough sanctions against Iran. This week, Obama met with leading senators on the Banking and Foreign Relations committees to dissuade them from their efforts while diplomacy is underway.¶ "There's a fundamental disagreement between the vast majority of Congress and the president when it comes to increasing Iran sanctions right now," said one Democratic operative involved in the advocacy efforts. "Pro-Israel groups, like AIPAC, try to do things in a bipartisan way; they don't like open confrontation. But in this instance, it's hard."¶ That awkwardness has been evident in the lukewarm reaction from many of Obama's Senate Democratic allies to the administration's outreach to Iran. Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Robert Menendez of New Jersey said last week he was concerned that the administration seems "to want the deal almost more than the Iranians." Normally outspoken Sen. Chuck Schumer of New York, a reliable ally of Israel, has been conspicuously quiet about his views on the negotiations. In a CNN interview this month, Democratic Rep. Debbie Wasserman Schultz of Florida, whose job as chairwoman of the Democratic National Committee is to defend the president, notably declined to endorse the administration's approach, focusing instead on Obama's past support of sanctions. This, despite the full-court press from Secretary of State John Kerry, a former congressional colleague.¶ On Tuesday, after meeting with Obama, Menendez and Schumer signed a bipartisan letter to Kerry warning the administration about accepting a deal that would allow Iran to continue its nuclear program. The letter was also signed by Sens. John McCain, R-Ariz., Lindsey Graham, R-S.C., Susan Collins, R-Maine, and Robert Casey, D-Pa.¶ Democrats, of course, realize that the president plays an outsized role in the policy direction of his party. Just as George W. Bush moved the Republican Party in a more hawkish direction during his war-riven presidency, Obama is nudging Democrats away from their traditionally instinctive support for the Jewish state. "I can't remember the last time the differences [between the U.S. and Israel] were this stark," said one former Democratic White House official with ties to the Jewish community. "There's now a little more freedom [for progressive Democrats] to say what they want to say, without fear of getting their tuchus kicked by the organized Jewish community."¶ A Gallup survey conducted this year showed 55 percent of Democrats sympathizing with the Israelis over the Palestinians, compared with 78 percent of Republicans and 63 percent of independents who do so. A landmark Pew poll of American Jews, released in October, showed that 35 percent of Jewish Democrats said they had little or no attachment to Israel, more than double the 15 percent of Jewish Republicans who answered similarly. At the 2012 Democratic National Convention, many delegates booed a platform proposal supporting the move of the U.S. Embassy in Israel from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. In 2011, Democrats lost Anthony Weiner's heavily Jewish, solidly Democratic Brooklyn House seat because enough Jewish voters wanted to rebuke the president's perceived hostility toward Israel.¶ Pro-Israel advocacy groups rely on the mantra that support for Israel carries overwhelming bipartisan support, a maxim that has held true for decades in Congress. But most also reluctantly acknowledge the growing influence of a faction within the Democratic Party that is more critical of the two countries' close relationship. Within the Jewish community, that faction is represented by J Street, which positions itself as the home for "pro-Israel, pro-peace Americans" and supports the Iran negotiations. "Organizations that claim to represent the American Jewish community are undermining [Obama's] approach by pushing for new and harsher penalties against Iran," the group wrote in an action alert to its members.¶ Some supporters of Israel view J Street with concern. "There's a small cadre of people that comes from the progressive side of the party that are in the business of blaming Israel first. There's a chorus of these guys," said a former Clinton administration foreign policy official. "But that doesn't make them the dominant folks in the policy space of the party, or the Hill."¶ Pro-Israel activists worry that one of the ironies of Obama's situation is that as his poll numbers sink, his interest in striking a deal with Iran will grow because he'll be looking for any bit of positive news that can draw attention away from the health care law's problems. Thus far, Obama's diminished political fortunes aren't deterring Democrats from protecting the administration's prerogatives. Congressional sources expect the Senate Banking Committee, chaired by South Dakota Democrat Tim Johnson, to hold off on any sanctions legislation until there's a resolution to the Iranian negotiations. ¶ But if Obama's standing continues to drop, and if Israel doesn't like the deal, don't be surprised to see Democrats become less hesitant about going their own way.

#### Deal key to prevent war

Shank and Gould 9/12 Michael Shank, Ph.D., is director of foreign policy at the Friends Committee on National Legislation. Kate Gould is legislative associate for Middle East policy at FCNL, No Iran deal, but significant progress in Geneva, 9/12/13, http://communities.washingtontimes.com/neighborhood/cause-conflict-conclusion/2013/nov/12/no-iran-deal-significant-progress-geneva/

Congress should welcome, not stubbornly dismiss, diplomatic efforts to finalize the interim accord and support the continued conversation to reach a more comprehensive agreement. The sanctions that hawks on the Hill are pushing derail such efforts and increase the prospects of war. ¶ There is, thankfully, a growing bipartisan contingent of Congress who recognizes that more sanctions could undercut the delicate diplomatic efforts underway. Senator Carl Levin, D-Mich., chair of the Senate Armed Services Committee, cautioned early on that, “We should not at this time impose additional sanctions.” ¶ Senator Tim Johnson, D-S.D., chair of the Banking Committee, is still weighing whether to press forward with new sanctions in his committee. Separately, as early as next week, the Senate could vote on Iran sanctions amendments during the chamber’s debate on the must-pass annual defense authorization bill.¶ This caution against new sanctions, coming from these more sober quarters of the Senate, echoes the warnings from a wide spectrum of former U.S. military officials against new sanctions. There is broad recognition by U.S. and Israeli security officials that the military option is not the preferred option; a diplomatic one is. ¶ This widespread support for a negotiated solution was highlighted last week when 79 national security heavyweights signed on to a resounding endorsement of the Obama Administration’s latest diplomatic efforts.¶ Any member of Congress rejecting a diplomatic solution moves the United States toward another war in the Middle East. Saying no to this deal-in-the-works, furthermore, brings the world no closer toward the goal of Iran giving up its entire nuclear program. Rather, it would likely result in an unchecked Iranian enrichment program, while the United States and Iran would teeter perilously close on the brink of war. ¶ A deal to prevent war and a nuclear-armed Iran is within reach and it would be dangerous to let it slip away. Congress can do the right thing here, for America’s security and Middle East’s stability, and take the higher diplomatic road. Pandering to harsh rhetoric and campaign contributors is no way to sustain a foreign policy agenda. It will only make America and her assets abroad less secure, not more. The time is now to curb Iran’s enrichment program as well as Congress’s obstructionism to a peaceful path forward.

#### US-Iran war causes global nuclear war and collapses the global economy

Avery 11/6 John Scales, Lektor Emeritus, Associate Professor, at the Department of Chemistry, University of Copenhagen, since 1990 he has been the Contact Person in Denmark for Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs, An Attack On Iran Could Escalate Into Global Nuclear War, 11/6/13, http://www.countercurrents.org/avery061113.htm

Despite the willingness of Iran's new President, Hassan Rouhani to make all reasonable concessions to US demands, Israeli pressure groups in Washington continue to demand an attack on Iran. But such an attack might escalate into a global nuclear war, with catastrophic consequences.¶ As we approach the 100th anniversary World War I, we should remember that this colossal disaster escalated uncontrollably from what was intended to be a minor conflict. There is a danger that an attack on Iran would escalate into a large-scale war in the Middle East, entirely destabilizing a region that is already deep in problems.¶ The unstable government of Pakistan might be overthrown, and the revolutionary Pakistani government might enter the war on the side of Iran, thus introducing nuclear weapons into the conflict. Russia and China, firm allies of Iran, might also be drawn into a general war in the Middle East. Since much of the world's oil comes from the region, such a war would certainly cause the price of oil to reach unheard-of heights, with catastrophic effects on the global economy.¶ In the dangerous situation that could potentially result from an attack on Iran, there is a risk that nuclear weapons would be used, either intentionally, or by accident or miscalculation. Recent research has shown that besides making large areas of the world uninhabitable through long-lasting radioactive contamination, a nuclear war would damage global agriculture to such a extent that a global famine of previously unknown proportions would result.¶ Thus, nuclear war is the ultimate ecological catastrophe. It could destroy human civilization and much of the biosphere. To risk such a war would be an unforgivable offense against the lives and future of all the peoples of the world, US citizens included.

## Relations

**No biod extinction**

**Paltrowitz, 01** (JD Brooklyn Journal of I-Law, 2001 (A Greening of the World Trade Organisation”)

However, the panel did not take into account the practical reality that negotiations are time-consuming. The environment, animal life and human life can all be irreparably harmed as time passes. n105 For instance, one scholar has reported [\*1807] that "the world is losing between 27,000 and 150,000 species per year, approximately seventy-four species every day, and three every hour and up to seventy percent of the world's fisheries are depleted or under stress after years of over-exploitation." n106 This concern is especially pertinent in the case of the eastern spinner dolphin and coastal spotted dolphin, which are on the endangered species list. n107 Yet, even for the dolphin species that are not endangered, a similar concern applies because if dolphins continue to be maimed or killed in tuna purse seines then their numbers could become seriously depleted to the point where they may be put on the endangered species list. In short, Tuna-Dolphin I shows the preeminence of trade values at the expense of environmental values. Therefore, the panel's acknowledgment of the WTO's Preamble rang hollow when it stated: " . . . that the provisions of the GATT impose few constraints on a contracting party's implementation of domestic environmental policies." n108

NADBank empirically fails – high interest rates, poor management

AP 1 (Associated Press, “NADBank Admits Poor Lending Record,” *Lubbock Avalanche-Journal,* http://lubbockonline.com/stories/081401/upd\_075-5743.shtml, AC)

BROWNSVILLE, Texas {AP}— Officials of the North American Development Bank, a U.S.-Mexico development bank set up under the North American Free Trade Agreement, admit they have failed to meet their goal of funding key environmental projects near the border.¶ "We are the first to admit our lending record is very, very, poor. Yes, in a sense we have failed miserably but that's because of the interest-rate situation. It has been that way since we were set up," Jorge Garcs, deputy-managing director at the San Antonio-based NADBank, told the Brownsville Herald in Tuesday's editions.¶ NADBank has loaned only $11 million out of an authorized $3 billion in its five years in existence.¶ "We are well aware of our constraints and are hoping to see some modifications to make more loans available."¶ The funding is used to help communities within 100 kilometers on either side of the border with water and wastewater projects.¶ Critics blame a combination of high interest rates, poor management and federal bureaucracy for the banks performance. They are urging Presidents Bush and Fox to overhaul the institution when they discuss the issue in Washington in September.¶ Officials from NADBank and its sister organization, the Border Environmental Cooperation Commission, met in Washington last week to hammer out new loan guidelines in advance of the Bush-Fox summit but could not reach agreement.¶ Officials from the bank say they have only $350 million in cash to lend right now, not the $3 billion in capitalization pledged by the U.S. and Mexico, but admit they are not meeting the challenge presented by border communities.¶ "It's clear there's been a fatal flaw in the execution of their mandate," said Raul Hinojosa-Ojeda, a UCLA professor who, as an adviser to President Clinton, helped draft the rules of the banks lending process.¶ "The Treasury Department has insisted the bank sets interest rates above the market rate and that is completely inappropriate for the border's infrastructure needs. It's been a wretched performance," Hinojosa-Ojeda said.¶ NADBank, comprising U.S. and Mexico state department, treasury and environmental agency officials, was formed through legislation parallel to NAFTA in 1996.¶ The role of the Border Environmental Cooperation Commission is to identify and certify projects for NADBank to fund. While only loaning $11 million during the last five years, NADBank has helped distribute grants totaling almost $1 billion to the border region, most of the funds coming from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.¶ The Mexican government has to match EPA grants when the water and wastewater projects are for Mexican border communities.

## Econ

#### Manufacturing is growing at its fastest pace in years

Puzzanghera, 8/1 (Jim, reporter for LA Times, 2013, <http://www.latimes.com/business/money/la-fi-mo-ism-manufacturing-economy-20130801,0,7724106.story>, “Manufacturing sector expanded in July at fastest pace in two years,”)//VP

WASHINGTON -- Factories heated up last month as the manufacturing sector expanded at its fastest pace in two years, the Institute for Supply Management said Thursday. The group's purchasing managers index jumped to 55.4 in July from 50.9 the previous month. It was the second-straight month of improvement after the index fell to to 49.9 in May, a four-year low that indicated the crucial economic sector had contracted. A reading above 50 indicates that manufacturing businesses are expanding. The July figure exceeded analyst expectations for a more modest rise and was the highest since June 2011. The index gained in all its major categories last month. The employment figure, a gauge of industry hiring, rebounded into expansion territory at 54.4 after dropping to 48.7 in June. July's reading was the strongest since June 2012. The production index soared to 65, its highest level since 2004. The new orders index, a read on future activity, also jumped significantly to 58.3, a more than two-year high. Of the 18 industries the index tracks, 13 reported growth in July, including transportation equipment and computers and electronics. Four reported contracting in July, including the apparel industry. The strong ISM report comes after other positive economic data in recent days, particularly the goverment's report that the economy expanded at a 1.7% annualized rate in the second quarter. Though still weak, the growth rate was better than anticipated in the face of this year's tax increases and federal spending cuts.

#### The economy is resilient and the impact is empirically denied

**Zakaria, ‘9** - Fareed (editor of Newsweek International) December 2009 “The Secrets of Stability,” <http://www.newsweek.com/id/226425/page/2>]

One year ago, the world seemed as if it might be coming apart. The global financial system, which had fueled a great expansion of capitalism and trade across the world, was crumbling. All the certainties of the age of globalization—about the virtues of free markets, trade, and technology—were being called into question. Faith in the American model had collapsed. The financial industry had crumbled. Once-roaring emerging markets like China, India, and Brazil were sinking. Worldwide trade was shrinking to a degree not seen since the 1930s. Pundits whose bearishness had been vindicated predicted we were doomed to a long, painful bust, with cascading failures in sector after sector, country after country. In a widely cited essay that appeared in The Atlantic n this May, Simon Johnson, former chief economist of the International Monetary Fund, wrote: "The conventional wisdom among the elite is still that the current slump 'cannot be as bad as the Great Depression.' This view is wrong. What we face now could, in fact, be worse than the Great Depression." Others predicted that these economic shocks would lead to political instability and violence in the worst-hit countries. At his confirmation hearing in February, the new U.S. director of national intelligence, Adm. Dennis Blair, cautioned the Senate that "the financial crisis and global recession are likely to produce a wave of economic crises in emerging-market nations over the next year." Hillary Clinton endorsed this grim view. And she was hardly alone. Foreign Policy ran a cover story predicting serious unrest in several emerging markets. Of one thing everyone was sure: nothing would ever be the same again. Not the financial industry, not capitalism, not globalization. One year later, how much has the world really changed? Well, Wall Street is home to two fewer investment banks (three, if you count Merrill Lynch). Some regional banks have gone bust. There was some turmoil in Moldova and (entirely unrelated to the financial crisis) in Iran. Severe problems remain, like high unemployment in the West, and we face new problems caused by responses to the crisis—soaring debt and fears of inflation. But overall, things look nothing like they did in the 1930s. The predictions of economic and political collapse have not materialized at all. A key measure of fear and fragility is the ability of poor and unstable countries to borrow money on the debt markets. So consider this: the sovereign bonds of tottering Pakistan have returned 168 percent so far this year. All this doesn't add up to a recovery yet, but it does reflect a return to some level of normalcy. And that rebound has been so rapid that even the shrewdest observers remain puzzled. "The question I have at the back of my head is 'Is that it?' " says Charles Kaye, the co-head of Warburg Pincus. "We had this huge crisis, and now we're back to business as usual?"This revival did not happen because markets managed to stabilize themselves on their own. Rather, governments, having learned the lessons of the Great Depression, were determined not to repeat the same mistakes once this crisis hit. By massively expanding state support for the economy—through central banks and national treasuries—they buffered the worst of the damage. (Whether they made new mistakes in the process remains to be seen.) The extensive social safety nets that have been established across the industrialized world also cushioned the pain felt by many. Times are still tough, but things are nowhere near as bad as in the 1930s, when governments played a tiny role in national economies. It's true that the massive state interventions of the past year may be fueling some new bubbles: the cheap cash and government guarantees provided to banks, companies, and consumers have fueled some irrational exuberance in stock and bond markets. Yet these rallies also demonstrate the return of confidence, and confidence is a very powerful economic force. When John Maynard Keynes described his own prescriptions for economic growth, he believed government action could provide only a temporary fix until the real motor of the economy started cranking again—the animal spirits of investors, consumers, and companies seeking risk and profit. Beyond all this, though, I believe there's a fundamental reason why we have not faced global collapse in the last year. It is the same reason that we weathered the stock-market crash of 1987, the recession of 1992, the Asian crisis of 1997, the Russian default of 1998, and the tech-bubble collapse of 2000. The current global economic system is inherently more resilient than we think. The world today is characterized by three major forces for stability, each reinforcing the other and each historical in nature.

**Mexican economy thriving—congestion not preventing growth.**

**Hutchinson, 13-** columnist for Reuters (Martin Hutchinson, “Mexican industry struts its stuff”, The Globe and Mail, February 27, 2013, https://secure.globeadvisor.com/servlet/ArticleNews/story/gam/20130227/RBBVMEXICOMANU0226ATL)EFish

Mexican manufacturing is putting places like China and Brazil in the shade. Exports and industrial data point to steady gains in competitiveness over the last decade. Mexico's wage costs are up only 20 per cent in dollar terms - a fraction of the increase in China and Brazil. With Europe mired in recession, global market share is up for grabs.¶ Offshore investors seem to see the opportunity. Foreign investment in Mexican stocks, bonds and the like doubled last year to $80-billion (U.S.), according to statistics released on Monday. On the other hand, foreign direct investment has stagnated, with a 35-per-cent drop in 2012, to $13-billion. Explanations for this vary and include a big swing caused by the flotation of the Mexican unit of Santander, the Spanish bank, but electoral uncertainty and a sometimes shaky security situation are surely also factors.¶ That hasn't stopped Mexico's domestic industries, however. Manufacturing exports last year were up 8.4 per cent and represented 80 per cent of all exports and 25 per cent of GDP. In spite of a continued decline in oil exports stemming largely from stifling government management of Pemex, the national oil company, Mexico in 2012 reported its first trade surplus in 15 years.¶ Behind these figures is a sharp improvement in Mexico's global competitive position. Productivity growth is far from stellar: It averaged 1 per cent annually between 1996 and 2010 before ticking up to more than 2 per cent in recent years, according to the Conference Board's Total Economy Database. But wages tell a different story.¶ Mexican hourly compensation increased only 20 per cent in dollar terms between 2001 and 2011 while Brazil's more than tripled, according to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. China's manufacturing wages almost quadrupled between 2000 and 2010, the Boston Consulting Group reckons.¶ With the reformist government of Enrique Pena Nieto relatively recently elected and costs still rising in other big emerging markets, Mexico may be able to attract a new wave of direct investment from abroad. Even without that, domestic enterprises may finally be enjoying the payoff predicted when the North American free trade agreement was signed 20 years ago.

**Congestion is exaggerated – it has a minimal effect on the economy.**

**Mallett 7** – Analyst in Transportation Policy Resources, Science, and Industry Division (William John Mallett, “Surface Transportation Congestion: Policy and Issues”, CRS Report For Congress, 5/10/07, http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/NR/rdonlyres/3E559F5A-9958-4F05-816C-1EC02069BAE3/0/SurfaceTransportationCongestionPolicyandIssuesCRS.pdf | AK)

It is commonplace these days to attempt to quantify the costs of congestion and add them together to arrive at a total cost of congestion to the economy, sometimes expressed as a share of GDP. This approach is particularly common in accounting for the costs of road traffic congestion, as TTI does in terms of extra time and fuel, and other researchers have attempted to calculate more comprehensively. 155 There are, however, some problems with this approach. These cost estimates are often based on the premise of “free-flowing traffic,” which, as discussed above, tends to exaggerate the amount of congestion experienced. Furthermore, total cost estimates suggest that there is a monetary windfall waiting to be distributed to every household, when in reality, eliminating congestion, if it were possible, would only save most travelers a few minutes on peak-period trips. 156 Consequently, a number of experts question the calculation of total costs and suggest that what matters in practical terms is the change in the cost of congestion brought about by a specific feasible projects or act of policy.... As economists would say, we need to change our thinking from total costs to marginal costs. 15

**And, Jobs are Re-shoring- manufacturing recovery now.**

**Carr 6-25** (Robert Carr, writer for National Real Estate Investor, June 25, 2013. “High-Tech Manufacturing Job Growth a Positive Sign for Industrial Sector.” <http://nreionline.com/industrial/high-tech-manufacturing-job-growth-positive-sign-industrial-sector>)//NR

The slide is over for U.S. high-tech manufacturing jobs. The industry has recovered the massive job losses that took place a decade ago. And now companies are slowly “onshoring” work back into the country—leading to the first growth in high-tech manufacturing employment in more than 10 years. High-tech manufacturing includes engineering positions covering everything from assembling computers and peripherals, audio-visual and communications equipment and semiconductors.

**Too many alt causes for them to solve**

**Jasinowski 4-22-2013** (Jerry Jasinowshi, Former President of the National Association of Manufacturers, “A Real Manufacturing Resurgence.” <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/jerry-jasinowski/manufacturing-comeback_b_3131062.html> )//NR

There are contradictory analyses in the media about a resurgence of manufacturing - some praising it as the second coming and others insisting it is imaginary. For instance, on April 2, The Washington Post featured a front page report of European manufacturers setting up shop in the U.S. to take advantage of low natural gas prices, while the *New York Times* had a [story on the front page](http://www.nytimes.com/2013/04/02/business/economy/rumors-of-a-cheap-energy-jobs-boom-remain-just-that.html?pagewanted=all) of its business section entitled "Manufacturing's Mirage, A Jobs Boom Built on Cheap Energy Has Yet To Appear." In reality, there is no contradiction. Even the optimistic souls like me who perceive a resurgence in manufacturing do not contend manufacturing will ever be the fountain of jobs that it once was. It is a fact of life that low skill manufacturing jobs have fled the U.S. and they are increasingly fleeing developing nations as more and more rote tasks are automated. Even so, manufacturing remains a key driving force of economy growth and a critical seedbed for innovation. Akio Morita, the founder of Sony, said years ago that the world power that loses its manufacturing base will cease to be a world power. That is why the Chinese are so determined to build their manufacturing sector. Manufacturing is key to economic growth. The reality on the ground is that U.S. manufacturing is today giving a good account of itself, but with sensible incentives, it could do much more. Thomas J. Duesterberg of the Aspen Institute suggests there is a realistic path for growing manufacturing's contribution to GDP by 4 percentage points, from 11.6 percent to 15.8 percent by 2025. To do it, he advocates: • Expanding exports and reducing imports. We need a much more aggressive effort to open foreign markets to our exports, a greater effort to promote exports, and a tougher stand on violations of trade agreements, such as currency manipulation. • We need a clear strategy for taking advantage of plentiful and cheaper natural gas that is attracting foreign investment. In many key manufacturing sectors, this gives us a once in a lifetime opportunity to grow and expand. • We must intensify our investments in productivity gains, knowing our competitors are nipping at our heels, and we should also streamline the U.S. regulatory process and apply manufacturing technology to the service industries. • We need a coherent national commitment to endow workers with the skills they need in modern manufacturing. For though manufacturing will never again be the fountain of jobs it once was, it is creating millions of fresh opportunities for qualified people. The Aspen Study on the Manufacturing Resurgence provides a practical framework for increasing manufacturing's contribution to economic growth, and the corporate and public policies we need to make it happen. We should read it and heed it.

# 2NC

## Econ

**Econ decline doesn’t cause war – prefer empirics**

Ferguson, 6 – Professor of History at Harvard University and a Senior Fellow at the Hoover Institution at Stanford University (Niall, “The Next War of the World”, <http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2006/09/the_next_war_of_the_world.html>)//AA

Nor can economic crises explain the bloodshed. What may be the most familiar causal chain in modern historiography links the Great Depression to the rise of fascism and the outbreak of World War II. But that simple story leaves too much out. Nazi Germany started the war in Europe only after its economy had recovered. Not all the countries affected by the Great Depression were taken over by fascist regimes, nor did all such regimes start wars of aggression. In fact, no general relationship between economics and conflict is discernible for the century as a whole. Some wars came after periods of growth, others were the causes rather than the consequences of economic catastrophe, and some severe economic crises were not followed by wars.

## Relations

**Species extinction won't cause human extinction – humans and the environment are adaptable**

**Doremus, 00** (Holly, Professor of Law at UC Davis Washington & Lee Law Review, Winter 57 Wash & Lee L. Rev. 11, lexis)

In recent years, this discourse frequently has taken the form of the ecological horror story . That too is no mystery. The ecological horror story is unquestionably an attention-getter, especially in the hands of skilled writers [\*46] like Carson and the Ehrlichs. The image of the airplane earth, its wings wobbling as rivet after rivet is carelessly popped out, is difficult to ignore. The apocalyptic depiction of an impending crisis of potentially dire proportions is designed to spur the political community to quick action . Furthermore, this story suggests a goal that appeals to many nature lovers: that virtually everything must be protected. To reinforce this suggestion, tellers of the ecological horror story often imply that the relative importance of various rivets to the ecological plane cannot be determined. They offer reams of data and dozens of anecdotes demonstrating the unexpected value of apparently useless parts of nature. The moth that saved Australia from prickly pear invasion, the scrubby Pacific yew, and the downright unattractive leech are among the uncharismatic flora and fauna who star in these anecdotes. n211 The moral is obvious: because we cannot be sure which rivets are holding the plane together, saving them all is the only sensible course. Notwithstanding its attractions, the material discourse in general, and the ecological horror story in particular, are not likely to generate policies that will satisfy nature lovers. The ecological horror story implies that there is no reason to protect nature until catastrophe looms. The Ehrlichs' rivet-popper account, for example, presents species simply as the (fungible) hardware holding together the ecosystem. If we could be reasonably certain that a particular rivet was not needed to prevent a crash, the rivet-popper story suggests that we would lose very little by pulling it out. Many environmentalists, though, would disagree. 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, the complete elimination of life on earth seems unlikely. 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. 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. 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.

cost inefficiencies, sovereignty mean they don’t solve

Vanderpool 6 (Tim Vanderpool, “NADBank Blues: Will Border Cleanup Efforts Be Abandoned,” 04/13/2006, http://www.tucsonweekly.com/tucson/nadbank-blues/Content?oid=1083801, AC)

Still, the NADBank has been no stranger to criticism. Environmentalists condemn its secretive operating style, while others have chastised the bank's inability to offer lower-interest loans to desperately poor communities.¶ Congress liberalized the finance rate structure in 2001, allowing the bank more loan flexibility. But the criticism has nonetheless grown among U.S. Treasury Department officials, who target the bank's administrative costs totaling about $80 million over the past dozen years.¶ There are also NADBank critics south of the line. According to Hugh Holub, they include officials at Mexico's treasury department, Hacienda. "We were getting info that the attack (on NADBank) was coming from Hacienda," Holub says. "The EPA reaches through the NADBank to (provide grants). So you have the EPA setting all these terms and conditions for spending that money. The Mexicans didn't particularly like having conditions imposed on them--conditions that were impinging on their sovereignty."¶ Attempts to contact Hacienda officials for comment were unsuccessful.¶ Nancy Woo is associate director of the EPA's Region 9 Water Division. She denies that the agency is heavy-handed in Mexico. "I don't think that's an issue," she says from her San Francisco office. For example, "We have a very good working relationship with (Mexico's) federal water authority."¶ This conflict hit a fever pitch last year, when word leaked out that NADBank's future was under discussion between U.S. Treasury and Hacienda negotiators. Those murky bull sessions reportedly included disbanding the NADBank altogether.¶ Such claims are denied by Brookly McLaughlin, a Treasury Department spokeswoman. "There has probably been some confusion," she says. "There were all these reports that we were talking about closing the bank, and we never said that. We had no intention to close the bank."¶ Not true, says NADBank spokesman Juan Antonio Flores. "We learned in late January that there were discussions among some representatives at the U.S. Treasury and Hacienda," he says. "They were looking at the role of the bank and what its future may be. Among options being considered was possible closure of the bank."¶ Still, Treasury Department officials have been more honest about their ongoing complaints. "Our concern is with the functioning of the bank," says McLaughlin. "We think the administrative costs are pretty high.”

## CP

**Also solves the infrastructure internal link**

**MARAD ‘11** [U.S. Department of Transportation Maritime Administration], America’s Marine Highway Report to Congress, Prepared in Consultation with the Environmental Protection Agency, April 2011, p. 8]

The correct valuation of such benefits in planning and investment decisions could justify a much greater role for America’s Marine Highway as part of a balanced national transportation system. USDOT, with its responsibility to develop and implement national freight and passenger transportation strategies and target public resources to satisfy public needs across State and other jurisdictional lines, is best positioned to see that this role is realized. The Federal government is also well-situated to coordinate the development of national standards to ensure the compatibility of infrastructure and equipment throughout the Marine Highway system. MARAD is currently working closely with other USDOT modal administrations and the Office of the Secretary of Transportation to develop national transportation strategies that maximize the positive contributions of Marine Highway services.

**Seaports are key to competitiveness**

**Nagle, 11** [MR. KURT NAGLE President and CEO American Association of Port Authorities “America’s Seaports Promote Prosperity A strong infrastructure supports a strong economy,” In The Coast Guard Proceedings of the Marine Safety and Security Council, “The Marine Transportation System,” Summer 2011, www.uscg.mil/proceedings, p. 24-5]

As primary gateways for overseas trade, U.S. seaports are critical links for access to the global marketplace and enable America’s exports to compete internationally. In-vestment in America’s port infrastructure and inter- modal connections—both land and waterside—helps the nation prosper and provides an opportunity to bolster the country’s economic and employment recovery. A strong infrastructure helps American agricultural and mineral producers export their products, while U.S. manufacturing and assembly firms benefit from import transportation savings because they often rely on imported parts, components, and bulk commodities. Seaports are so much more than safe harbors for ships to load and unload cargo. They help us build and grow international trade, which strengthens the national economy. At the same time, seaports stoke local economic engines by providing high-paying jobs while supporting employment in other industry sectors—ranging from freight logistics to retailing—that rely on the efficient movement of goods. Our seaports are also dynamic transportation hubs that must constantly adapt to meet ever-changing global trade demands. This is why keeping them modern, navigable, safe, and sustainable is such a core priority for the American Association of Port Authorities (AAPA)—as it should be, we believe, for the nation.

**Marine shipping key to the economy**

**LaHood, 11** [Ray LaHood, US Secretary of the Department of Transportation and Chair of the Committee on the Marine Transportation System, The Coast Guard Proceedings of the Marine Safety and Security Council, “The Marine Transportation System,” Summer 2011, www.uscg.mil/proceedings, p. 4]

The U.S. Marine Transportation System (MTS) is critical to the overall health of our nation’s economy, including the creation of jobs throughout the country. It carries 78 percent of our international trade, and is one of the most efficient, effective, safe, and environmentally sound ways to transport people and goods.¶ America’s “marine highways” have great untapped capacity to relieve congestion and wear-and-tear on our roads while enhancing highway safety, reducing carbon emissions, and increasing international trade. But in order to achieve President Obama’s National Export Initiative goal of doubling our nation’s exports between 2010 and 2015, the MTS will require our continuing commitment to ensure that our waterways and maritime infrastructure can handle the increased traffic.

**Short-sea shipping’s key to resolve congestion**

**Connor 4** [Peter H. Connor, The Development of Short Sea Shipping in the United States: A Dynamic Alternative Submitted to the Department of Ocean Engineering in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Science in Ocean Systems Management at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, June 2004]

U.S. waterborne trade, transportation, and the U.S. economy in general are dependent on the efficient flow of goods and people through U.S. ports and inland waterways (Transportation, 2001). This is why it is so important to have an efficiency supply chain or goods coming into this country. With the increase in trade, congestion could decrease the quantity of goods that are physically able to enter and exit the country. By revitalizing our maritime transportation system with short sea shipping, we are allowing our economy to grow in the future, thus increasing our economic security. It will also allow us to build our reserve civilian and military shipping fleets making us more prepared and capable in crisis. Furthermore, SSS will help to remove some dangerous cargoes from populated areas and provide an additional tool in combating terrorism.

**Empirics prove we solve land infrastructure development - Europe proves and sea shipping is key to increasing competitiveness with land based transportation**

**MARAD ‘11** [U.S. Department of Transportation Maritime Administration], America’s Marine Highway Report to Congress, Prepared in Consultation with the Environmental Protection Agency, April 2011, p. 9-10]

There is good precedent for effective governmental action to support short sea shipping. The European Union (EU) is faced with many of the same issues as is the United States regarding surface transportation congestion, environmental impacts of transportation systems, and energy conservation. EU leadership has recognized that greater reliance on waterborne transportation is an important means of reaching its goals regarding environmental sustainability and economic competitiveness. It therefore has an active and longstanding policy of promoting short sea shipping and has invested millions of euros to promote greater use of its coastal and inland waterways, including: ␣ funding through the Trans-European Transport Network (TEN-T), the Marco Polo programs (designed to reduce congestion and improve the environmental performance of the intermodal transport system), the European Regional Development Fund, and State funding sources; and ␣ establishment of the Motorways of the Sea program (part of the TEN-T), the Program for the Promotion of Short Sea Shipping, and other and predecessor programs.17 As a result, container barge transportation has seen strong growth, with annual European traffic crossing the one million TEU level by 1991, the two million TEU level by 1996, and the three million TEU level by 2000.18 Estimated barge traffic in 2004 reached four million TEU.19 Short sea shipping (here including bulk materials as well as non-bulk) currently represents 40 percent of intra-EU exchanges in terms of ton-kilometers.20 There are significant differences between freight transportation systems of Europe and the United States. Europe’s rail system is less efficient than the U.S. rail system for moving freight, and Europe’s geography has led to many of its largest industrial centers being in close proximity to water.21 Nonetheless, the strong growth of short sea shipping of containers in Europe highlights both the ability of short sea shipping to compete with land-based transportation modes and the potential benefits of government support to this mode. MARAD is closely monitoring this successful European example.

**Even if they win wars will happen, they won’t escalate**

**Nicol, 03** (Alan Nicol, political scientist specializing in the water sector. "The dynamics of river basin cooperation: The Nile and the Okavango basins"http://www.odi.org.uk/wpp/publications\_pdfs/Okavango.pdf)

The issue of water and conflict is the focus of frequent media reports, usually written by ill-informed journalists keen to cover column inches. The publication of such reports is often proportional to concerns over water scarcity in various regions of the world, with the Middle East and Southern Africa in the spotlight. Some reports even portray impending ‘water wars’, quoting out-of-context statements made by politicians and technocrats who mostly have vested national interests. The statement made in 1995 by a prominent water sector professional that the next world war would be over water is a case in point (Serageldin 1995). In fact, the history of conflicts or disputes over water is somewhat threadbare—instances of cooperation and agreement far outstrip those of dispute and conflict (for a comprehensive listing of agreements and treaties see <www.transboundarywaters.orst.edu/>).

**Strategic issues make water wars impossible**

**Wolf, 97** (Aaron T. Wolf Ph.D., professor of geoscience at Oregon State University. “Conflict and Cooperation Over International Waterways.” http://www.transboundarywaters.orst.edu/publications/conflict\_coop/)

If one were to launch a war over water, what would be the goal? Presumably, the aggressor would have to be both downstream and the regional hegemon -- an upstream riparian would have no cause to launch an attack and a weaker state would be foolhardy to do so. (Foolhardiness apparently does not preclude such "asymmetric conflicts." Paul (1994) describes eight such case studies from 1904-1982, but points out that in none did the weaker power achieve its goals.) An upstream riparian, then, would have to launch a project which decreases either quantity or quality, knowing that it will antagonize a stronger down-stream neighbor. The down-stream power would then have to decide whether to launch an attack -- if the project were a dam, destroying it would result in a wall of water rushing back on down-stream territory; were it a quality-related project, either industrial or waste treatment, destroying it would probably result in even worse quality than before. Furthermore, the hegemon would have to weigh not only an invasion, but an occupation and depopulation of the entire watershed in order to forestall any retribution -- otherwise, it would be extremely simple to pollute the water source of the invading power. Both countries could not be democracies, since the political scientists tell us that democracies do not go to war against each other, and the international community would have to refuse to become involved (this, of course, is the least far-fetched aspect of the scenario). All of this effort would be expended for a resource which costs about a US dollar per cubic meter to create from seawater. There are "only" 261 international watersheds -- there are only a handful on which the above scenario is even feasible (the Nile, Plata, and Mekong come to mind), and many of those either have existing treaties or ongoing negotiations towards a treaty. Finding a site for a "water war" turns out to be as difficult as accepting the rationale for launching one.

**1) Short sea shipping has support of both democrats and republicans**

**Lehman ’11** [Ryan Lehman: Deputy Political Director, M.E.B.A. Washington Update. <http://www.mebaunion.org/MarineOfficer/eMagazienWinter-spring-2012/files/assets/seo/page7.html>. July 13, 2012.]

While you may now be saying to yourself, “What a depressing list of failures,” the truth of the matter is that even in such a gridlocked and dysfunctional environment as Washington last year, the M.E.B.A. has been able to continue to advance the issues important to the U.S. merchant marine. In an important step for the maritime industry, Chairman Mica’s initial outline of the surface transportation bill has, for the first time, included a maritime title. It’s also important to note that the Restore America’s Maritime Promise (RAMP) Act also continues to advance through both the House and the Senate and now has over 175 cosponsors on the House bill. The RAMP Act will ensure money collected by the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund is used for dredging and port maintenance projects. The Short Sea Shipping Act has also been making significant progress in the House. This bill will help encourage the use of short sea shipping in the U.S. by ending double taxation of domestic waterborne cargo. The Short Sea Shipping Act has continued to add new cosponsors throughout the year and enjoys the support of both Democrats and Republicans, an uncommon occurrence in 2011. In fact, both the Short Sea Shipping Act and the RAMP Act were the topic of a recent Ways and Means Committee hearing on maritime tax issues which attracted a lot of attention from both the news media and members of Congress. These kinds of hearings are a crucial step in advancing any legislation through Congress.

**2) Congress Supports SSS- empirically proven**

**USDTMA 11** (United States Department of Transportation Maritime Administration “America’s Marine Highway Report to Congress” April 2011 http://www.marad.dot.gov/documents/MARAD\_AMH\_Report\_to\_Congress.pdf)

Congress has understood the need to promote the expansion of the Marine Highway. In recent years, its most significant action in supporting America’s Marine Highway was to enact the Energy Act. Among the many provisions of the Energy Act is Subtitle C of Title XI, titled “Marine Transportation,” which requires the Secretary to “establish a short sea transportation program and designate short sea transportation projects to be conducted under the program to mitigate surface congestion.” 15 The Energy Act recognizes environmental and transportation benefits of such services and calls for research in these areas. This would generate public benefits that include less delay and more reliable transportation as well as improved air quality, highway safety, and national security. Congress recently passed additional legislation that will foster growth of Marine Highway services. This legislation includes the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 and the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2010. The former act authorizes the newly established Marine Highway Grants program; the latter act appropriates up to $7 million in funds for the new grants program in Fiscal Year (FY) 2010. Additionally, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 created a discretionary surface transportation grants program in which Marine Highway port projects have competed successfully for grant awards along with highway, transit, and rail projects. The Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2010 created a successor to this discretionary surface transportation grants program for FY 2010. The America’s Marine Highway Program envisioned by USDOT will comply fully with Congress’s legislative requirements for short sea shipping by working to bring about a more diverse, energy-efficient, and climate-friendly transportation system through the creation and expansion of domestic water transportation services. The goal of the Program is to develop and expand these services in a self-sustaining, commercially-viable manner that also recognizes the public benefits these services create in the form of reduced surface congestion, fewer GHG emissions resulting from a more sustainable transportation system, improved safety, and additional sealift resources for national defense. The future success of Marine Highway services cannot be tied to any single factor, such as rising fuel prices or landside congestion. Rather, it is contingent on a broad range of qualities, none more important than the ability to serve the needs of shippers for reliable, innovative, and costeffective transportation. MARAD is confident that the private U.S. maritime sector, with the backing of Federal, State, and local governments, will deliver the required quality and reliability of service needed to attract greater cargo volumes. The private U.S. maritime sector has expressed great interest in the Marine Highway initiative, including by its initiation of new Marine Highway services (discussed later in this document) and by providing extensive information to MARAD about the opportunities and impediments to such services. MARAD notes that innovation by the private U.S. maritime sector has directly or indirectly led to major advancements in international and domestic shipping over the last 70 years, including the revolution in intermodal shipping via containerships, double-stack rail service (in cooperation with the U.S. railroad industry), improved logistics, new and larger ship types, and modern shipbuilding techniques. 16 A full exposition of the Energy Act and other legislative requirements for the America’s Marine Highway Program, along with USDOT’s efforts through MARAD to implement them, is provided in detail in the latter half of this report. Information is also provided on MARAD’s broader efforts to promote America’s Marine Highway through support to local government planners and private sector water transportation services, as well as MARAD’s efforts to identify impediments and solutions to impediments that will enable future growth of this national asset.
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#### We control time frame and magnitude – deal failure draws in global powers and goes nuclear within months

PressTV 11/13

Global nuclear conflict between US, Russia, China likely if Iran talks fail, 11/13/13, http://www.presstv.ir/detail/2013/11/13/334544/global-nuclear-war-likely-if-iran-talks-fail/

A global conflict between the US, Russia, and China is likely in the coming months should the world powers fail to reach a nuclear deal with Iran, an American analyst says.¶ “If the talks fail, if the agreements being pursued are not successfully carried forward and implemented, then there would be enormous international pressure to drive towards a conflict with Iran before [US President Barack] Obama leaves office and that’s a very great danger that no one can underestimate the importance of,” senior editor at the Executive Intelligence Review Jeff Steinberg told Press TV on Wednesday. ¶ “The United States could find itself on one side and Russia and China on the other and those are the kinds of conditions that can lead to miscalculation and general roar,” Steinberg said. ¶ “So the danger in this situation is that if these talks don’t go forward, we could be facing a global conflict in the coming months and years and that’s got to be avoided at all costs when you’ve got countries like the United States, Russia, and China with” their arsenals of “nuclear weapons,” he warned. ¶ The warning came one day after the White House told Congress not to impose new sanctions against Tehran because failure in talks with Iran could lead to war.

#### Growth is necessary for environmental transition—resource access.

Ben-Ami 11 — Daniel Ben-Ami, journalist and author, regular contributor to *spiked*, has been published in the *American*, the *Australian*, Economist.com, *Financial Times*, the *Guardian*, the *Independent*, *Novo* (Germany), *Ode* (American and Dutch editions), *Prospect*, *Shanghai Daily*, the *Sunday Telegraph*, the *Sunday Times*, and *Voltaire* (Sweden), 2011 (“Growth is good,” *Ode*, June, Available Online at http://www.odemagazine.com/doc/print/75/growth-is-good, Accessed 08-16-2011)//VP

But is this notion of environmental limits really true? It is certainly the case that, say, building a factory can lead to pollution. However, it is also true that economic growth can generate the resources to clean up the environment and mold it to benefit human beings. That is why, as a general rule, developed countries are less polluted and cleaner than developing ones. Typically, countries experience an environmental transition as they develop. In the early stages, cities may be grossly unsanitary and factories might billow filthy smoke. But as they become richer, these cities clean things up. In London, my hometown, cholera was widespread in the mid-19th century as raw human waste flowed into the Thames River. Then the authorities built an extensive sewage system, a pioneering civil engineering project at the time, and the problem was solved. If anything, today’s developing countries potentially have it easier. They do not need to reinvent sewage systems or modern medicine. Instead, they just need to generate the resources to be able to afford the type of infrastructure already available in the West.

#### Negotiations will be successful – no derailment from allies or Congress

Kinzer 1/6

Stephen, former New York Times foreign correspondent who has covered more than 50 countries on five continents, US-Iran detente will be biggest geopolitical story of 2014, 1/6/14, http://america.aljazeera.com/opinions/2014/1/us-iran-detente-.html

In the end, crazies on both sides will fail. Key figures in Tehran and Washington will have no choice but to recognize that reconciliation will bring enormous strategic benefits. It is a classic win-win situation. Iran finds a way out of its isolation and an escape from crushing sanctions. The United States guarantees a nuclear-weapon-free Iran and gains a potentially valuable partner in the fight against radical Sunni insurgents in Syria, Lebanon, Iraq and Afghanistan.¶ Not to be underestimated in the Washington debate is the influence of U.S. corporations, which see enormous opportunities in Iran. Oil companies would be obvious beneficiaries of reconciliation. Aerospace companies are salivating at the prospect of a large nation whose airplanes are in need of replacement. The pharmaceutical industry sees great possibilities in Iran because of its booming market and lack of specialized medicines. All are quietly lobbying for normalization.¶ Outrage over the prospect of U.S.-Iran reconciliation is based largely on emotion. Iran and the United States have inflicted terrible blows on each other, and the legacy of this history has proved maddeningly difficult to overcome. In 2014 the anger these countries feel toward each other will be moderated by strategic logic.¶ Saudi Arabia and Israel are working intently to block this peace process. Many of the members of Congress who bloviated at the Foreign Affairs Committee hearing sounded as if they were reading index cards prepared by pro-Israel lobbyists. This is the beginning of a major campaign in Washington aimed at blocking a U.S.-Iran deal. It will be highly reminiscent of efforts to block reconciliation between the U.S. and China 40 years ago and will fail, just as those efforts did.¶ When the U.S. shocked the world by extending a hand of friendship to China, two important American allies became suddenly apoplectic. Japan was terrified, and Taiwan entered panic mode. A series of reassurances, including a strengthened U.S. military commitment to Taiwan, did not resolve these doubts but allowed the United States to proceed in spite of them.¶ China in the 1970s was in a situation comparable to Iran’s today: marginalized from the world system despite its size, history, culture and influence. Such isolation is always destabilizing, since — as President Lyndon Johnson memorably said, it is always better to have a rival “inside the tent pissing out than outside the tent pissing in.”¶ Japan and Taiwan have seen that their fears of China’s emergence from isolation were unwarranted. Will Saudi Arabia and Israel follow the same path, ultimately recognizing that Iran’s return to normality might not be so bad and could even have benefits? Saudi Arabia is too trapped in its narrow paradigm to take advantage of regional shifts. Israel may be more adroit. It has a long history of cooperation with Iran, and strategic logic dictates that this resume.¶ Despite their evident differences, Israel and Iran are logical partners. They have cooperated fitfully over the years, most recently in the 1980s, when they faced common enemies in Iraq and the Soviet Union. Today they both view Sunni radicalism as a major threat. They share a deep suspicion of Arabs. If 2014 does indeed turn out to be the year the United States begins dealing normally with Iran, Israel could follow — but probably only in the post-Netanyahu era.¶ Imagining the future of Middle East politics after a U.S.-Iran rapprochement is tantalizing. First, however, the current interim accord — signed not just by the United States and Iran but also by Britain, France, Germany, Russia and China — must be transformed into a long-term treaty that will end Western sanctions and guarantee that Iran never produces nuclear weapons. Decisive progress will be made toward such a treaty in 2014. Enemies of peace in Tehran and Washington will not be able to derail it.

#### Sanction supporters will seize on any opportunity for a revived push

Sargent 1/22

Greg, Washington Post, Another blow to the Iran sanctions bill, 1/22/14, http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/plum-line/wp/2014/01/22/another-blow-to-the-iran-sanctions-bill/

Add two more prominent Senators to the list of lawmakers who oppose a vote on an Iran sanctions bill right now: Patty Murray and Elizabeth Warren.¶ Murray’s opposition — which she declared in a letter to constituents that was sent my way by a source — is significant, because she is a member of the Senate Dem leadership, which is now clearly split on how to proceed. While Chuck Schumer favors the Iran sanctions bill, Murray, Harry Reid and (reportedly) Dick Durbin now oppose it. This could make it less likely that it ever gets a vote.¶ From Murray’s letter:¶ Please know that I share your concerns about the Iranian government’s nuclear program. Like you, I am troubled by Iran’s nuclear enrichment program and their desire to enrich nuclear materials above levels required for energy production. That is why I was pleased to see Iran take measurable steps toward addressing the international community’s concerns by signing the Joint Plan of Action last fall…While I still remain concerned about Iran’s nuclear program, I believe this agreement could be an important step in our efforts to reach a diplomatic solution to this complicated issue.¶ I believe the Administration should be given time to negotiate a strong verifiable comprehensive agreement. However, if Iran does not agree to a comprehensive agreement that is acceptable, or if Iran does not abide by the terms of the interim agreement, I will work with my colleagues to swiftly enact sanctions in order to increase pressure on the Iranian regime.¶ This hits some of the key points: The mere possibility of a long term deal is worth trying for, and sanctions can always be imposed later if the talks go awry.¶ Meanwhile, Elizabeth Warren is circulating a letter to constituents out there that also opposes a vote. Asked about the letter, Warren spokesperson Lacey Rose emails me:¶ “Senator Warren believes we must exhaust every effort to resolve the Iranian nuclear issue through diplomacy, and she does not support imposing additional sanctions through new legislation while diplomatic efforts to achieve a long-term agreement are ongoing.”¶ Warren’s pull with the Democratic base, of course, is largely rooted in her emphasis on economic issues, but there has been some chatter in liberal circles inquiring about her stance on Iran. Since a mobilized left is important in preventing a vote that could derail diplomacy, her opposition can only help.¶ The method by which both Senators declared their positions — letters to constituents, in response to questions perhaps stoked by pressure from outside groups — says something about the caution Dems are demonstrating when it comes to the domestic politics of engagement with Iran. Those who favored a vote were far more vocal at first — as of now, 16 Dem Senators have signed on. But the continued silence of many Dem Senators signaled a broad unwillingness to join the bill, even as many were unwilling to publicly declare this to be the case, since Dems apparently see allowing negotiations to proceed, without getting a chance to vote in favor of getting tougher on Iran, as a politically difficult position to take.¶ If current conditions remain, a vote is starting to look less and less likely. Right now, the bill has 58 co-sponsors. On the other side, 10 Dem Senate committee chairs have signed a letter opposing a vote. Around half a dozen Dem Senators subsequently came out against it. With Murray and Warren, the number of Dems against a vote has comfortably surpassed the number who want one.¶ Meanwhile, announcements like the one earlier this month indicating that the deal with Iran is moving forward make a vote still less likely. With Murray now opposed, that means virtually the whole Dem leadership is a No. On the other hand, those who adamantly want a vote — insisting it would only help the White House and make success more likely, despite what the White House itself wants – will be looking for any hook they can find to reactivate pressure.

#### Top of the docket but capital key

Rothkopf 11/12 David, CEO and editor at large of Foreign Policy, This Deal Won’t Seal Itself, 11/12/13, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2013/11/12/this\_deal\_won\_t\_seal\_itself\_obama\_nuclear\_talks\_iran

No, even the Iranians should be happy with the delay... and not just for the cynical reason that any delay buys them the time they want and need to advance their nuclear weapons program. They also very much want sanctions relief, and to get it, they need the deal to win support from the U.S. Congress. Given the efforts of multiple forces to block the deal, this will mean the Obama administration and the president himself will have to systematically engage opponents in a way they seldom do on anything. Winning support on Capitol Hill and with the American people for such a deal is potentially the president's next big domestic political test. Failure on this after the failure to win support for his Syria efforts, the blowback from the NSA scandal, and his unsteady and confusing Egypt policies would be a big setback for the president during his second term, a period in which chief executives often turn to foreign policy to shape their legacies.¶ Of central concern to those domestic and international skeptics and opponents of any kind of rapprochement with Iran will be how the administration will ensure any deal is being adhered to and whether they have the resolve to punish Iran for any missteps or misrepresentations. If the President and his team can make a compelling case that they do, and then such a deal is certainly a risk worth taking. However, if the deal is seen as a dodge, as a way to avoid testing the president's resolve to do whatever is necessary to stop Iran from developing nuclear weapons, or even as a way to simply punt the hard questions associated with Iranian nukes to the next Oval Office occupant, then few will or should support what would amount to simply papering over one of the Middle East's great problems.¶ In short, the most critical component of this deal is not the words drafted by diplomats but what lies in the heart of the Iranians and the president of the United States. If Iran reverses past patterns and actually complies, the deal could be part of a game-changing reduction of tension that all in the region should welcome. But because that is a change without precedent and one that goes against the grain of decades' worth of Iranian behavior, as well as the character and commitment of the president of the United States, it is even more important to its success. If the Iranians believe President Obama is resolved to enforce it swiftly and decisively, it may work. If they think he will be reluctant to take tough enforcement measures, if they think he can be played -- either because he wants the legacy of an apparently successful deal or because he simply is loath to run the risk of costly, dangerous military action against Iran -- then history suggests they will play him (much as past U.S. leaders have been played in other such "deals" as was the case with North Korea).

**Also outweighs any offense they have – legal immigration is the democrat’s foremost priority – the plan would cause them to pull the plug**

**Garrett, 13** [M, Politics for the National Journal, “The Hidden Obstacles to Legal Immigration Reform” The National Journal Online, 2/21/13 factiva//GBS-JV]

The toughest issue may be legal immigration. You know, the issue everyone is for. Who is against legal immigration? Obama is for it. Mitt Romney was for it. Our entire history is suffused with the narrative of dreams that began at the golden door first opened by legal immigration. We all agree, right? Think again.¶ Legal immigration is much tougher than that. It’s the stunningly underappreciated policy linchpin to reform. Its politics are even more complicated than border security or legalization of undocumented workers. And the White House draft said nothing about it. Nothing. The president’s speech in Nevada on Jan. 29 was similarly vacuous. The White House insists it has a plan, and Obama’s May 10, 2011, speech in El Paso made a glancing reference to helping immigrant entrepreneurs stay and create jobs and a way for seasonal agricultural workers to stay legally in America. That was it.¶ Legal immigration is far more complex. If Obama and Congress don’t create a workable balance of future legal immigration — in the argot, “future flow” — it might as well give up. Why? Because that’s what Congress did with the 1986 immigration reform act. It legalized 3 million undocumented workers here, didn’t tighten border security, and created a legal immigration system so small (in numbers) and slow (in terms of approval) that illegals flooded across the border for jobs in a variety of industries. That will happen again unless new numbers and rules are applied to all variety of work and immigrant applicants for it.¶ It is for this reason that Republicans — chief among them non-savior Marco Rubio, the senator from Florida — cannot and will not accept immigration reform that does not rewrite legal immigration rules.¶ Legal immigration is now the subject of intense outside negotiations between the AFL-CIO and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce (which are aligned in pursuit of reform, unlike in 2007), as well as other stakeholders. Business wants actual job demands to determine how many visas are issued for all varieties of work. Big labor wants — get ready — a commission to review the needs and decide how many visas should be allocated. There’s no resolution. Yet. The White House eyes this intense debate with Sphinx-like inscrutability. ¶ It’s a high-stakes fight over an alphabet soup of visas, which includes but is not limited to H-1B for immigrants with highly specialized “theoretical and practical” knowledge suitable for high-tech jobs; H-2A for seasonal agricultural workers who pick crops; H-2B for peak-season nonagricultural workers who toil at theme parks, hotels, restaurants, and ski resorts; and H-4 for the family members (nonworking spouses and children) of H-2A and H-2B workers, who are desperate to legally live in America.¶ According to the State Department, there were 117,409 H-1B visa recipients in 2010 and 129,134 in 2011 — not nearly enough, according to business leaders and those eager to keep top-performing immigrant specialists here. The Washington Post on Tuesday wrote of student visa recipients from India who have invented a “world-changing” system to decontaminate water from hydraulic fracking. They may have to leave America and take their plans to hire 100 employees to India or elsewhere. The story said that places like China, Canada, Germany, Australia, and Singapore are dangling cash and other incentives before visa-limited American innovators such as these.¶ And what about the workers who wash dishes, change sheets at hotels, mow resort golf courses, and provide home health care? Are they temporary? Are they high-skilled? No. Are they necessary? Absolutely. What are the legal numbers for these workers going forward? The choice will be a functioning U.S. economy, with a ready supply of legal labor, or a choked off and backward legal immigration system (like we have now), where the jobs are filled but by illegals … and we repeat the … cycle all over again.¶ The biggest immigration news of the weekend wasn’t the leak. It was what the leak exposed. And what the Senate working group, now on a tight deadline, will have to address with specificity, originality, and political deftness.¶ You read it here first. If immigration reform dies, it will not be because of disagreeable topics such as border security, legalization, or a “national ID card.”¶ It will be because of the agreeable topic of legal immigration.

**There’s zero chance of you winning a turn – House republicans will do everything they can to stop Obama from claiming any jobs victory**

Cooper, 12-Senior Fellow at American Progress (Donna, “Will Congress Block Infrastructure Spending?,” American Progress 1-25, http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2012/01/infrastructure\_sotu.html)

At first glance it would appear that the president’s call to invest in infrastructure should enjoy wide bipartisan support. The leadership of both parties in Congress is on record as strong advocates for rebuilding the nation’s roads, bridges, rail, ports, and airports. On Fox News earlier this week, Speaker of the House John Boehner (R-OH) said he wants the president to follow the recommendations of the White House Jobs and Competitiveness Council on increasing federal investments in infrastructure (look for the transcript on the speaker's blog). And Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-KY) is on the record saying, “Everybody knows we have a crumbling infrastructure. Infrastructure spending is popular on both sides. The question is how much are we going to spend.” Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-NV) and House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (D-CA) also strongly support President Obama’s infrastructure plans. But bipartisanship isn’t always what it seems, especially when it comes to infrastructure. In 2011 Republicans in the House and Senate unveiled a new strategy that linked new infrastructure investments with divisive environmental proposals. They know this linkage is unacceptable to the president, Senate Democrats, and most of the American public. Yet congressional Republicans are making this push so they can block movement to create jobs and rebuild our infrastructure while sounding like they are in favor of policies that do both. This is a serious claim, but the evidence is clear. In the past year, instead of rolling up their sleeves and drafting long-term highway and aviation spending bills, the House leadership cranked out a package of bills that include measures to weaken clean water and clean air protections and to restrict union organizing. They disingenuously called this a "jobs package." In spite of the compelling evidence that federal investments in infrastructure are an effective tool for creating jobs—the U.S. Department of Transportation 2007 estimates indicated that $1 billion in highway investments can create 27,800 jobs—this “jobs package” included the House-passed fiscal year 2012 budget bill that makes deep cuts in spending for highway and other surface transportation repairs. This package of bills willfully neglects the dire state of our aging infrastructure and the need to create more well-paying construction jobs. They haven’t stopped there. While ignoring the president’s very popular American Jobs Act, they’ve joined the all-out offensive campaign to push the environmentally dangerous Keystone pipeline project, claiming it as their solution to the jobs crisis. This project is more like a jobs pipedream. It’s already three years behind schedule and may never see the light of day due to broad-based U.S. opposition to building the pipeline, including from the Republican governor of Nebraska, who opposes the pipeline route through his state. None of this is news to the House Republicans. They are desperate to shift attention away from their failure to advance legislation to address our nation’s crumbling infrastructure because they are more concerned with blocking a jobs victory for President Obama that would help him win the 2012 presidential election. Emblematic of this strategy was the announcement in a November House leadership press conference where Speaker Boehner indicated that he intended to release a multiyear highway funding bill early in 2012 and fund it with revenues dependent on a massive expansion in oil-and-gas drilling offshore and on public lands, including in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska. The only problem is that the House leadership knows that this drilling-dependent approach is likely to be dead on arrival in the Senate. Just this past May, 57 senators voted against a motion to proceed to consider the House bill to permit expanded offshore oil-and-gas drilling. If the House leadership were sincere about creating new construction jobs, then why not start by getting behind a bill that can pass both chambers so that private contractors can get to work repairing more of the 150,000 bridges that need it or the $52.3 billion in improvements needed at the nation’s airports? Instead we are now on the eighth temporary extension of a federal highway bill that expired in 2009 and now only runs through the end of March 2012. Then there’s the Federal Aviation Administration funding bill. Yesterday before the president’s State of the Union address, House Transportation Committee Chairman John Mica (R-FL) held a vote for the 23rd temporary extension of the legislation that will provide funding for our airport safety and construction only through the end of February 2012. These extensions enable the status-quo level of inadequate funding for infrastructure to limp along while our national assets crumble. The House Republicans have blocked the passage of a long-term aviation funding bill for the past two years, demanding that arcane and unfair union election rules be included in the bill. As of today a compromise among all parties takes the union issue off the table. But there are many more details to work out, including the level of funding and what is funded. Given the Republican track record on passing the legislation that is needed to rebuild our infrastructure, it is premature to consider this aviation funding bill a done deal. The House is not the only problem. Sen. Reid late in 2011 put the president’s American Jobs Act, which included $60 billion to repair our schools and fund a National Infrastructure Bank, to a vote, but Senate filibuster rules that require 60 favorable votes to put a bill on the floor for consideration made moving this infrastructure funding bill impossible. After failing to reach that 60-vote threshold, Sen. Reid said, “Republicans think that if the economy improves, it might help President Obama. So they root for the economy to fail and oppose every effort to improve it.” Indeed, Sen. McConnell blocked passage of the Senate version of the Jobs Act while lambasting the president for pointing it out and blasting the Senate Democrats for not working with the House Republicans to reach a compromise. But that statement begs the question of why McConnell isn’t working with his own party’s leadership in the House to make sure the Senate receives a bill that has a chance of a positive vote. The answer is clear: The Republican leadership is very concerned that responding to the American popular call for infrastructure investment will benefit President Obama politically—never mind the pain suffered by the American people and our future economic competitiveness by their failure to act. The president should not be deterred, however, by the roadblocks he faces in Congress. In his speech in Kansas this past December, he summoned the nation to redouble its commitment to an economy that lifts all boats.

#### Prefer issues specific uniqueness – Obama fighting sanctions now – delayed launch date still collapses the deal

AFP 12/4 Obama warns Congress on new Iran sanctions, 12/4/13, http://manilastandardtoday.com/2013/12/04/obama-warns-congress-on-new-iran-sanctions

The White House warned Congress Tuesday that passing new sanctions on Iran—even with a delayed launch date—would give Tehran an excuse to undermine an interim nuclear deal.¶ White House spokesman Jay Carney also warned a bipartisan coalition of senators who are suspicious of the pact reached last month and want to pile up more punishments for Tehran, that their move would be seen as a show of “bad faith” by US partners abroad.¶ The White House stepped up its rhetorical push to forestall new sanctions amid intense behind-the-scenes lobbying by top Obama administration officials targeting key lawmakers from both Democratic and Republican parties.

**PC finite- legislative wins don’t spillover –empirics, true for Obama, too polarized**

Todd **Eberly** is coordinator of Public Policy Studies and assistant professor in the Department of Political Science at St. Mary's College of Maryland. His email is teeberly@smcm.edu. This article is excerpted from his book, co-authored with Steven Schier, "American Government and Popular Discontent: Stability without Success," to published later this year by Routledge Press., **1-21**-2013 <http://articles.baltimoresun.com/2013-01-21/news/bs-ed-political-capital-20130121_1_political-system-party-support-public-opinion/2>

As Barack Obama prepares to be sworn in for the second time as president of the United States, he faces the stark reality that little of what he hopes to accomplish in a second term will likely come to pass. Mr. Obama occupies an office that many assume to be all powerful, but like so many of his recent predecessors, the president knows better. He faces a political capital problem and a power trap.¶ In the post-1960s American political system, presidents have found the exercise of effective leadership a difficult task. To lead well, a president needs support — or at least permission — from federal courts and Congress; steady allegiance from public opinion and fellow partisans in the electorate; backing from powerful, entrenched interest groups; and accordance with contemporary public opinion about the proper size and scope of government. This is a long list of requirements. If presidents fail to satisfy these requirements, they face the prospect of inadequate political support or political capital to back their power assertions.¶ What was so crucial about the 1960s? We can trace so much of what defines contemporary politics to trends that emerged then. Americans' confidence in government began a precipitous decline as the tumult and tragedies of the 1960s gave way to the scandals and economic uncertainties of the 1970s. Long-standing party coalitions began to fray as the New Deal coalition, which had elected Franklin Roosevelt to four terms and made Democrats the indisputable majority party, faded into history. The election of Richard Nixon in 1968 marked the beginning of an unprecedented era of divided government. Finally, the two parties began ideologically divergent journeys that resulted in intense polarization in Congress, diminishing the possibility of bipartisan compromise. These changes, combined with the growing influence of money and interest groups and the steady "thickening" of the federal bureaucracy, introduced significant challenges to presidential leadership.¶ Political capital can best be understood as a combination of the president's party support in Congress, public approval of his job performance, and the president's electoral victory margin. The components of political capital are central to the fate of presidencies. It is difficult to claim warrants for leadership in an era when job approval, congressional support and partisan affiliation provide less backing for a president than in times past. In recent years, presidents' political capital has shrunk while their power assertions have grown, making the president a volatile player in the national political system.¶ Jimmy Carter and George H.W. Bush joined the small ranks of incumbents defeated while seeking a second term. Ronald Reagan was elected in two landslides, yet his most successful year for domestic policy was his first year in office. Bill Clinton was twice elected by a comfortable margin, but with less than majority support, and despite a strong economy during his second term, his greatest legislative successes came during his first year with the passage of a controversial but crucial budget bill, the Family and Medical Leave Act, and the North American Free Trade Agreement. George W. Bush won election in 2000 having lost the popular vote, and though his impact on national security policy after the Sept. 11 attacks was far reaching, his greatest domestic policy successes came during 2001. Ambitious plans for Social Security reform, following his narrow re-election in 2004, went nowhere.¶ Faced with obstacles to successful leadership, recent presidents have come to rely more on their formal powers. The number of important executive orders has increased significantly since the 1960s, as have the issuance of presidential signing statements. Both are used by presidents in an attempt to shape and direct policy on their terms. Presidents have had to rely more on recess appointments as well, appointing individuals to important positions during a congressional recess (even a weekend recess) to avoid delays and obstruction often encountered in the Senate. Such power assertions typically elicit close media scrutiny and often further erode political capital.¶ Barack Obama's election in 2008 seemed to signal a change. Mr. Obama's popular vote majority was the largest for any president since 1988, and he was the first Democrat to clear the 50 percent mark since Lyndon Johnson. The president initially enjoyed strong public approval and, with a Democratic Congress, was able to produce an impressive string of legislative accomplishments during his first year and early into his second, capped by enactment of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. But with each legislative battle and success, his political capital waned. His impressive successes with Congress in 2009 and 2010 were accompanied by a shift in the public mood against him, evident in the rise of the tea party movement, the collapse in his approval rating, and the large GOP gains in the 2010 elections, which brought a return to divided government.¶ By mid-2011, Mr. Obama's job approval had slipped well below its initial levels, and Congress was proving increasingly intransigent. In the face of declining public support and rising congressional opposition, Mr. Obama, like his predecessors, looked to the energetic use of executive power. In 2012, the president relied on executive discretion and legal ambiguity to allow homeowners to more easily refinance federally backed mortgages, to help veterans find employment and to make it easier for college graduates to consolidate federal student loan debt. He issued several executive orders effecting change in the nation's enforcement of existing immigration laws. He used an executive order to authorize the Department of Education to grant states waivers from the requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act — though the enacting legislation makes no accommodation for such waivers. Contrary to the outcry from partisan opponents, Mr. Obama's actions were hardly unprecedented or imperial. Rather, they represented a rather typical power assertion from a contemporary president.¶ Many looked to the 2012 election as a means to break present trends. But Barack Obama's narrow re-election victory, coupled with the re-election of a somewhat-diminished Republican majority House and Democratic majority Senate, hardly signals a grand resurgence of his political capital. The president's recent issuance of multiple executive orders to deal with the issue of gun violence is further evidence of his power trap. Faced with the likelihood of legislative defeat in Congress, the president must rely on claims of unilateral power. But such claims are not without limit or cost and will likely further erode his political capital.¶ Only by solving the problem of political capital is a president likely to avoid a power trap. Presidents in recent years have been unable to prevent their political capital from eroding. When it did, their power assertions often got them into further political trouble. Through leveraging public support, presidents have at times been able to overcome contemporary leadership challenges by adopting as their own issues that the public already supports. Bill Clinton's centrist "triangulation" and George W. Bush's careful issue selection early in his presidency allowed them to secure important policy changes — in Mr. Clinton's case, welfare reform and budget balance, in Mr. Bush's tax cuts and education reform — that at the time received popular approval.¶ However, short-term legislative strategies may win policy success for a president but do not serve as an antidote to declining political capital over time, as the difficult final years of both the Bill Clinton and George W. Bush presidencies demonstrate. None of Barack Obama's recent predecessors solved the political capital problem or avoided the power trap. It is the central political challenge confronted by modern presidents and one that will likely weigh heavily on the current president's mind today as he takes his second oath of office.