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## 2AC DA Politics SKFTA

**Existing and coming disagreements will undermine climate necessary for passage**

**Kim, 9/6** --- senior partner specializing in international trade at Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP in Washington, D.C. (9/6/2011, Sukhan, Joins.com, “Pushing the FTA to the finish line,” Factiva, JMP)

President Obama seeks to link ratification of the Korus FTA with TAA renewal, but Republicans on Capitol Hill are balking at this political maneuver. Many observers question the wisdom of this use of the Korus FTA as a bargaining chip to improve the prospects for TAA renewal, but the political reality for President Obama is that the Democratic political base, already eyeing Obama's re-election campaign in 2012, demands it.There have been other political impediments to the ratification of the FTA in the United States. The recent battles over the government budget and debt ceiling were bitterly fought and produced a hostile political climate. Now, President Obama is preparing to unveil, after the upcoming Labor Day weekend, major new spending initiatives to increase U.S. employment. With unemployment hovering above 9 percent, job creation is now the number one political issue in the country. However, Republicans and Democrats disagree sharply on how to fix the problem - particularly when it comes to government spending. The upcoming fight over jobs legislation is likely only to exacerbate the existing climate of distrust between the parties on economic matters and will not be conducive to reaching a bipartisan deal to pass the Korus FTA.Further, the legislative calendar for the next several months is already packed. In the weeks ahead, Congress will take up a number of highly contentious bills, including patent reform, highway funding and renewal of authority for the Federal Aviation Administration. Legislative wrangling over these bills will further distract from the FTA.Despite these hurdles, the time has come for political leaders in both countries to exercise decisive leadership, disentangle the FTA from other issues and find an expeditious path to ratification. President Obama has already expended great political capital to reshape the Korus FTA as a deal to call his own and to promote its passage. He has described it is a key element of his strategy to create new jobs through expanded trade, and he has sent Ron Kirk, his chief trade negotiator, on a state-by-state tour to promote the deal. And, there is little question that Korus FTA implementing legislation would secure enough votes on Capitol Hill to pass. Moreover, the business community is clamoring for its passage, and even some unions now support it. Given all that President Obama has put into the success of the FTA, he must now commit to action and get the deal done. If he acts quickly and takes advantage of the current Congressional willingness to consider the deal, ratification within the next two months seems feasible. As for Korea, its political leaders must rise above the political fray and do what is best for Korea's long-term national interests. These include, of course, the tangible economic benefits that the Korus FTA would deliver for many of Korea's key enterprises. The benefits also include positive ripple effects from the increased trade and investment flows from the United States that the FTA would bring. As U.S. commercial interests in Korea expand, the U.S. commitment to protect those interests in Korea will be stronger, buttressing the bilateral security relationship. At the same time, an enhanced U.S. commercial presence in Korea will strengthen Korea's hand in dealing with the United States as it will give Korea greater say. In short, as the U.S. stakes in Korea grow, so will Korea's leverage vis-a-vis the United States. The FTA is not merely a trade deal. It is essentially a political deal at the highest levels between the two countries that they are committed to deepening their strategic partnership. This enhanced relationship with the United States will also promote Korea's interests in many ways

**Plan is popular—past votes prove**

**Larrimore 7** – Lt Col, USAF (Scott C., April 2007, AIR FORCE FELLOWS AIR UNIVERSITY, “A NEW PARADIGM OR ANOTHER FALSE START?” Advised by Dr, Richard Van Atta, Institute for Defense Analyses https://www.afresearch.org/skins/RIMS/display.aspx?moduleid=be0e99f3-fc56-4ccb-8dfe-670c0822a153&mode=user&action=researchproject&objectid=5ea32116-b119-43ab-8fcb-9565110bb741 Ajones)

Political While the United States and its allies generally enjoy strategic peace, there is increasing apprehension over China’s rise as a near-peer military competitor. China’s defense budget grew 17.8 percent in 2007 and 14.7 percent in 2006. In response to China’s ASAT test and continued military build-up, Vice President Cheney stated these actions “are less constructive and are not consistent with China’s stated goal of a peaceful rise.”54 While China may be a strategic rival in the long term, the United States immediate attention is on regional powers. Regional conflicts, particularly the Middle East, will likely embroil the United States for years to come. Concern is increasing, however, that some regional actors such as Iran or North Korea might develop ASAT weapons to ride atop their proven intermediate ballistic missiles. Concern over United States’ satellite vulnerability is one reason Congress decided to fund robustly the ORS initiative in 2006 and 2007.

**Number of fights coming in the current agenda --- little is likely to pass**

**Knox, 9/4** (Olivier, 9/4/2011, AFP, “Unpopular US Congress faces debt, jobs fights,” http://news.yahoo.com/unpopular-us-congress-faces-debt-jobs-fights-200325039.html, JMP)

US lawmakers return to work next week after a month-long break, facing pitched battles over government spending, trade, and boosting the job-starved economy as the 2012 White House race heats up. Polarized politicians got bracingly bad news Friday as the US government reported the economy added no jobs in August, ending 10 months of gains and fueling fears of recession in the world's richest country. And new polls showed the US public angry and disgusted with Washington, with President Barack Obama hitting an all-time low of voters disapproving of him by 52 to 42 percent in a Quinnipiac University survey. The Congress fared even worse, slumped at 13 percent approval in a Gallup study. The data raised the already high stakes for Obama's speech to a rare joint session of the US Congress on Thursday, when he lays out his plan for assaulting 9.1 percent unemployment some 14 months before he faces the voters. Republican House Speaker John Boehner will counter exactly one week later with an address at the Economic Club of Washington, laying out a rival strategy on an issue vital to Obama's quest for a second term in November 2012. And House Republicans plan regular votes to roll back at least 10 government environmental or labor regulations that they describe as "job-killing" restrictions smothering US businesses. Those efforts are expected to fall short in the Democratic-held Senate, while Obama's proposals are unlikely to clear the House, amid political dysfunction that fed a weeks-long fight over the US debt ceiling and cost Washington its top-notch debt rating with the Standard & Poor's agency. The bitterly divided and woefully unpopular Congress may also feud over trade pacts with Colombia, Panama, and South Korea, which the White House and key lawmakers promise will help create jobs. Obama has called for swift approval of the three trade deals, while Democrats have said they want to be sure that a special assistance package for workers who lose their jobs due to overseas competition also clears Congress. Another marquee battle will focus on a 12-member "supercommittee" created in the hard-fought debt-limit deal and now tasked with slashing at least $1.2 trillion from government deficits over 10 years. If the panel cannot agree on a compromise by November 23, or if the compromise fails to clear Congress by December 23, that would trigger deep cuts to security programs and to providers in the popular Medicare health program for the elderly and disabled. Asked about the prospects for agreement, veteran US Congress-watched Norm Ornstein told AFP: "Everything on the surface would say it looks pretty awful." But lawmakers could find common ground in the face of "growing alarm -- for all the obvious reasons -- over the state of the economy and the global economy." Still, Obama's speech will likely open a new rift with House Republicans who refuse to accept new spending proposals and tax increases on the richest Americans and wealthy corporations, and want steep cuts in expenditures in programs dear to Democrats. The plan is expected to consist of a mix of old and new proposals, including a call for tax rises on the wealthiest Americans, more spending on job creating infrastructure projects and an extension to a payroll tax cut. Republicans, who once favored that reduction, now question its effectiveness and have signalled they may fight the White House.

**Obama’s capital is already jacked --- little chance of GOP cooperation**

**Yakabuski, 9**/3 (9/3/2011, Konrad, The Globe and Mail, “A president's silence on the jobs front,” Factiva, JMP)

After dropping calls for climate legislation, another plank in his plan to transform the U.S. economy, the President has little political capital left. Mr. Obama will attempt to argue next week for more stimulus measures, an approach that is largely supported by mainstream economists. But unless Republicans in Congress agree – and the odds of that are slim – Mr. Obama will likely return to his fallback position. He has argued that hyperpartisanship is hurting the economy. In other words, it is not his fault.

**Kyl loves the plan**

**Larrimore 7** – Lt Col, USAF (Scott C., April 2007, AIR FORCE FELLOWS AIR UNIVERSITY, “A NEW PARADIGM OR ANOTHER FALSE START?” Advised by Dr, Richard Van Atta, Institute for Defense Analyses https://www.afresearch.org/skins/RIMS/display.aspx?moduleid=be0e99f3-fc56-4ccb-8dfe-670c0822a153&mode=user&action=researchproject&objectid=5ea32116-b119-43ab-8fcb-9565110bb741 Ajones)

Official United States’ reaction to the ASAT has been muted. National Security Council spokesperson Gordon Johndroe said the country “expressed our concern” about the test to the Chinese.4 Secretary of Defense Robert Gates testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee that the test was “troubling”5 while the Department of State wanted the Chinese to “clarify their intentions in seeking to develop” their anti-satellite capability.6 The most visible sign of United States’ disapproval of the test was the suspension of cooperative civil space endeavors between China and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).7

Criticism has been much louder from several members of Congress. Senator Jon Kyl argued, “Key policy makers seem oblivious to the nature and the urgency of the threat.”8 In speeches following the Chinese ASAT test, Senator Kyl, as well as the former Ranking Member on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence Representative Jane Harman and current Chairman of the Strategic Forces Subcommittee, Representative Terry Everett,9 called on the nation to create new Operationally Responsive Space (ORS) capabilities as a means to mitigate the Chinese ASAT threat.10

The members of Congress look to ORS as a means to reconstitute critical assets lost in space combat. “In a world where our space assets are likely to be threatened, operationally responsive space capabilities will allow us to quickly and affordably replace assets lost to anti-satellite attacks,” Senator Kyl advocated. While a key motivator, ORS is more than just a satellite replenishment strategy. In a broader sense, Congress seeks ORS “to launch – and activate quickly – militarily useful satellites”11 in order to “supplement a battlefield commander’s capabilities.”12

**He’s key to the agenda**

**McConnell 10** (Mitch, Senate Minority Leader, “Jon Kyl,” Time 100, http://www.time.com/time/specials/packages/article/0,28804,1984685\_1984864\_1984901,00.html, EMM)

In the Senate, Arizona's Jon Kyl has built a reputation for his encyclopedic knowledge of domestic and foreign policy, and his hard work and leadership. Few people have his command of policy, his knowledge of its nuances or his grip on how they fit together. This is why so many of his Senate colleagues look to him for policy advice. Kyl, 68, is a principled conservative who knows what is attainable. He believes in the wisdom contained in a sign on President Reagan's desk that said, "There's no limit to what a man can do or where he can go if he doesn't mind who gets the credit." Jon Kyl is a great persuader. As minority whip, the No. 2 position in the Senate Republican leadership, he is responsible for rallying his Republican colleagues for key legislative votes. What is unique is his single-minded focus on convincing them that a particular vote is in the best interests of their state and the nation. Jon demonstrates continually that the essence of Senate power is the power to persuade.

**Issues in Congress are compartmentalized – political capital not key**

**Dickinson, 09** – professor of political science at Middlebury College and taught previously at Harvard University where he worked under the supervision of presidential scholar Richard Neustadt (5/26/09, Matthew, Presidential Power: A NonPartisan Analysis of Presidential Politics, “Sotomayor, Obama and Presidential Power,” http://blogs.middlebury.edu/presidentialpower/2009/05/26/sotamayor-obama-and-presidential-power/, JMP)

What is of more interest to me, however, is what her selection reveals about the basis of presidential power. Political scientists, like baseball writers evaluating hitters, have devised numerous means of measuring a president’s influence in Congress. I will devote a separate post to discussing these, but in brief, they often center on the creation of legislative “box scores” designed to measure how many times a president’s preferred piece of legislation, or nominee to the executive branch or the courts, is approved by Congress. That is, how many pieces of legislation that the president supports actually pass Congress? How often do members of Congress vote with the president’s preferences? How often is a president’s policy position supported by roll call outcomes? These measures, however, are a misleading gauge of presidential power – they are a better indicator of congressional power. This is because how members of Congress vote on a nominee or legislative item is rarely influenced by anything a president does. Although journalists (and political scientists) often focus on the legislative “endgame” to gauge presidential influence – will the President swing enough votes to get his preferred legislation enacted? – this mistakes an outcome with actual evidence of presidential influence. Once we control for other factors – a member of Congress’ ideological and partisan leanings, the political leanings of her constituency, whether she’s up for reelection or not – we can usually predict how she will vote without needing to know much of anything about what the president wants. (I am ignoring the importance of a president’s veto power for the moment.) Despite the much publicized and celebrated instances of presidential arm-twisting during the legislative endgame, then, most legislative outcomes don’t depend on presidential lobbying. But this is not to say that presidents lack influence. Instead, the primary means by which presidents influence what Congress does is through their ability to determine the alternatives from which Congress must choose. That is, presidential power is largely an exercise in agenda-setting – not arm-twisting. And we see this in the Sotomayer nomination. Barring a major scandal, she will almost certainly be confirmed to the Supreme Court whether Obama spends the confirmation hearings calling every Senator or instead spends the next few weeks ignoring the Senate debate in order to play Halo III on his Xbox. That is, how senators decide to vote on Sotomayor will have almost nothing to do with Obama’s lobbying from here on in (or lack thereof). His real influence has already occurred, in the decision to present Sotomayor as his nominee.

**Winners win-Even controversial policies boost Obama’s political capital**

**Singer 9**—degree in Politics from Pomona College, cum laude (Jonathan, 3 March 2009, By Expending Capital, Obama Grows His Capital, http://www.mydd.com/story/2009/3/3/191825/0428, RBatra)

"What is amazing here is how much political capital Obama has spent in the first six weeks," said Democratic pollster Peter D. Hart, who conducted this survey with Republican pollster Bill McInturff. "And against that, he stands at the end of this six weekswith as much or more capital in the bank." Peter Hart gets at a key point. Some believe that political capital is finite, that it can be used up. To an extent that's true. But it's important to note, too, that political capital can be regenerated -- and, specifically, that when a President expends a great deal of capital on a measure that was difficult to enact and then succeeds, he can build up more capital. Indeed, that appears to be what is happening with Barack Obama, who went to the mat to pass the stimulus package out of the gate, got it passed despite near-unanimous opposition of the Republicans on Capitol Hill, and is being rewarded by the American public as a result. Take a look at the numbers. President Obama now has a 68 percent favorable rating in the NBC-WSJ poll, his highest ever showing in the survey. Nearly half of those surveyed (47 percent) view him very positively. Obama's Democratic Party earns a respectable 49 percent favorable rating. The Republican Party, however, is in the toilet, with its worst ever showing in the history of the NBC-WSJ poll, 26 percent favorable. On the question of blame for the partisanship in Washington, 56 percent place the onus on the Bush administration and another 41 percent place it on Congressional Republicans. Yet just 24 percent blame Congressional Democrats, and a mere 11 percent blame the Obama administration. So at this point, with President Obama seemingly benefiting from his ambitious actions and the Republicans sinking further and further as a result of their knee-jerked opposition to that agenda, there appears to be no reason not to push forward on anything from universal healthcare to energy reform to ending the war in Iraq.

## 2AC DA Space Debris

**Debris high now but plan solves**

**Donahue 10** – USAF Major (Jack, “CATASTROPHE ON THE HORIZON: A SCENARIO-BASED FUTURE EFFECT OF ORBITAL SPACE DEBRIS,” https://www.afresearch.org/skins/rims/q\_mod\_be0e99f3-fc56-4ccb-8dfe-670c0822a153/q\_act\_downloadpaper/q\_obj\_af691818-359f-4999-be24-f88ca154bd94/display.aspx?rs=enginespage)

The warning signs and leading indicators for a catastrophic collision between orbital debris and satellites or manned spaceflight missions are all around us. If significant strides are not made within the next 5 years to clear and remove orbital debris it could result in the loss of satellites and the death of space crew. Furthermore, if something isn‘t done to better protect space assets now it could lead to adversaries exploiting vulnerabilities through various kinetic, nuclear, and cyber attacks causing satellites to become inoperative. This would lead to the generation of new debris which will further compound the orbital debris problem. The effects of this would be felt worldwide with the disruption of communications, internet access, navigation, military surveillance, environmental research, and the banking industry. The best way to avoid these consequences is to continue to harden satellites, improve space monitoring, and develop backups/alternatives to satellite capabilities. As mentioned, the US must also continue to partner with other countries to implement solutions of clearing and reducing the proliferation of orbital debris. The world can change the potential alarming future of a catastrophic collision from orbital debris, but the time to act is now.

**No impact—**

**1) US solves**

**Selding 10** (Peter, Space News Writer, “NASA May Move Orbital Debris Mitigation Off Back Burner,” July 23, http://www.spacenews.com/civil/100723-nasa-orbital-debris-mitigation.html, EMM)

BREMEN, Germany — NASA’s Orbital Debris Program Office expects to begin active work on how to remove debris in orbit on the strength of the new U.S. National Space Policy, according to the office’s chief scientist. Nicholas L. Johnson said the office, which assembles data from the U.S. Air Force-run Space Surveillance Network, has been working on these issues for years, but only on an informal basis, with few resources and no formal mandate. That changed on June 28, when President Barack Obama issued an updated space policy that specifically orders NASA and the U.S. Defense Department to “pursue research and development of technologies and techniques … to mitigate and remove on-orbit debris.” Attending the 38th Congress of the Committee on Space Research (Cospar) here July 18-25, Johnson said it is too early to tell exactly how the new policy will be transformed into programs and budgets. But the specificity of the wording, he said, gives reason to conclude that NASA will be able to increase its efforts. In addition to asking NASA and the Defense Department to research debris mitigation — making satellites and rockets less likely to break up in orbit, and removing satellites from the orbital highways upon retirement — the policy’s inclusion of orbital debris removal may take the NASA office in a new direction.

## 2AC DA Space Weaponization

**Plan funding offsets with offensive weaponization**

**Redifer 11** - LtCol, USMC, Master of Science in Applied Physics and Master of Science in Space Systems Operations, Naval Postgraduate School (Stephen, “TAKING THE INITIATIVE – PROTECTING US INTERESTS IN SPACE,” https://www.afresearch.org/skins/RIMS/display.aspx?moduleid=be0e99f3-fc56-4ccb-8dfe-670c0822a153&mode=user&action=researchproject&objectid=be97b3ea-7800-44ee-b6ff-76dcdb7c2960)

Second, the United States should make developing and fielding a terrestrial and space-based surveillance architecture a national priority. Making such an architecture a reality would support any of the possible strategies proposed in the preceding section of this paper, as space surveillance will support space being protected as a sanctuary, will be required for verification of any space treaties, and would be used to provide intelligence and targeting information should the United States ultimately elect to pursue a policy of space dominance. Making a comprehensive surveillance architecture a national priority would also focus US spending precedence on only one aspect of space control (possibly postponing and/or halting development of space-based weapons as a cost offset), thereby ensuring unity of effort toward a common goal.

**Non-unique—The US X-37B test**

**The China Post 10** [The China Post, “Weapons of the Future the Sky should be the Limit” December 7, http://www.chinapost.com.tw/editorial/world-issues/2010/12/07/282551/Weapons-of.htm]

Dec. 3, 2010 may go down in history as one of the most undervalued milestones in modern history, much like May 26, 1908, when British businessman William D'Arcy found oil in Persia (now Iran). On Dec. 3, the U.S. Air Force's unmanned spacecraft X-37B landed at Vandenberg Air Force Base in California after orbiting the Earth for more than 220 days. The military is secretive on the X-37B, named Orbital Test Vehicle 1,that was first designed by National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) in the late 1990s as a cheaper and safer alternative to the manned space shuttle and later taken over by the military. The cost and other details of the mission were classified. The seven-month maiden flight was a test for the technologies necessary for long duration reusable space vehicles with autonomous re-entry and landing capabilities, according to the website Space.com. Although the Vandenberg Air Force Base's website described the X-37B program as one that performs risk reduction, experimentation and concept of operations development for reusable space vehicle technologies, the spacecraft's capability to carry a payload, to orbit the earth unmanned and to perform autonomous reentry makes it a [has the] potential [to be a] space weapon. In this light, the X-37B might well herald the age of space weaponization and the space arms race that will surely follow. The idea of the military use of space is not new but it was mostly a farfetched idea and is mostly modeled for defensive or area-denial purposes. The Strategic Defense Initiative (also known as the Star Wars program) created by U.S. President Ronald Reagan mostly remains in the realm of theory. Media reports showed China tested its space-denial capability with the launch of its anti-satellite system, which destroyed a Chinese Feng Yun 1C polar orbit satellite in 2007. Such a system is intended to provide area denial by knocking down military or intelligence satellites but not for first strikes. With the X-37B coming into orbit, the world might witness the first spacecraft with potential first-strike capability.