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**FTAs will pass—continued push by Obama is key**

**Palmer, 9/2** (Doug, 9/2/2011, Reuters News,” ANALYSIS-Obama's trade legacy in a crucible this fall,” Factiva, JMP)

WASHINGTON, Sept 2 (Reuters) - After a slow start that has frustrated U.S. business groups, the next four months could be important to President Barack Obama's legacy on trade.

Obama has a goal of doubling U.S. exports by 2014 but he has not moved as aggressively as his Republican predecessor, George W. Bush, to open markets abroad.

This month business groups expect Obama at long last to submit three Bush-era free trade pacts with South Korea, Colombia and Panama to Congress for approval.

"We're quite confident" that Congress has the votes needed to approve the pact, said Frank Vargo, vice president for international economic affairs at the National Association of Manufacturers.

Successful passage by Congress would burnish Obama's free trade credentials and boost talks on a regional free trade agreement that the White House hopes will establish "21st Century" trade rules in the fast-growing Asia-Pacific region.

The plan is for Obama and leaders of the eight other "Trans-Pacific Partnership" countries to shake hands on the broad outlines of a deal in November when the United States hosts the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation summit.

The proposed pact would build existing U.S. free trade deals with Australia, Chile, Singapore and Peru into a regional free trade pact that includes Malaysia, Vietnam, New Zealand and Brunei Darussalam.

Japan, Canada, South Korea, the Philippines and Thailand have also expressed interest in eventually joining the pact.

LABOR OPPOSITION

Still, Congress' approval of the South Korea, Colombia and Panama deals is not assured.

Richard Trumka, president of the the AFL-CIO labor federation which opposes the deals, boasted on Wednesday that opponents may have the votes to stop the pacts, which they see as a threat to U.S. jobs. "I think we have a real shot at it," Trumka said.

In addition to the challenge from organized labor, Obama must persuade Republicans focusing on spending cuts to renew a retraining program for displaced workers known as Trade Adjustment Assistance. This is critical to gaining enough Democratic votes in the Senate to approve the trade pacts.

Republican opposition to TAA "makes our job, quite frankly, a little bit easier, because no one is going to support those trade agreements without TAA," said Trumka.

Democrats like House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi and Senator Charles Schumer also have signaled plans to push for a vote on legislation to pressure China to revalue its currency in conjunction with the free trade pacts.

That would inflame relations with Beijing and possibly trigger tit-for-tat trade retaliation if Obama does not expend political capital to block it.

The early start of the 2012 U.S. election campaigns, however, may dampen Obama's appetite to lead aggressively on trade.

But "if the administration spends the effort and actually finishes the job (the trade deals) with Congress, that will send a very positive signal," said Jeffrey Schott, a senior fellow at the Peterson Institute for International Economics.

**SKFTA key to US trade leadership**

**Bacchus 10** – chairman, Global Trade and Investment Practice Group, Greenberg Traurig (James, 12/30/10, “Reviving U.S. Power Abroad From Within,” http://www.cfr.org/publication/23701/reviving\_us\_power\_abroad\_from\_within.html)

But the president may be beginning to realize -- if he did not before -- that trade is not only about exports; it is about how exports and imports can combine in an international division of labor to create more overall prosperity for the entire world. Creating such prosperity requires much more than merely export incentives and export promotion; it requires increased market access everywhere.

This is why, in the past, Democratic and Republican presidents alike have made securing more market access by lowering tariff and non-tariff barriers to international trade the bipartisan cornerstone of U.S. trade policy. And this is why Obama will be driven to do the same in 2011.

He got a head start toward yearend when the United States and South Korea resolved their longstanding differences over auto trade. This could lead to congressional approval early in the new year of the long-delayed free trade agreement between the two countries. Approval of the trade agreement with South Korea could also pave the way toward approval of long-pending free trade agreements with Colombia and Panama.

This in turn could open the political door, at long last, to renewed American leadership in breaking the deadlock in the decade-long Doha Development Round of global trade negotiations among the more than 150 member countries of the World Trade Organization. By far the best way of creating more market access worldwide for U.S. goods and services -- and more American jobs through more trade -- is by lowering trade barriers worldwide among all WTO members.

Although it is not at all clear where "Tea Party" Republicans stand on trade, Republican control of the U.S. House of Representatives in the new Congress should ease the way for all of this politically and could give the president yet another opportunity for achieving bipartisan success in the new year.

**Trade is good**

**Dreier 11** – Rep. Chairman of the House Rules Committee (Rep. David Dreier, 1/5/11, Politico, “Bipartisanship can revive economy,” http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0111/47044.html, JMP)

There are no higher priorities for our country right now than job creation and economic growth.

As the new Congress begins, every decision we make must be tied directly to those goals. If we are going to get our economy back on track, we need to take several key steps. These include making the current tax rates permanent, repealing the job-killing health care law and dramatically reducing federal spending.

Some of these efforts will divide Congress politically. But they are all a part of what House Republicans pledged we would do — and of what the American people expect us to do.

At the same time, there are areas in which both parties can work together. A strong trade agenda presents a unique opportunity to promote economic growth, global partnerships and bipartisan cooperation.

Unfortunately, the trade agenda has been allowed to languish for the past four years and, in some cases, has been thwarted. In the meantime, our economy and our global prestige have suffered. There’s never been a more important time to re-engage on trade.

Trade is often blamed for every manner of society’s ills. Globally connected commerce has been accused of having a hand in everything from terrorism to pandemics. In December, Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez blamed it for the tragic mudslides that claimed dozens of lives in his nation and in Colombia.

Setting aside the disservice that such a claim does for addressing the true root causes of the great challenges we face, the reality of the role of trade is precisely the opposite of what this viewpoint presents. International trade plays an important part in improving a nation’s circumstances — far beyond the immediate scope of exports and imports.

Given the current climate, the direct economic impact is the most urgent. Opening up new markets for U.S. producers, farmers, service providers and investors is essential for spurring growth and creating new job opportunities for both union and nonunion workers here at home. The three markets with which we have pending free-trade agreements — Colombia, Panama and South Korea — represent 96 million consumers and $1.8 trillion in economic activity. The opportunity for U.S. job creators is enormous, so the delay in the agreements’ consideration is unjustifiable.

The benefits of trade, however, extend considerably beyond job creation and economic growth. Economic engagement across borders builds the strong global partnerships that are necessary to address the challenges of the 21st century. Whether the issue is tariffs or nuclear proliferation, the trust and spirit of collaboration forged through economic ties help the United States advance its interests and spread its values around the globe.

Enhancing prosperity through international trade also creates the resources necessary for essential efforts like improving environmental quality, protecting human rights and building democratic institutions. Raising living standards, in fact, helps alleviate many of society’s ills, including terrorism, pandemics and, yes, even the ability to respond to natural disasters in South America.

Reviving the trade agenda also helps with another challenge: partisan politics. Trade once enjoyed a strong bipartisan consensus. The last time there was a new Republican majority, we were enthusiastic about working with then-President Bill Clinton on the trade agenda. That collaboration produced some of the biggest bipartisan achievements of the 1990s.

We are eager, again, to join with a Democratic president in revitalizing America’s global leadership role in trade liberalization.

President Barack Obama has demonstrated a commitment to expanding trade by finalizing negotiations on a side agreement with South Korea, as well as through his National Export Initiative. Republicans stand ready as committed partners in these efforts to create new opportunities for Americans through greater international trade.

By working together to pass our three pending free-trade agreements and re-engaging in the bilateral, regional and multilateral negotiations that have languished, we can revive our stagnant job market and sluggish economy. We can re-energize our relationships with key international partners.

What’s more, we can demonstrate that Republicans and Democrats can come together for the sake of our economy and our country. Though many of the issues the 112th Congress faces will inevitably lead to a clash of ideas, both parties can and should work together with a renewed commitment to economic growth and global leadership through trade.

**Trade solves war**

**Griswold, 5** – director of the Center for Trade Policy Studies at the Cato Institute (Daniel, “Peace on earth? Try free trade among men,” 12-29-2005, http://www.freetrade.org/node/282) // JMP

Buried beneath the daily stories about car bombs and insurgents is an underappreciated but comforting fact during this Christmas season: The world has somehow become a more peaceful place.

As one little-noticed headline on an Associated Press story recently reported, "War declining worldwide, studies say." According to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, the number of armed conflicts around the world has been in decline for the past half century. In just the past 15 years, ongoing conflicts have dropped from 33 to 18, with all of them now civil conflicts within countries. As 2005 draws to an end, no two nations in the world are at war with each other. The death toll from war has also been falling. According to the AP story, "The number killed in battle has fallen to its lowest point in the post-World War II period, dipping below 20,000 a year by one measure. Peacemaking missions, meanwhile, are growing in number." Those estimates are down sharply from annual tolls ranging from 40,000 to 100,000 in the 1990s, and from a peak of 700,000 in 1951 during the Korean War. Many causes lie behind the good news -- the end of the Cold War and the spread of democracy, among them -- but expanding trade and globalization appear to be playing a major role. Far from stoking a "World on Fire," as one misguided American author has argued, growing commercial ties between nations have had a dampening effect on armed conflict and war, for three main reasons. First, trade and globalization have reinforced the trend toward democracy, and democracies don't pick fights with each other. Freedom to trade nurtures democracy by expanding the middle class in globalizing countries and equipping people with tools of communication such as cell phones, satellite TV, and the Internet. With trade comes more travel, more contact with people in other countries, and more exposure to new ideas. Thanks in part to globalization, almost two thirds of the world's countries today are democracies -- a record high. Second, as national economies become more integrated with each other, those nations have more to lose should war break out. War in a globalized world not only means human casualties and bigger government, but also ruptured trade and investment ties that impose lasting damage on the economy. In short, globalization has dramatically raised the economic cost of war. Third, globalization allows nations to acquire wealth through production and trade rather than conquest of territory and resources. Increasingly, wealth is measured in terms of intellectual property, financial assets, and human capital. Those are assets that cannot be seized by armies. If people need resources outside their national borders, say oil or timber or farm products, they can acquire them peacefully by trading away what they can produce best at home. Of course, free trade and globalization do not guarantee peace. Hot-blooded nationalism and ideological fervor can overwhelm cold economic calculations. But deep trade and investment ties among nations make war less attractive. Trade wars in the 1930s deepened the economic depression, exacerbated global tensions, and helped to usher in a world war. Out of the ashes of that experience, the United States urged Germany, France and other Western European nations to form a common market that has become the European Union. In large part because of their intertwined economies, a general war in Europe is now unthinkable. In East Asia, the extensive and growing economic ties among Mainland China, Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan is helping to keep the peace. China's communist rulers may yet decide to go to war over its "renegade province," but the economic cost to their economy would be staggering and could provoke a backlash among its citizens. In contrast, poor and isolated North Korea is all the more dangerous because it has nothing to lose economically should it provoke a war. In Central America, countries that were racked by guerrilla wars and death squads two decades ago have turned not only to democracy but to expanding trade, culminating in the Central American Free Trade Agreement with the United States. As the Stockholm institute reports in its 2005 Yearbook, "Since the 1980s, the introduction of a more open economic model in most states of the Latin American and Caribbean region has been accompanied by the growth of new regional structures, the dying out of interstate conflicts and a reduction in intra-state conflicts." Much of the political violence that remains in the world today is concentrated in the Middle East and Sub-Saharan Africa -- the two regions of the world that are the least integrated into the global economy. Efforts to bring peace to those regions must include lowering their high barriers to trade, foreign investment, and domestic entrepreneurship. Advocates of free trade and globalization have long argued that trade expansion means more efficiency, higher incomes, and reduced poverty. The welcome decline of armed conflicts in the past few decades indicates that free trade also comes with its own peace dividend.

## Link – Vision for Space Exploration

**Expanding VSE is perceived as controversial new spending**

**Handberg, 11** - Professor and Chair of the Department of Political Science at the University of Central Florida (Rodger, “Small ball or home runs: the changing ethos of US human spaceflight policy,” The Space Review, 1/17, http://www.thespacereview.com/article/1759/1)

The US space program remained focused, not on duplicating Apollo, but on achieving another difficult goal such as going to Mars, a logical extension truly of the Apollo effort. Twice, the presidents Bush provided the presidential rationale, if not support, for achieving great things. The Space Exploration Initiative (SEI) in 1989 and the Vision for Space Exploration (VSE) in 2004 were announced with great fanfare but neither survived the realities of congressional and presidential budgeting. The VSE appeared on paper more realistic about funding, but its choices were draconian: the ISS and space shuttle were both to be sacrificed on the altar of the new program. The earlier SEI died quickly, so hard choices were not required, while the VSE in the form of the Constellation Program lingers on although its effective demise appears certain. The Obama Administration prefers another approach while the new Congress is likely more hostile to big ticket discretionary spending. If the Tea Party faction in the Republican House caucus means what it says, the future for Constellation or any other similar program is a dim one.

The reality is that the Apollo program, the SEI, and the VSE are examples in space terms of the home run approach. Such efforts confront the cruel but obvious reality that the human spaceflight program is considered by the public and most of Congress to be a “nice to have,” but not a necessity when compared to other programs or national priorities. Congressional support is narrow and constituency-driven (i.e. protect local jobs), which means most in Congress only support the space program in the abstract. Big ticket items or programs are not a priority for most, given other priorities. What happens is what can be loosely termed normal politics: a situation where human spaceflight remains a low priority on the national agenda. Funding for bold new initiatives is going to be hard to come by even when the economy recovers and deficits are under control. The home run approach has run its course at least for a time; now the small ball approach becomes your mantra.

## Link – Space Based Solar Power

**Zero Congressional support for SPS --- its too expensive and tied to unpopular military space programs**

**Day 8** (Dwayne A., Program Officer – Space Studies Board of the National Research Council, “Knights in Shining Armor”, The Space Review, 6-9, http://www.thespacereview.com/article/1147/1)

If all this is true, why is the space activist community so excited about the NSSO study? That is not hard to understand. They all know that the economic case for space solar power is abysmal. The best estimates are that SSP will cost at least three times the cost per kilowatt hour of even relatively expensive nuclear power. But the military wants to dramatically lower the cost of delivering fuel to distant locations, which could possibly change the cost-benefit ratio. The military savior also theoretically solves some other problems for SSP advocates. One is the need for deep pockets to foot the immense development costs. The other is an institutional avatar—one of the persistent policy challenges for SSP has been the fact that responsibility for it supposedly “falls through the cracks” because neither NASA nor the Department of Energy wants responsibility. If the military takes on the SSP challenge, the mission will finally have a home.

But there’s also another factor at work: naïveté. Space activists tend to have little understanding of military space, coupled with an idealistic impression of its management compared to NASA, whom many space activists have come to despise. For instance, they fail to realize that the military space program is currently in no better shape, and in many cases worse shape, than NASA. The majority of large military space acquisition programs have experienced major problems, in many cases cost growth in excess of 100%. Although NASA has a bad public record for cost overruns, the DoD’s less-public record is far worse, and military space has a bad reputation in Congress, which would never allow such a big, expensive new program to be started.

Again, this is not to insult the fine work conducted by those who produced the NSSO space solar power study. They accomplished an impressive amount of work without any actual resources. But it is nonsensical for members of the space activist community to claim that “the military supports space solar power” based solely on a study that had no money, produced by an organization that has no clout.