# 2nc overview—econ

**Econ collapse outweighs and turns case, that’s Friedberg and Schoenfeld—**

**A) Magnitude—recession triggers 1930’s regional trading blocs, empirically escalates and is uniquely likely to cause extinction**

**Mootry 2008,** [Primus, B.A. Northern Illinois University “Americans likely to face more difficult times” - The Herald Bulletin, 10/8/2008 http://www.theheraldbulletin.com/columns/local\_story\_282184703.html?keyword=secondarystory]

These are difficult times. The direct and indirect costs associated with the war on Iraq have nearly wrecked our economy. The recent $700 billion bailout, bank failures, and the failure of many small and large businesses across the nation will take years — perhaps decades — to surmount. Along with these rampant business failures, we have seen unemployment rates skyrocket, record numbers of home foreclosures, an explosion of uninsured Americans, and other economic woes that together have politicians now openly willing to mention the "D" word: Depression. These are difficult days. We have seen our international reputation sink to all time lows. We have seen great natural disasters such as hurricanes Ike and Katrina leaving hundreds of thousands of citizens stripped of all they own or permanently dislocated. In all my years, I have never seen a time such as this. To make matters worse, we are witnessing a resurgence of animosities between the United States and Russia, as well as the rapid growth of India and China. As to the growth of these two huge countries, the problem for us is that they are demanding more and more oil — millions of barrels more each week — and there is not much we can say or do about it. In the meantime, if America does not get the oil it needs, our entire economy will grind to a halt. In short, the challenges we face are complex and enormous. Incidentally, one of the factors that makes this time unlike any other in history is the potential for worldwide nuclear conflict. **There has never been a time in** the long **history** of ~~man~~ **when**, through his own technologies — and his arrogance — ~~he~~ can destroy the planet. Given the tensions around the world, **a mere spark could lead to global conflagration.**[This evidence has been gender paraphrased].

**B) Timeframe and Probability—econ at tipping point now, perception of irresponsibility will send us into another recession**

Victoria Craig **9/24** (writer for Fox Business) September 24**,** 2012 “Fiscal Pitfalls Hinge on Gridlocked Congress” http://www.foxbusiness.com/government/2012/09/20/fiscal-pitfalls-hinge-on-gridlocked-congress/

A fix for the national economy is not as simple as just passing a budget, or reducing government spending. And the risk is potential to seriously destabilize an economy that is already at a tipping point. If more than one credit ratings service decides to downgrade its outlook on the U.S., it not only spells trouble for lawmakers, but financial markets as well. In its report, Moody’s warns what follows multiple downgrades would be a very different scene than when S&P took action. That’s because money-markets funds and other investment tools hold only the highest quality bonds. But the report adds, “Even without any action by the ratings agencies, a failure to make progress toward fiscal sustainability would signal that policymakers will not act until the budget is out of control and the nation is in a serious financial crisis.” Holtz Eakin takes that one step further, describing what the bigger picture would look like in the absence of some kind of Congressional action. “It would be an unambiguously bad event in the financial markets,” Holtz-Eakin said. “We’ve seen turbulence in the past and Main Street’s unimmune. We’d have bad equity market performance, bond yields would go up, credit channels would be depressed. It would send us into another recession.” Still, no matter how you slice it, it seems the future of the economy all comes down to politics.

**D) Economic downturn collapses R&D in green energy, causes the aff to get rolled back**

**RICHARD 08** LLL & LLB . 2/6/08 (“Counter-Point: 4 Reasons Why Recession is BAD for the Environment” http://www.treehugger.com/files/2008/02/4\_reasons\_recession\_bad\_environment.php)

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

# sequestration mod

#### Sequestration and debt ceiling will be part of the same comprehensive deal

NJ News (New Jersey News publication) January 4, 2013 “Obama's debt ceiling gambit” http://www.nj.com/us-politics/index.ssf/2013/01/obamas\_debt\_ceiling\_gambit.html

The challenge is how Obama separates the sequester from the debt limit in his negotiations with Congress. He could attempt to limit the scope of the talks to the size of the sequester, which is roughly $1 trillion. But Obama has already said he wants as comprehensive of a deal as possible, so the total cost of a successful agreement could still make it appear, in the end, that he negotiated over the debt limit -- perpetuating the cycle he hopes to break.

**Sequestration guarantees collapse of the economy and hegemony – causes Middle East war**

Kay Bailey Hutchison (U.S. Senator from Texas) 9/21/2012 “A Looming Threat to National Security,” States News Service, Lexis

Despite warnings of the dire consequences, America is teetering at the edge of a fiscal cliff, with January 1st, 2013 as the tipping point. On that date, unless Congress and the White House can reach agreement on how to cut the federal deficit, all taxpayers will be hit with higher taxes and deep cuts - called "sequestration" - will occur in almost all government spending, disrupting our already weak economy and putting our national security at risk. According to the House Armed Services Committee, if sequestration goes into effect, it would put us on course for more than $1 trillion in defense cuts over the next 10 years. What would that mean? A huge hit to our military personnel and their families; devastating cuts in funding for critical military equipment and supplies for our soldiers; and a potentially catastrophic blow to our national defense and security capabilities in a time of increasing violence and danger. All Americans feel a debt of gratitude to our men and women who serve in uniform. But Texas in particular has a culture that not only reveres the commitment and sacrifice they make to protect our freedom, we send a disproportionate number of our sons and daughters to serve. The burden is not borne solely by those who continue to answer the call of duty, but by their families as well, as they endure separation and the anxiety of a loved one going off to war. These Americans have made tremendous sacrifices. They deserve better than to face threats to their financial security and increased risks to their loved ones in uniform, purely for political gamesmanship. Sequestration would also place an additional burden on our economy. In the industries that support national defense, as many as 1 million skilled workers could be laid off. With 43 straight months of unemployment above 8 percent, it is beyond comprehension to add a virtual army to the 23 million Americans who are already out of work or under-employed. Government and private economic forecasters warn that sequestration will push the country back into recession next year. The recent murder of our Ambassador to Libya and members of his staff, attacks on US embassies and consulates and continued riots across the Middle East and North Africa are stark reminders that great portions of the world remain volatile and hostile to the US. We have the mantle of responsibility that being the world's lone super-power brings. In the absence of U.S. military leadership, upheaval in the Middle East would be worse. As any student of history can attest, instability does not confine itself to national borders. Strife that starts in one country can spread like wildfire across a region. Sequestration's cuts would reduce an additional 100,000 airmen, Marines, sailors and soldiers. That would leave us with the smallest ground force since 1940, the smallest naval fleet since 1915 and the smallest tactical fighter force in the Air Force's history. With the destabilization in the Middle East and other areas tenuous, we would be left with a crippled military, a diminished stature internationally and a loss of technological research, development and advantage - just as actors across the globe are increasing their capabilities. Sequestration can still be avoided. But that will require leadership from the President that has thus far been missing. Congress and the White House must reach a long-term agreement to reduce $1 trillion annual budget deficits, without the harsh tax increases that could stall economic growth and punish working families.

**Middle East instability escalates**  
**Primakov, 9** [September, Yevgeny, President of the Chamber of Commerce and Industry of the Russian Federation; Member of the Russian Academy of Sciences; member of the Editorial Board of Russia in Global Affairs. This article is based on the scientific report for which the author was awarded the Lomonosov Gold Medal of the Russian Academy of Sciences in 2008, “The Middle East Problem in the Context of International Relations”]

The Middle East conflict is unparalleled in terms of its potential for spreading globally. During the Cold War, amid which the Arab-Israeli conflict evolved, the two opposing superpowers directly supported the conflicting parties: the Soviet Union supported Arab countries, while the United States supported Israel. On the one hand, the bipolar world order which existed at that time objectively played in favor of the escalation of the Middle East conflict into a global confrontation. On the other hand, the Soviet Union and the United States were not interested in such developments and they managed to keep the situation under control. The behavior of both superpowers in the course of all the wars in the Middle East proves that. In 1956, during the Anglo-French-Israeli military invasion of Egypt (which followed Cairo’s decision to nationalize the Suez Canal Company) the United States – contrary to the widespread belief in various countries, including Russia – not only refrained from supporting its allies but insistently pressed – along with the Soviet Union – for the cessation of the armed action. Washington feared that the tripartite aggression would undermine the positions of the West in the Arab world and would result in a direct clash with the Soviet Union. Fears that hostilities in the Middle East might acquire a global dimension could materialize also during the Six-Day War of 1967. On its eve, Moscow and Washington urged each other to cool down their “clients.” When the war began, both superpowers assured each other that they did not intend to get involved in the crisis militarily and that that they would make efforts at the United Nations to negotiate terms for a ceasefire. On July 5, the Chairman of the Soviet Government, Alexei Kosygin, who was authorized by the Politburo to conduct negotiations on behalf of the Soviet leadership, for the first time ever used a hot line for this purpose. After the USS Liberty was attacked by Israeli forces, which later claimed the attack was a case of mistaken identity, U.S. President Lyndon Johnson immediately notified Kosygin that the movement of the U.S. Navy in the Mediterranean Sea was only intended to help the crew of the attacked ship and to investigate the incident. The situation repeated itself during the hostilities of October 1973. Russian publications of those years argued that it was the Soviet Union that prevented U.S. military involvement in those events. In contrast, many U.S. authors claimed that a U.S. reaction thwarted Soviet plans to send troops to the Middle East. Neither statement is true. The atmosphere was really quite tense. Sentiments both in Washington and Moscow were in favor of interference, yet both capitals were far from taking real action. When U.S. troops were put on high alert, Henry Kissinger assured Soviet Ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin that this was done largely for domestic considerations and should not be seen by Moscow as a hostile act. In a private conversation with Dobrynin, President Richard Nixon said the same, adding that he might have overreacted but that this had been done amidst a hostile campaign against him over Watergate. Meanwhile, Kosygin and Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko at a Politburo meeting in Moscow strongly rejected a proposal by Defense Minister Marshal Andrei Grechko to “demonstrate” Soviet military presence in Egypt in response to Israel’s refusal to comply with a UN Security Council resolution. Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev took the side of Kosygin and Gromyko, saying that he was against any Soviet involvement in the conflict.  The above suggests an unequivocal conclusion that control by the superpowers in the bipolar world did not allow the Middle East conflict to escalate into a global confrontation. After the end of the Cold War, some scholars and political observers concluded that a real threat of the Arab-Israeli conflict going beyond regional frameworks ceased to exist. However, in the 21st century this conclusion no longer conforms to the reality. The U.S. military operation in Iraq has changed the balance of forces in the Middle East. The disappearance of the Iraqi counterbalance has brought Iran to the fore as a regional power claiming a direct role in various Middle East processes. I do not belong to those who believe that the Iranian leadership has already made a political decision to create nuclear weapons of its own. Yet Tehran seems to have set itself the goal of achieving a technological level that would let it make such a decision (the “Japanese model”) under unfavorable circumstances. Israel already possesses nuclear weapons and delivery vehicles. In such circumstances, the absence of a Middle East settlement opens a dangerous prospect of a nuclear collision in the region, which would have catastrophic consequences for the whole world. The transition to a multipolar world has objectively strengthened the role of states and organizations that are directly involved in regional conflicts, which increases the latter’s danger and reduces the possibility of controlling them. This refers, above all, to the Middle East conflict. The coming of Barack Obama to the presidency has allayed fears that the United States could deliver a preventive strike against Iran (under George W. Bush, it was one of the most discussed topics in the United States). However, fears have increased that such a strike can be launched Yevgeny Primakov 1 3 2 RUSSIA IN GLOBAL AFFAIRS VOL. 7 • No. 3 • JULY – SEPTEMBER• 2009 by Israel, which would have unpredictable consequences for the region and beyond. It seems that President Obama’s position does not completely rule out such a possibility.

# 2nc econ turns relations

**Growth solves their impact—interdependence**

**Griswold 2007** - director of the Center for Trade Policy Studies (4/20, Daniel, “Trade, Democracy and Peace”, http://www.freetrade.org/node/681)

A second and even more potent way that trade has promoted peace is by promoting more economic integration. As national economies become more intertwined 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.

**Economic growth is the basis of strong relations and diplomacy.**

**Summers 1999**-10-28 (Lawrence H., fmr Treasury Secretary, current Director of the White House's National Economic Council, Charles W. Eliot University Professor at Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government, 27th President of Harvard University, "Economic Engagement: The Risks of Malign Neglect" Brookings, http://www.brookings.edu/events/1999/1028global-economics.aspx)

Let me address the economic part of this argument. The first crucial part of what we have done for 50 years and need to continue to do is to be a vigorous proponent of support for open-markets policies. The crucial link between closer economic integration and our national security is this: We are much less likely as a nation to be drawn into conflict if nations of the world are strong, confident and forging closer connections than if they are financially unstable and disconnected. Trade promotes prosperity. And by promoting prosperity, it promotes peace. You know, if you look at the history of the world's conflicts, a surprisingly high fraction have their roots in economic issues, whether those economic issues are poor economic performance that is a breeding ground for hostile nationalism or whether those conflicts have their roots in rising economic power that feels constrained by closed markets abroad. Think about the roots of World War I in German economic expansion and the barriers it encountered and the roots of the Second World War in the Pacific. There may never have been so radical a change in the balance of global economic power as there has been in the emerging markets of the world, particularly in Asia, in the last 25 years. That it has taken place without major conflict is in no small part a tribute to increased integration of the world's economies and support for cooperative institutions to cement that integration. By supporting liberalization in Asia, we have invested in our future security and in the spread of our core values. Examples such as Korea -- not just in Asia -- as Korea, Taiwan and Argentina illustrate that economic development and openness bring democratization in their wake. And there is no better way to spur this process than by integrating these economies into the global marketplace.

# 2nc global economy internal

**Default hurts the global economy – US econ key**

**Goldfarb 1-1 –** Zachary, staff writer covering the White House, focusing on President Obama’s economic, financial and fiscal policy, graduated from the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton (‘Fiscal cliff’ deal does little to tame threats from debt ceiling, high unemployment rates, Washington Post, http://www.washingtonpost.com/business/fiscal-cliff/fiscal-cliff-deal-does-little-to-tame-threats-from-debt-ceiling-high-unemployment-rates/2013/01/01/8e4c14aa-5393-11e2-bf3e-76c0a789346f\_story.html)

The debt ceiling danger

The deal fell somewhere in between. But by gaining the support of both sides, it did not achieve what many economists believe is necessary for the short- and long-term success of the U.S. economy.

Leaving the fate of the debt ceiling up in the air will cause anxiety among businesses and individuals, potentially crimping hiring, investing and consumer spending.

In many ways, the threat of default in two months is a more serious risk than the Jan. 1 fiscal cliff deadline. If Congress does not increase the debt ceiling, the government will quickly run out of ways to pay the nation’s bills and make interest payments on the nation’s outstanding debt. Any failure by the government to meet its financial obligations could be seen as a default, shaking world financial markets, given the special role that U.S. government bonds play in the global economy.

# 2nc credit downgrade internal link

**Debt ceiling failure causes a credit downgrade – official statements from S&P, Moody & Fitch**

**Thompson 1-2** Mark, writer for CNN Money (U.S. credit ratings test is yet to come, CNN Money, http://www.money.cnn.com/2013/01/02/news/economy/fiscal-cliff-ratings/

Credit rating agencies are likely to hold off passing judgment on the U.S. fiscal cliff deal until they have a clearer picture about the fate of the debt ceiling and longer term plans to reduce borrowing.

The New Year agreement between the White House and Congress raised taxes on the richest Americans but postponed much of the toughest political wrangling on automatic spending cuts for another two months.

Also, the bill does not address the $16.4 trillion debt ceiling, which was hit on Monday. Instead, the Treasury Department will deploy "extraordinary measures" to allow additional borrowing of about $200 billion, in effect buying the United States about two months to raise the official limit.

The last time Congress negotiated the debt ceiling it prompted Standard & Poor's to strip the country of its coveted AAA credit rating. The agency criticized ineffective decision-making in Washington and the lack of a plan to stabilize the country's debt in the medium term.

S&P said in late December it still held that view, and repeated a warning that the United States could face another downgrade by 2014, or sooner, if Congress doesn't come up with a plan to reduce the national debt.

Related: Fiscal cliff deal boosts world markets

Fitch and Moody's both kept their top AAA ratings in place after the S&P downgrade but have warned of the risk of downgrades.

Moody's said in September a downgrade was likely if lawmakers were unable to agree on a long-term debt reduction plan.

"Failure to reach even a temporary arrangement to prevent the full range of tax increases and spending cuts implied by the fiscal cliff and a repeat of the August 2011 debt ceiling episode would indicate that the general election had not resolved the political gridlock in Washington and would probably result in a sovereign rating downgrade," Fitch said last month.

With a temporary agreement now in place, and the debt ceiling debate deferred, an imminent downgrade seems unlikely. But the threat hasn't gone away.

"Failure to reach agreement on raising the debt ceiling in a timely manner -- weeks in advance rather than just a single day before the funding capacity of the federal government is exhausted as happened in August 2011 -- would raise questions about US governance on fiscal matters and undermine confidence in the United States as a reliable borrower and prompt a formal review of the U.S. rating," Fitch said in its global sovereign outlook.

**Independently causes economic collapse**

**Washington Times, 6/14** (Patrice Hill, The Washington Times, 14 June 2012, “Debt fight poses new risk to U.S. credit rating,” http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2012/jun/14/debt-fight-poses-new-risk-to-us-credit-rating/?page=all)//CC

Any downgrade by Moody’s could be more devastating than a second downgrade by S&P, analysts say, because it would clearly move the U.S. out of the exclusive club of AAA-rated nations and throw into question the privileged status of U.S. Treasury securities as a safe haven for global investors. Threat to Treasury Any significant flight from the Treasury market triggered by a downgrade would raise Treasury bond rates and have devastating consequences. The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that a 1-percentage-point increase in rates would increase Treasury’s debt payments by $1 trillion in the next decade, wiping out the benefit of all the budget cuts enacted by Congress last year. Treasury’s safe-haven status is the critical factor that enabled the U.S. to avoid a debilitating increase in interest rates after the S&P downgrade last year, said Ivan Rudolph-Shabinsky, an analyst at AllianceBernstein. In fact, Treasury rates declined after the S&P downgrade as the U.S. benefited from the turmoil created by the European debt crisis. The flight to safety by investors drawing out of Europe has pushed Treasury rates to record lows, with the yield on Treasury’s 10-year bond falling for the first time to 1.44 percent. Those extraordinarily low interest rates not only have enabled the U.S. government to easily finance its growing debt load, but have been a boon to the beleaguered U.S. housing market and indebted U.S. consumers. Thirty-year mortgage rates, which are linked to the 10-year bond rate, have plunged to record lows, below 4 percent, triggering a big wave of refinancings and boosting prospects for a budding housing recovery. Mr. Rudolph-Shabinsky said America’s safe-haven status doesn’t appear to be in much danger, but how markets view the political impasse will be critical. “The current assumption is that the threat of a potential crisis will spur the U.S. government to act” to reduce the debt at the end of the year, he said. But what if global investors conclude, like S&P, that “the U.S. is simply incapable of addressing its underlying structural issues with Social Security, Medicare and other entitlement programs?” In that case, Treasury yields will rise and “higher financing costs will cause a dramatic deterioration” in U.S. finances, he said, possibly putting the U.S. in the same boat with Greece, Spain and other debt-strapped European countries. “The U.S. might fall into the category of sovereign downgrades that accelerate an already-worsening fiscal situation,” he said.

.

# 2nc US economy internal

**Failure to raise the debt ceiling is five times worse for the economy than going over the fiscal cliff—investors are watching, so a fight is enough to trigger the impact**

**NBC News 12-30 –** (Forget the 'fiscal cliff': Debt ceiling is much scarier, From Reuters, http://www.nbcnews.com/business/forget-fiscal-cliff-debt-ceiling-much-scarier-1C7753061)

Investors fearing a stock market plunge if the U.S. tumbles off the "fiscal cliff" next week may want to relax.

But they should be scared if a few weeks later Washington fails to reach a deal to raise the nation's debt ceiling as that threatens a default, another credit downgrade and a financial markets panic.

Market strategists say that falling off the cliff for any lengthy period -- which would lead to automatic tax hikes and stiff cuts in government spending -- would badly dent both consumer and business confidence, but it would take some time for the U.S. economy to slide into recession. In the meantime, there would be plenty of chances for lawmakers to make amends by reversing some of the effects.

That has been reflected in a U.S. stock market that has still not shown signs of melting down. Instead, it has drifted lower and gotten more volatile.

In some ways, that has let Washington off the hook. In the past, a plunge in stock prices forced the hand of Congress, such as in the middle of the financial crisis in 2008.

"If this thing continues for a bit longer and the result is you get a U.S. debt downgrade ... the risk is not that you lose two and half percent, the risk is that you lose ten and a half," said Jonathan Golub, chief U.S. equity strategist at UBS Equity Research in New York.

U.S. Treasury Secretary Tim Geithner said earlier this week that the United States will technically reach its debt limit at the end of the year.

'Tremendous fight'

The White House has said it will not negotiate the debt ceiling as in 2011, when the fight over what was once a procedural matter preceded the first-ever downgrade of the U.S. credit rating, but it may be forced into such a battle again. A repeat of that war is most worrisome for markets.

Markets posted several days of sharp losses in the period surrounding the debt ceiling fight in 2011. Even after a bill to increase the ceiling passed, stocks plunged in what was seen as a vote of no confidence in Washington's ability to function, given how close lawmakers came to a default.

Credit ratings agency Standard & Poor's lowered the U.S. sovereign rating to double-A-plus, citing Washington's legislative problems as one reason for the downgrade. The benchmark S&P 500 dropped 16 percent in a four-week period ending Aug. 21, 2011.

"I think there will be a tremendous fight between Democrats and Republicans about the debt ceiling," said Jon Najarian, a co-founder of online brokerage TradeMonster.com in Chicago.

"I think that is the biggest risk to the downside in January for the market and the U.S. economy."

There are some signs in the options market that investors are starting to eye the January period with more wariness. The CBOE Volatility Index, or the VIX, the market's favored anxiety indicator, has remained at relatively low levels throughout this process, though on Thursday it edged above 20 for the first time since July.

# 2nc ux no overwhelm

**That gives Obama the political freedom to broker a deal – but it can change quickly**

The Irish Times 1/3, 2013 “Once more unto the brink” Lexis

The federal government has already broken through that ceiling but technical extraordinary measures by the treasury will allow the government to continue paying its bills for two months. If Republicans again hold the line, the real prospect of default looms as the government runs out of money to pay wages with the likely consequent chaos on domestic and world markets . The White House says that there will be no negotiations over the debt ceiling, and that if Republicans want further spending cuts, their only chance is to hand over more tax revenue. We’re back to the game of chicken. And it’s not as if the small deal and Bill agreed yesterday by the House goes anywhere near solving the deficit problem it was supposed to address. On the contrary. In all, the bill which will barely stabilise borrowing overthe next decade, will cause deficits to rise by nearly $4 trillion over the period, according to the nonpartisan congressional budget office. Nor, its critics complain, does the Bill go anywhere near addressing the challenge of 12 million unemployed, while it is also stuffed with the sort of pork barrel concessions to individual politicians that are typical of the worst kind of congressional legislating. In the end, however, and this is perhaps clutching at straws, Congress did act, albeit in the most minimal way. And a significant majority of Republicans those who, as one columnist put it, still hold the old-fashioned view that they were elected to help run the country did demonstrate a degree of flexibility and bipartisanship almost unthinkable before the election. Obama’s renewed mandate has given him a new small measure of freedom. But it will dissipate fast if he does not use it.

# 2nc at: thumpers

### **Issues don’t cost capital till they are at the finish line, if they cant cite vote counts 0 weight**

Drum, 10 (Kevin, Political Blogger, Mother Jones, http://motherjones.com/kevin-drum/2010/03/immigration-

coming-back-burner)

Not to pick on Ezra or anything, but this attitude betrays a surprisingly common misconception about political issues in general. The fact is that political dogs never bark until an issue becomes an active one. Opposition to Social Security privatization was pretty mild until 2005, when George Bush turned it into an active issue. Opposition to healthcare reform was mild until 2009, when Barack Obama turned it into an active issue. Etc. I only bring this up because we often take a look at polls and think they tell us what the public thinks about something. But for the most part, they don't.1 That is, they don't until the issue in question is squarely on the table and both sides have spent a couple of months filling the airwaves with their best agitprop. Polling data about gays in the military, for example, hasn't changed a lot over the past year or two, but once Congress takes up the issue in earnest and the Focus on the Family newsletters go out, the push polling starts, Rush Limbaugh picks it up, and Fox News creates an incendiary graphic to go with its saturation coverage — well, that's when the polling will tell you something. And it will probably tell you something different from what it tells you now. Immigration was bubbling along as sort of a background issue during the Bush administration too until 2007, when he tried to move an actual bill. Then all hell broke loose. The same thing will happen this time, and without even a John McCain to act as a conservative point man for a moderate solution. The political environment is worse now than it was in 2007, and I'll be very surprised if it's possible to make any serious progress on immigration reform. "Love 'em or hate 'em," says Ezra, illegal immigrants "aren't at the forefront of people's minds." Maybe not. But they will be soon.

# at: hagel

#### Fiscal fights thump Hagel nomination – the decision will occur after the deadline

Hope Hodge (writer for Human Events) January 3, 2013 “COULD SEQUESTER PUNT PUSH BACK A HAGEL NOMINATION?” <http://www.humanevents.com/2013/01/03/could-sequester-punt-push-back-a-hagel-nomination/>

At minimum, the decision of Congress to delay a decision on sequestration will mean two more months of fiscal uncertainty for the Defense Department and the businesses that support it. But could the punt also affect how and when the transition to a new Defense Secretary takes place? Heritage Foundation research fellow Baker Spring told Human Events in November that he believed current defense secretary Leon Panetta, an outspoken critic of the sequestration mechanism, might be retained in his position if the more than $500 billion in cuts to planned spending did take effect, to oversee their implementation. President Barack Obama’s nomination of John Kerry for Secretary of State, in November, without an accompanying nomination for defense, fueled speculation that there would be a strategic delay in the transition of the Defense top spot

# 2nc agenda tradeoff link

#### Congressional Agenda Finite

James J. Brudney, Associate Professor, The Ohio State University College of Law, Connecticut Law Review, Summer 1998 lexis

Moreover, at a minimum it overstates the meaning of legislative inaction to impute to recent Congresses an indifferent or tolerant mindset toward the diminution of NLRA rights. The complex demands of modern national government require Congress to maximize its use of finite resources--particularly the time and political capital of its members. Any commitment Congress makes to respond to judicial interpretations of older statutes means less time and fewer political resources are available for an already crowded legislative agenda. The Supreme Court has become less interested in NLRA cases over recent decades, 11 and court of appeals decisions are unlikely to be noticed even by congressional committees that would have jurisdiction to [\*1357] address them. 12 Accordingly, many cases that are hotly debated within the labor-management community do not achieve legislative recognition, much less become agenda priorities