### 2NC Overview

#### Disad outweighs

#### a. Faster – failure to raise the debt ceiling causes quick unraveling of the U.S. and global economy – collapse before November

Sahadi 9/10

Jeanne, “Debt ceiling 'X date' could hit Oct. 18”, <http://money.cnn.com/2013/09/10/news/economy/debt-ceiling-bills-coming-due/index.html>, MCR

A new analysis by a think tank shows that **Washington's drop-dead deadline for the debt ceiling could hit as soon as Oct. 18**.¶ Estimating exactly when the Treasury Department will be unable to pay all the bills coming due if Congress fails to raise the nation's legal borrowing limit is notoriously difficult.¶ That's why, in an analysis released Tuesday, the Bipartisan Policy Center put the "X date" between Oct. 18 and Nov. 5.¶ Treasury Secretary Jack Lew has warned that **by mid-October the agency will have only $50 billion in cash on top of incoming revenue.**¶That may sound like a lot. But, as the Bipartisan Policy Center details, **it won't last very long**.¶ If the "X" date turns out to be Oct. 18, Treasury would run about $106 billion short of the money it owes between then and Nov.15. That means it wouldn't be able to pay the equivalent of a third of all the bills due during that period.¶ Here's why: Treasury handles about 80 million payments a month. Those payments are not evenly spaced out so on some days more is owed than on others. And the revenue flowing into federal coffers is unpredictable and varies from day to day.¶ Payments include IRS refunds, Social Security and veterans benefits, Medicare reimbursements for doctors and hospitals, bond interest owed investors, payments to contractors and paychecks for federal workers and military personnel.¶ If Congress fails to act in time, Treasury will have to make difficult -- and legally questionable -- decisions about who should get paid and who should be stiffed. It may decide to pay some bills in full and on time and not others.¶ Or it may decide to delay all payments due on a given day until it has sufficient revenue on hand to pay in full. in a Treasury Inspector General's report that this might be the most plausible and least harmful approach.¶ But under that scenario, **delays would grow over time from a day or two to several weeks**. For example, the payments due to seniors, veterans and active duty military personnel on Nov. 1 wouldn't go out until Nov. 13.¶ In any case, the expectation is that the agency will try to prioritize payments to bond investors over everyone else, lest the financial markets go haywire. Politically, of course, that carries risk, said Steve Bell, the senior director of the Bipartisan Policy Center's economic policy project.¶ "There's a political danger you'll be accused of paying bondholders over Social Security recipients," Bell said.¶ On both Oct. 23 and Nov. 14, $12 billion in Social Security benefits come due, while another $25 billion comes due on Nov. 1, according to the analysis.¶ Meanwhile, on Oct. 24, Treasury will have to roll over $57 billion in outstanding debt and another $115 billion on Oct. 31. Normally that's not a problem, because U.S. Treasury auctions attract a lot of buyers willing to purchase bonds at low rates.¶ But if those rollover dates come after the "X" date, and **the perception is that the United States is defaulting on some of its obligations, Treasury could have trouble finding enough buyers or investors could demand higher interest rates**.¶ The debt ceiling is currently set at $16.7 trillion. That ceiling was reached on May 19, and ever since Treasury has been using a host of special measures to keep the country's borrowing at or below that ceiling. But those measures will be exhausted by mid-October, according to Treasury.¶ If lawmakers want to raise the ceiling enough to get past the 2014 midterm elections in November, the Bipartisan Policy Center estimates they will have to raise it by $1.1 trillion to $17.8 trillion. To top of page

#### Debt ceiling failure collapses the global economy in October causes multiple hotspots to escalate globally—you should evaluate timeframe first—you can only die once so number of scenarios is irrelevant- your wells ev just said we were resilient to first downgrade- doesn’t assume October impact where there’s gvt shut-down

#### b.) SCOPE – US economic decline triggers military withdrawal across the globe—causes a power vacuum and nuclear war—hegemony deters hostile powers and controls the escalation of all conflict—solves the impact to the aff—that’s Khalilzad

#### c.) TURNS CASE –

#### Prerequisite for military power – determines limits of power in international politics

Pape 9 (Robert, Professor of Political Science at the University of Chicago “Realities and Obama's diplomacy,” *Chicago Tribune*, March 8, http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/nationworld/chi-perspec0308diplomacymar08,0,4785661.story)

From Rome to the United States today, the rise and fall of great nations have been driven primarily by economic strength. At any given moment, a state's power depends on the size and quality of its military forces and other power assets. Over time, however, power is a result of economic strength—the prerequisite for building and modernizing military forces. And so the size of the economy relative to potential rivals ultimately determines the limits of power in international politics.

#### Climate Change-

Anderson 4 [Terry L. professor of economics at Montana State University, Ph.D. in economics, “Why Economic Growth is Good for the Environment,” http://www.perc.org/articles/article446.php]

Hansen's essay concludes on an optimistic note, saying "the main elements [new technologies] required to halt climate change have come into being with remarkable rapidity." This statement would not have surprised economist Julian Simon. He saw the "ultimate resource" to be the human mind and believed it to be best motivated by market forces. Because of a combination of market forces and technological innovations, we are not running out of natural resources. As a resource becomes more scarce, prices increase, thus encouraging development of cheaper alternatives and technological innovations. Just as fossil fuel replaced scarce whale oil, its use will be reduced by new technology and alternative fuel sources. Market forces also cause economic growth, which in turn leads to environmental improvements. Put simply, poor people are willing to sacrifice clean water and air, healthy forests, and wildlife habitat for economic growth. But as their incomes rise above subsistence, "economic growth helps to undo the damage done in earlier years," says economist Bruce Yandle. "If economic growth is good for the environment, policies that stimulate growth ought to be good for the environment." The link between greenhouse gas emissions and economic prosperity is no different. Using data from the United States, Professor Robert McCormick finds that "higher GDP reduces total net [greenhouse gas] emissions."

#### debt default means the plan would be delayed or under-funded – fiat only means the plan passes

Goldfarb 1-1 [Zachary A. Goldfarb 1-1-2013 Washington Post “‘Fiscal cliff’ deal does little to tame threats from debt ceiling, high unemployment rates” 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]

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.¶ And while a default would be all but certain to push the economy into recession, growth is likely to be slow — and job-market improvement slight — even without such a cataclysmic event. The unemployment rate, which stands at 7.7 percent, is not expected to fall below 7.4 percent by the end of this year, and not below 6 percent until at least 2016 or later.

### Syria Thumper

#### Syria won’t hurt debt talks

Lerer 9/12

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

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

#### Dismiss aff pessimism – Syria win guaranteed

Khan 9/11

Naureen, “Obama pays high political price for fumbling on Syria”, <http://america.aljazeera.com/articles/2013/9/11/obama-pays-high-politicalpriceforhandlingofsyria.html>, MCR

Some of the president’s allies said he had shown strength but that **a diplomatic solution would be in the administration’s best interest.**¶ “**The president is going to be fine. He has stood strong, he got** (Osama) **bin Laden and he has not wavered one bit**,” Rep. Elijah Cummings, D-Md., told Al Jazeera America. “**If this deal goes through, and I think it will**, because I think the president will make it go through … **he will look like a hero**.”¶ Sabato too said **it was too soon to predict doom for the rest of the Obama term**.

#### Syria fallout minimal – won’t hurt debt talks

Bohan 9/11

Caren, “Delay in Syria vote frees Obama to shift to hefty domestic agenda”, <http://carnegieeurope.eu/strategiceurope/?fa=52932>, MCR

**On** issues like the **budget battles** **in which** Obama will go toe-to-toe with Republicans, **the Syria push will have** little fallout **for Obama,** predicted Matt Bennett, senior vice president at Third Way, a center-left think tank.¶ Republicans showed a huge resistance to Obama's agenda well before the administration's effort to win congressional backing on Syria began to falter, Bennett noted. He said **the time focused on Syria** over the last week and half **did nothing to change that dynamic**.¶ "**I certainly don't think the situation he's in today is markedly different** from the one he faced a few weeks ago," Bennett said.

### UQ Wall

#### Ext 1NC Kapur- Obama wants to meet his obligations and house is taming-

#### Obama PC key to keep Reps on board b/c they’re already demanding so many concessions for a deal to be reached-

#### Boehner will have to make concessions to democrats on debt ceiling now – wont allow economic havoc

Harold Maass, 9/12

John Boehner vs. the Tea Party: The impending showdown, <http://theweek.com/article/index/249512/john-boehner-vs-the-tea-party-the-impending-showdown>, accessed 9/13/13,WYO/JF

Even as Congress remains embroiled in the situation in Syria, House Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) is barreling toward a showdown with the Tea Party over preventing a government shutdown.¶ The continuing resolution funding the government runs out at the end of September, and Tea Party Republicans are vowing to use the negotiations as [leverage to defund ObamaCare](http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/09/11/us-usa-fiscal-debtlimit-idUSBRE98A0QR20130911), even if that leads to an impasse that [shuts down](http://theweek.com/article/index/247597/no-a-government-shutdown-wont-kill-obamacare) the federal government.¶ Boehner and other House GOP leaders are trying to avert such a calamity with a compromise that they pitched this week, which would entail a vote on a stopgap spending measure that would [keep government agencies](http://www.latimes.com/opinion/opinion-la/la-ol-gop-defunding-obamacare-plan-shifts-toward-delaying-it-20130910,0,4825515.story) open from October 1 to December 15, at a level that preserves the sequester budget cuts. A separate measure would propose defunding ObamaCare.¶ Boehner had to postpone a vote on the plan Wednesday, though, [due to a revolt](http://www.journalgazette.net/article/20130912/NEWS03/309129960/1066/NEWS03) by several dozen Tea Party conservatives. They argue that Boehner and House Majority Leader Eric Cantor (Va.) are squandering the leverage provided by the Sept. 30 deadline, in exchange for a symbolic vote against ObamaCare that will never pass the Democratic-controlled Senate. GOP leaders are trying to soothe their troops by saying they will insist on a one-year delay of ObamaCare in any deal to raise the debt limit, an even bigger budgetary matter looming in October.¶ "But here's the rub," [says Greg Sargent at The Washington Post](http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/plum-line/wp/2013/09/11/john-boehner-must-cut-loose-the-tea-party/). "At some point, something will have to pass with a lot of Dems." And President Obama and his fellow Democrats have vowed not to horse-trade over raising the debt ceiling. Here's more from Sargent:¶ That will leave only two choices: Pass a debt limit hike with mostly Democrats, stiff-arming the Tea Party, or allow economic havoc to break out. Boehner isn't going to do the latter. So his only choice will be the former... Which means that at some point this fall, Boehner will have to cut the Tea Party loose, and suffer the consequences. [[Washington Post](http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/plum-line/wp/2013/09/11/john-boehner-must-cut-loose-the-tea-party/)]¶ Not all conservatives think it will — or should — get to that point. [W. James Antle III at The American Conservative](http://www.theamericanconservative.com/articles/why-ted-cruz-cant-win-a-government-shutdown/), who supports repealing ObamaCare, says Tea Party Republicans are pursuing the wrong strategy, since ObamaCare is likely to "collapse under its own weight" once it's implemented:¶ A failed attempt to defund ObamaCare would be just as pointlessly symbolic as the various House repeal and delay votes. But instead of winning Democratic votes and underscoring the enduring unpopularity of ObamaCare, it might unify the Democrats and deepen the GOP's unpopularity. [[The American Conservative](http://www.theamericanconservative.com/articles/why-ted-cruz-cant-win-a-government-shutdown/)]

### Link Wall

#### Extend 1NC ev- Republicans hate the plan- not signing on with the EU proposal proves- Republicans sent a letter indicating they were unwilling to compromise on it- causes a distraction

### Winner Win

#### Group the winners win debate:

#### 1. Plan isn’t a win – 1NC link says restrictions will be costly to Obama

#### 2. Political capital finite:

#### A. PC finite – opportunity cost

Hayward 12

[John, writer at Human Events. “DON’T BE GLAD THE BUFFETT RULE IS DEAD, BE ANGRY IT EVER EXISTED,” 4/17, <http://www.humanevents.com/2012/04/17/dont-be-glad-the-buffett-rule-is-dead-be-angry-it-ever-existed/>]

Toomey makes the excellent point that Obama’s class-warfare sideshow act is worse than useless, because it’s wasting America’s valuable time, even as the last fiscal sand runs through our hourglass. Politicians speak of “political capital” in selfish terms, as a pile of chips each party hoards on its side of the poker table, but in truth America has only a finite amount of political capital in total. When time and energy is wasted on pointless distractions, the capital expended---in the form of the public’s attention, and the debates they hold among themselves---cannot easily be regained. ¶ There is an “opportunity cost” associated with the debates we aren’t having, and the valid ideas we’re not considering, when our time is wasted upon nonsense that is useful only to political re-election campaigns. Health care reform is the paramount example of our time, as countless real, workable market-based reforms were obscured by the flaccid bulk of ObamaCare. The Buffett Rule, like all talk of tax increases in the shadow of outrageous government spending, likewise distracts us from the real issues.

#### B. PC finite – Obama perceives and acts like it

Burnett, 13

Bob Burnett, Founding Executive @ CiscoSystems, Berkeley writer, journalist, columnist @ huffington post, 4/5, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/bob-burnett/keystone-xl-obama_b_3020154.html>

On April 3 and 4, President Obama spoke at several San Francisco fundraisers. While he didn't specifically mention the Keystone XL pipeline, the tenor of his remarks indicated that he's likely to approve the controversial project. Obama seems to be most influenced by his inherent political pragmatism. I've heard Barack Obama speak on several occasions. The first was February 19, 2007, at a San Francisco ore-election fundraiser with a lengthy question and answer session. Towards the end of the event a woman asked then presidential-candidate Obama what his position was on same-sex marriage. For an instant, Obama seemed surprised; then he gathered himself and responded he was aware of strong feelings on both sides of this issue and his position was evolving. Five years later, in May of 2012, President Obama announced his support for same-sex marriage. What took Obama so long to make up his mind? No doubt he needed to clarify his own moral position -- although the Protestant denomination he was baptized into, the United Church of Christ, announced its support for same-sex marriage in 2005. But I'm sure the president carefully weighed the political consequences and, last May, thought the timing was right. Over the last six years I've realized Barack Obama has several personas. On occasion he moves us with stirring oratory; that's Reverend Obama, the rock star. Once in a while, he turns philosophical; that's Professor Obama, the student of American history. On April 3, I saw Politician Obama, the pragmatic leader of the Democratic Party. Obama has learned that, as president, he only gets a fixed amount of political capital each year and has learned to ration it. In 2007, he didn't feel it was worth stirring up controversy by supporting same-sex marriage; in 2012 he thought it was. He's a cautious pragmatist. He doesn't make snap decisions or ones that will divert his larger agenda. Intuitively, most Democrats know this about the president. At the beginning of 2012, many Democratic stalwarts were less than thrilled by the prospect of a second Obama term. While their reasons varied, there was a common theme, "Obama hasn't kept his promises to my constituency." There were lingering complaints that 2009's stimulus package should have been bigger and a communal whine, "Obama should have listened to us." Nonetheless, by the end of the Democratic convention on September 6, most Dems had come around. In part, this transformation occurred because from January to September of 2012 Dems scrutinized Mitt Romney and were horrified by what they saw. In January some had muttered, "There's no difference between Obama and Romney," but nine months later none believed that. While many Democrats were not thrilled by Obama's first-term performance, they saw him as preferable to Romney on a wide range of issues. In 2009, Obama got a bad rap from some Dems because they believed he did not fight hard enough for the fiscal stimulus and affordable healthcare. In March of 2011, veteran Washington columnist, Elizabeth Drew, described Obama as: ... a somewhat left-of-center pragmatist, and a man who has avoided fixed positions for most of his life. Even his health care proposal -- denounced by the right as a 'government takeover' and 'socialism' -- was essentially moderate or centrist. When he cut a deal on the tax bill, announced on December 7 [2010], he pragmatically concluded that he did not have the votes to end the Bush tax cuts for the wealthiest, and in exchange for giving in on that he got significant concessions from the Republicans, such as a fairly lengthy extension of unemployment insurance and the cut in payroll taxes. Making this deal also left him time to achieve other things -- ratification of the START treaty, the repeal of don't ask, don't tell. Drew's description of the president as a "left-of-center pragmatist" resonates with my sense of him. He is a political pragmatist who, over the past five years, has learned to guard his political capital and focus it on his highest priorities. § Marked 12:40 § In this year's State-of-the-Union address half of the president's remarks concerned jobs and the economy. We gather here knowing that there are millions of Americans whose hard work and dedication have not yet been rewarded. Our economy is adding jobs -- but too many people still can't find full-time employment. Corporate profits have rocketed to all-time highs -- but for more than a decade, wages and incomes have barely budged. It is our generation's task, then, to reignite the true engine of America's economic growth -- a rising, thriving middle class. He also spoke passionately about the need to address to address global warming, "For the sake of our children and our future, we must do more to combat climate change." But it's clear that's a secondary objective. At one of the Bay Area fundraisers, President Obama observed that his big challenge is to show middle-class families that, "we are working just as hard for them as we are for an environmental agenda." Obama isn't going to block the Keystone XL pipeline because he doesn't believe that he can make the case his action will help the middle-class. He's conserving his political capital. He's being pragmatic

#### Hirsh agrees with the thesis of the politics DA even if he disagrees with the term “political capital”

Michael Hirsh, National Journal, 2/7/13, There’s No Such Thing as Political Capital, www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207

Presidents are limited in what they can do by time and attention span, of course, just as much as they are by electoral balances in the House and Senate. But this, too, has nothing to do with political capital. Another well-worn meme of recent years was that Obama used up too much political capital passing the health care law in his first term. But the real problem was that the plan was unpopular, the economy was bad, and the president didn’t realize that the national mood (yes, again, the national mood) was at a tipping point against big-government intervention, with the tea-party revolt about to burst on the scene. For Americans in 2009 and 2010—haunted by too many rounds of layoffs, appalled by the Wall Street bailout, aghast at the amount of federal spending that never seemed to find its way into their pockets—government-imposed health care coverage was simply an intervention too far. So was the idea of another economic stimulus. Cue the tea party and what ensued: two titanic fights over the debt ceiling. Obama, like Bush, had settled on pushing an issue that was out of sync with the country’s mood.¶ § Marked 12:40 § Unlike Bush, Obama did ultimately get his idea passed. But the bigger political problem with health care reform was that it distracted the government’s attention from other issues that people cared about more urgently, such as the need to jump-start the economy and financial reform. Various congressional staffers told me at the time that their bosses didn’t really have the time to understand how the Wall Street lobby was riddling the Dodd-Frank financial-reform legislation with loopholes. Health care was sucking all the oxygen out of the room, the aides said.

#### Hirsh agrees with the concept of PC---just not that it’s numerically quantifiable

Michael Hirsh, National Journal, 2/7/13, There’s No Such Thing as Political Capital, www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/there-s-no-such-thing-as-political-capital-20130207

The point is not that “political capital” is a meaningless term. Often it is a synonym for “mandate” or “momentum” in the aftermath of a decisive election—and just about every politician ever elected has tried to claim more of a mandate than he actually has. Certainly, Obama can say that because he was elected and Romney wasn’t, he has a better claim on the country’s mood and direction. Many pundits still defend political capital as a useful metaphor at least. “It’s an unquantifiable but meaningful concept,” says Norman Ornstein of the American Enterprise Institute. “You can’t really look at a president and say he’s got 37 ounces of political capital. But the fact is, it’s a concept that matters, if you have popularity and some momentum on your side.”

#### Wins don’t spill over- bruising effort doesn’t generate capital- their author

Michael Hirsch, Daily Beast, 1-19-2010 <http://www.thedailybeast.com/newsweek/2010/01/19/the-politics-of-hubris.html>

There was nothing new about this, of course. It falls into the age-old annals of hubris, the same excess of pride that got Achilles and Agamemnon in trouble with the gods. Obama apparently did buy into the idea that he was a Man of Destiny and, being one, possessed bottomless supplies of political capital. But he really had no more political capital than any first-year president, and he was straining his reserves just dealing with the stimulus and financial reform, much less fixing Afghanistan.¶ I first became worried about this bridge-too-far problem last year while covering financial reform on the Hill, when various congressional staffers told me their bosses didn't really have the time to understand how the Wall Street lobby was riddling the legislation with loopholes. Health care was sucking all the oxygen out of the room—and from their brains, the aides said. Obama and his team seemed barely focused on transforming the financial system—except now, belatedly—and left a lot of the infighting to regulators like Gary Gensler, the chairman of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission. Obama had spoken admiringly of Ronald Reagan as a transformational president. And yet at what would seem to be a similar historical inflection point—what should have been the end of Reaganite free-market fundamentalism and a laserlike scourging of Wall Street—Obama seemed to put this once-in-a-lifetime task on a back burner.¶ It is only now, a year later, when he has a terrific fight on his hands over health care, that Obama is talking about seriously breaking up the structure of Wall Street. The big-bank lobby will dig in big time of course, and seek to buy everyone it can on Capitol Hill, which means that the president will need even more political capital that he no longer has.¶ Just as bad, when the president did do health care—whatever version of it squeaks through now—he seemed to be getting such a meager result for so bruising an effort that it will be a long time before anyone has the stomach to set it right legislatively.

.

### PDB

#### Interpretation: The negative should be able to test the opportunity costs of the plan

#### K2 neg ground- politics is a core generic disad- aff spectrum is so large on this topic we need to uniquely preserve our generics in order to give the neg a fair shot

#### K2 education-Politics tests a key opportunity cost

Saideman 11

[Steve Saideman, associate professor of political science - McGill University, 7/25/’11 “Key Constraint on Policy Relevance,” http://duckofminerva.blogspot.com/2011/07/key-constraint-on-policy-relevance.html]

Dan Drezner has a great post today about how the foreign policy smart set (his phrase) gets so frustrated by domestic politics that they tend to recommend domestic political changes that are never going to happen. I would go one step further and suggest that one of the key problems for scholars who want to be relevant for policy debates is that we tend to make recommendations that are "incentive incompatible." I love that phrase. What is best for policy may not be what is best for politics, and so we may think we have a good idea about what to recommend but get frustrated when our ideas do not get that far. Lots of folks talking about early warning about genocide, intervention into civil wars and the like blame "political will." That countries lack, for whatever reason, the compulsion to act. Well, that is another way of saying that domestic politics matters, but we don't want to think about it. Dan's piece contains an implication which is often false--that IR folks have little grasp of domestic politics. Many IR folks do tend to ignore or simplify the domestic side too much, but there is plenty of scholarship on the domestic determinants of foreign policy/grand strategy/war/trade/etc. Plenty of folks look at how domestic institutions and dynamics can cause countries to engage in sub-optimal foreign policies (hence the tradeoff implied in my second book--For Kin or Country). The challenge, then, is to figure out what would be a cool policy and how that cool policy could resonate with those who are relevant domestically. That is not easy, but it is what is necessary. To be policy relevant requires both parts--articulating a policy alternative that would improve things and some thought about how the alternative could be politically appealing. Otherwise, we can just dream about the right policy and gnash our teeth when it never happens.

#### Reject the argument, not the team

### Case

#### [1] Empirics disprove a relationship between U.S. hegemony and global stability. The world increased cooperation and peace when the U.S. withdrew its forces. –That’s Fettweis

#### [2] The U.S. will maintain its global power despite difficulties because other global actors lack the political stability, military capability, and influence to challenge the U.S. –That’s Kaplan

#### [3] U.S. hegemonic decline peaceful

Fettweis 10

--assistant professor of political science @ Tulane Christopher, Survival, Volume 52, Issue 2, April

One potential explanation for the growth of global peace can be dismissed fairly quickly: US actions do not seem to have contributed much. The limited evidence suggests that there is little reason to believe in the stabilising power of the US hegemon, and that there is no relation between the relative level of American activism and international stability. During the 1990s, the United States cut back on its defence spending fairly substantially. By 1998, the United States was spending $100 billion less on defence in real terms than it had in 1990, a 25% reduction.[29](http://www.informaworld.com.www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/smpp/section?content=a920295991&fulltext=713240928#EN0029) To internationalists, defence hawks and other believers in hegemonic stability, this irresponsible 'peace dividend' endangered both national and global security. 'No serious analyst of American military capabilities', argued neo-conservatives William Kristol and Robert Kagan in 1996, 'doubts that the defense budget has been cut much too far to meet America's responsibilities to itself and to world peace'.[30](http://www.informaworld.com.www2.lib.ku.edu:2048/smpp/section?content=a920295991&fulltext=713240928#EN0030) And yet the verdict from the 1990s is fairly plain: the world grew more peaceful while the United States cut its forces. No state seemed to believe that its security was endangered by a less-capable US military, or at least none took any action that would suggest such a belief. No militaries were enhanced to address power vacuums; no security dilemmas drove insecurity or arms races; no regional balancing occurred once the stabilising presence of the US military was diminished. The rest of the world acted as if the threat of international war was not a pressing concern, despite the reduction in US military capabilities. Most of all, the United States was no less safe. The incidence and magnitude of global conflict declined while the United States cut its military spending under President Bill Clinton, and kept declining as the George W. Bush administration ramped the spending back up. Complex statistical analysis is unnecessary to reach the conclusion that world peace and US military expenditure are unrelated.