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### Plan

Plan text: The United States federal government ought to raise the federal minimum wage to $15/hour. Seattle is normal means.

**Sheetz 14** James Zissler and Breanne Sheetz. “United States: Seattle Increases Minimum Wage To $15.00 Per Hour Over Several Years.” Mondaq. June 6th, 2014. http://www.mondaq.com/unitedstates/x/318950/Employee+Benefits+Compensation/Seattle+Increases+Minimum+Wage+to+1500+Per+Hour+Over+Several+Years

How are franchisees treated under the ordinance? **Any franchisee** associated with a franchisor or network of franchises **with franchisees that employ more than 500** employees in aggregate in the United States **is considered a Schedule 1 Employer**.12 In other words, even if a franchisee employs only one employee, that franchisee is considered a Schedule 1 Employer if it is associated with a franchisor or network of franchises with franchisees that employ more than 500 employees in total in the United States. What are the new minimum wage rates? **The Seattle minimum wage is initially $11.00 per hour, effective April 1, 2015, followed by incremental increases** according to the timelines set forth below. **Schedule 1 Employers have two and a half years to reach** a minimum wage of **$15.00**. Those that provide qualifying medical benefits will have an additional year. **Schedule 2 Employers have four and a half years to reach $15.00** per hour. Those that can claim a sufficient credit for tips and/or qualifying employer-paid medical benefits have an additional two years, and also benefit from a lower initial effective minimum wage rate of $10.00 per hour.

Seattle’s minimum wage increase is a model for the rest of the US and it’s a living wage.

**Wegmann 14** Philip Wegmann (member of the young leaders program at the Heritage Foundation). “Seattle Mayor Says $15 Minimum Wage Is ‘Model for the Nation.’” The Daily Signal. June 9th, 2014. http://dailysignal.com/2014/06/09/seattle-mayor-says-15-minimum-wage-model-nation/

A week ago, **Seattle made history when it bumped its minimum wage to $15 an hour, and** yesterday **Mayor** Ed **Murray defended** the city’s move, trumpeting **it as a “**model for the nation**.”** Murray argued that the minimum wage hike is key to Washington state’s recovery. “If we want to regain our economic strength and be competitive in the nation,” the mayor told ABC News’ Neal Karlinsky, “the minimum wage is going to have to raise.” Murray described the increase as an attempt to bolster the middle class and once again kick start “a vibrant economy.” **A longstanding proponent of the** living wage**, Murray** rode public support for the measure into office during the 2013 mayoral election. Now, the newly elected mayor **views Seattle as a national example, “a laboratory for democracy.”**

Use reasonability on topicality with a brightline of a solvency advocate in the topic literature and the presence of link and impact turn ground. A. there are tons of many mutually exclusive T interps and I can’t possibly know which one you’ll read so I shouldn’t be punished for setting ground. B. increases topical clash-as long as you can debate under my plan the substantive education we receive outweighs time spent reading T.

### Adv 1 = Inequality

Two internal links:

A. Decline in minimum wage is the main source of economic inequality.

Boushey 14 Heather Boushey (Executive Director and Chief Economist, Washington Center for Equitable Growth). “Understanding how raising the federal minimum wage affects income inequality and economic growth.” Testimony before the U.S. Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions. March 12th, 2014. http://equitablegrowth.org/research/understanding-the-minimum-wage-and-income-inequality-and-economic-growth/

Finally, the level of the minimum wage has a considerable effect on the distribution of wages in the United States. As mentioned above, the minimum wage used to be much closer to the average wage. But **since 1968,** the average wage grew as the **purchasing power of** the **minimum wage declined by 23 percent**. At the same time, the **distance between wage earner at the 10th percentile and** median wage earner, or the earner at **the 50th percentile, grew by 18 percent from** 19**79 to 2009. Economists have found** that the **declining inflation-adjusted value of the minimum wage had a considerable effect on wage inequality** for those workers in the bottom half of the wage distribution. A 1996 paper by economists John DiNardo, of the University of Michigan, Nicole Fortin, of the University of British Columbia, and Thomas Lemieux, also of the University of British Columbia, found that the decrease in the minimum wage from 1979 to 1988 had a considerable effect on the wage distribution. They found the decline over that time could explain up to 25 percent of the change in the standard deviation in the logarithm of male wages and up to 30 percent for female wages. In plain English, this means the decline in the minimum wage explained up to a fourth of increasing wage inequality for men and up to three-tenths of increase wage inequality for women. In more recent work, MIT economist David **Autor**, London School of Economics economist Alan Manning, **and** Federal Reserve Board economist Christopher **Smith find that** about **75 percent of the increase in low-end inequality from** 19**79 to** 19**91 is due to** the **decline in the value of the minimum wage, but** the decline **only explains 45 percent** of the increase **from** 19**79 to** 20**09**. While the literature has not come to an agreement on the exact size of the effect, the decline of the minimum wage was a significant factor in the increase in inequality for lower half of the income distribution.

B. Living wage is key to bargaining power. Counterplans can’t solve.

**NYT 14** New York Times Editorial Board. “The Case for a Higher Minimum Wage.” February 8th, 2014. http://www.nytimes.com/2014/02/09/opinion/sunday/the-case-for-a-higher-minimum-wage.html

WHAT’S THE POINT OF THE MINIMUM WAGE? Most people think of the minimum wage as the lowest legal hourly pay. That’s true, but it is really much more than that. As defined in the name of the law that established it — the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 — the minimum wage is a fundamental labor standard designed to protect workers, just as child labor laws and overtime pay rules do. Labor standards, like environmental standards and investor protections, are essential to a functional economy. Properly set and enforced, these standards check exploitation, pollution and speculation. In the process, they promote broad and rising prosperity, as well as public confidence. The **minimum wage** is specifically intended to **take aim at the** inherent **imbalance in power between employers and low-wage workers** that can push wages down to poverty levels. **A**n appropriate **wage floor** set by Congress effectively **substitutes for** the **bargaining power that low-wage workers lack**. **When low-end wages rise, poverty and inequality are reduced**. But that doesn’t mean the minimum wage is a government program to provide welfare, as critics sometimes imply in an attempt to link it to unpopular policies. An hourly minimum of $10.10, for example, as Democrats have proposed, would reduce the number of people living in poverty by 4.6 million, according to widely accepted research, without requiring the government to tax, borrow or spend. IS THERE AN ALTERNATIVE? No. **Other programs, including** food stamps, Medicaid and the **e**arned-**i**ncome **t**ax **c**redit, also **increase** the meager **resources** of low-wage workers, **but they do not provide bargaining power to claim a better wage**. In fact, they can drive wages down, because employers who pay poorly factor the government assistance into their wage scales. This is especially true of the earned-income tax credit, a taxpayer-provided wage subsidy that helps lift the income of working families above the poverty line. Conservatives often call for increases to the **E.I.T.C.** instead of a higher minimum wage, saying that a higher minimum acts as an unfair and unwise tax on low-wage employers. That’s a stretch, especially in light of rising corporate profits even as pay has dwindled. It also ignores how the tax credit **increases** the supply of **low-wage labor by encouraging more people to work, holding down** the **cost of labor for employers**. By one estimate, increasing the tax credit by 10 percent reduces the wages of high-school educated workers by 2 percent. There are good reasons to expand the tax credit for childless workers, as President Obama recently proposed. It is a successful antipoverty program and a capstone in the conservative agenda to emphasize work over welfare. But an expanded E.I.T.C. is no reason to stint on raising the minimum wage — just the opposite. **A higher minimum wage could** help **offset the wage-depressing effect of a bolstered E.I.T.C**., and would ensure that both taxpayers and employers do their part to make work pay.

$15/hour reduces income inequality. Income inequality decreases consumer spending, killing the entire US economy.

**Sanders 15** Bernie Sanders (independent U.S. senator from Vermont, former chairman of the Senate Veterans’ Affairs Committee, studied at UChicago, was an organizer for the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee during the Civil Rights Movement). “We Need a Pro-Worker, Anti-Austerity Agenda.” Campaign for America’s Future. February 5th, 2015. http://ourfuture.org/20150205/we-need-a-pro-worker-anti-austerity-agenda

Most significantly, the simple truth of the matter is the 40-year decline of the American middle class continues. **Real unemployment** is not 5.6 percent – including those people who have given up looking for work or people who are working part time when they want to work full time – it **is over 11 percent**. Youth unemployment – something we almost never talk about in this country – is a horrendous 17 percent, and African-American youth unemployment is over 30 percent. It is totally unacceptable. Real median family income has declined by nearly $5,000 since 1999. All over this country – in Vermont and in every other State in this country – **we have people working longer hours for lower wages**. We have husbands and wives working 50, 60 hours a week just to pay the bills. Incredibly, despite huge increases in productivity, in technology, and all of the global economy we hear so much about, the median male worker now earns $783 less than he did 42 years ago. Let me repeat that. That American male worker right in the middle of the economy now earns, after inflation adjusted for wages, $783 less than he did 42 years ago. The female worker right in the middle of the economy now makes $1,300 less than she made in 2007. When you ask why people are angry, why people are stressed, why people are frustrated, that is exactly why. Further, this country continues to have, shamefully, the highest rate of childhood poverty of any major country on Earth, and 40 million Americans still have zero health insurance. In the midst of this tragic decline of the American middle class, there is, however, another reality. The wealthiest people and the largest corporations are doing phenomenally well. The result: **The U**nited **S**tates today **has more income** and wealth **inequality than at any time since the** Great **Depression**. Today the top one-tenth of 1 percent own almost as much wealth as the bottom 90 percent. Let me repeat that because that truly is a startling fact. Today the top one-tenth of 1 percent – which is what this chart talks about – owns almost as much wealth as the bottom 90 percent. Today one family – the Walton family, owners of Walmart – owns more wealth than the bottom 40 percent of the American people, some 120 million Americans. I don’t believe most of our people think this is what the American economy should be about. In fact, this is not an economy for a democracy. This is what oligarchy is all about. **One-tenth of 1 percent own**ing **almost as much wealth as the bottom 90 percent**, 1 family owning the equivalent of what 131 million Americans own, that is wealth. In terms of income – which is what we make every year – what we have seen in the last number of years since the Wall Street crash is virtually all new income is going to the top 1 percent. Last year – just as one example – the top 25 hedge fund managers earned more income than 425,000 public school teachers. Does anybody believe that makes sense? Twenty-five hedge fund managers making more income than 425,000 public school teachers. That gap between the very rich and everybody else is growing wider and wider and wider. The fact is that over the past 40 years, we have witnessed an enormous transfer of wealth from the middle class to the top 1 percent. In other words, what we are seeing in our economy is the Robin Hood principle in reverse. We are taking from the poor and the working families and transferring that income and wealth to the very wealthy. From 1985 to 2013 the share of the nation’s wealth going to the middle class has gone down from 36 percent to less than 23 percent. If the middle class had simply maintained the same share of our nation’s wealth as it did 30 years ago, it would have $10.27 trillion more in cumulative wealth than it does today. Almost $11 trillion would have stayed with the middle class but has disappeared since 1985. But while the middle class continues to shrink, while millions of Americans are working longer hours for low wages, while young people cannot afford to go to college or leave school deeply in debt, while too many kids in this country go hungry, we have seen, since 2009, that the top 1 percent has experienced an $11.5 trillion increase in its wealth. So the top 1 percent in recent years sees an $11.5 trillion increase in wealth, while in roughly the same period the middle class sees a $10.7 trillion decrease in wealth. This $11.5 trillion transfer of wealth from the middle class to the top 1 percent over a five-year period is one of the largest such transfers of wealth in our country’s history. Here is my point. This is not just a moral issue, although it is a profound moral issue – and Pope Francis, by the way, deserves a lot of credit for talking about this issue all over the world. Are we satisfied as a nation when so few have so much and so many have so little? Are we satisfied with the proliferation of millionaires and billionaires, at the same time as we have millions of children living in poverty? Is that what America is supposed to be about? That is the moral component of this debate. But this is not just a moral issue. It is also a fundamental economic issue. As we know, **70 percent of our economy is based on consumer spending. When working people do not have** enough income, **enough disposable income, they are unable to** go out and **buy goods and services** that they would like or that they need. The **so-called job creators** that my Republican friends often refer to **are not** the **CEOs** of the large corporations. The CEOs of large **corporations cannot sell** their **products** or services **unless people have** the **income to buy them**. Someone can come up with the greatest product in the world, but if people do not have the money, they are not going to sell that product, they are not going to hire workers to produce that product. The truth is that the real job creators in this country are those millions of people who every single day go out and purchase goods and services, but **if they do not have adequate income, the entire economy suffers.** There was a very interesting article in the Wall Street Journal, written by Nick Timiraos and Kris Hudson, talking about how a two-tier economy is reshaping the U.S. marketplace. What they talk about is: It is a tale of two economies. Said Glenn Kelman, chief executive of Redfin, a real estate brokerage in Seattle, “There is a high-end market that is absolutely booming. And then there’s everyone in the middle class. They don’t have much hope of wage growth.” The article continues. Indeed, such midtier retailers as J.C. Penney, Sears and Target have slumped. “The consumer has not bounced back with the confidence we were looking for,” Macy’s chief executive Terry Lundgren told investors last fall. So what we are hearing – basically what this article tells us – is if people’s income is going down, they are not going to Macy’s, they are not going to Target. Those stores are not hiring workers or are getting rid of workers because the middle class does not have the income it needs. Here is a very important point. Within President Obama’s recent budget – by the way, I think the President’s budget is beginning to move us in the right direction – there was a very interesting projection that unfortunately got very little attention. Here is the point: Over the last 50 years GDP growth in the United States of America averaged about 3.2 percent. What the President’s budget is suggesting is that more or less over the next 10 years we are going to see 3 percent growth, 2.7, 2.5, 2.3. For the rest of the decade, 2.3 percent. The bottom line is, if we continue along the same type of economic growth we have had over the previous 50 years, unemployment would be substantially lower, people would be paying more taxes, Social Security, among other programs, would be in much stronger shape. The debate we are going to be having in the Budget Committee – I am the ranking member of the Budget Committee – are two very different philosophies. Our Republican friends believe in more austerity for the middle class and working families. Their goal, over a period of months and years, is to cut Social Security, cut Medicare, cut Medicaid, cut nutrition programs for hungry children, not invest in infrastructure, and then give huge tax breaks for millionaires and billionaires. In other words, more austerity for the middle class, tax breaks for the wealthy and large corporations. I believe that philosophy is wrong for many reasons, the most important being that if we want to grow the overall economy, if we want to create jobs, we have to put money into the hands of working people. We do not do that by cutting, cutting, cutting, and imposing more austerity on people who already desperately are hurting. A far more sensible approach is to create the millions of jobs that our country desperately needs by, among other things, investing heavily in our crumbling infrastructure. Last week I introduced legislation that would invest $1 trillion over a 5-year period into rebuilding our crumbling roads and bridges, rail, airports, water systems, wastewater plants. If we do that, we make our country more productive, safer, and create up to 13 million jobs, putting money into the hands of working people. It not only will improve their lives, but they will then go out and spend their money in their communities, creating further economic growth. That is the direction we should be going. We also have to raise wages. **People cannot survive on the starvation** minimum **wage** imposed at the Federal level **of $7.25** an hour. **If we raise the minimum wage** over a period of years **to $15 an hour, we are going to have billions** of dollars go **in**to **the hands of people who need it** the **most**, improve their lives, **allow them to** go out and invest in our economy, **spend money and create jobs.**

Bargaining power is key to solve income inequality

**Gupta 15** Sarita Gupta (executive director of Jobs with Justice). “Protect and Expand Workers’ Ability to Bargain.” Moyers and Company. January 20th, 2015. http://billmoyers.com/2015/01/20/protect-expand-workers-ability-bargain/

**Greedy corporations** have been on a decades-long bender to **take advantage of working people — depressing wages, benefits and job standards, which has led to record inequality** and poverty. At Jobs With Justice, we believe that **fighting poverty requires expanding** and protecting **the ability of workers to bargain with their employers** to demand higher wages, better working conditions and better living standards. As the nature of work changes, we look at collective bargaining through the union workplace campaign lens, but also through nontraditional forms, including legislative, policy, rulemaking and industry-wide interventions that put more money in workers’ pockets and improve standards and conditions for workers. **Only through bargaining do workers have** the **power to directly confront** the **corporate actors behind poverty and inequality**.

Seattle’s model means no job loss.

**Reich 14** Robert Reich (former labor secretary). “Seattle has set the bar for living wages.” Salon. June 8th, 2014. http://www.salon.com/2014/06/08/robert\_reich\_seattle\_is\_leading\_a\_long\_overdue\_movement\_toward\_a\_living\_wage\_partner/

Some worry about job losses accompanying a higher minimum wage. **I wouldn’t advise any place to raise** its minimum wage **immediately** from the current federal minimum of $7.25 an hour **to $15**. That would be too big a leap all at once. **Employers** – especially small ones – **need time to adapt. But this isn’t what Seattle is doing**. It’s raising its minimum from $9.32 (Washington State’s current statewide minimum) to $15 incrementally over several years. Large employers (with over 500 workers) that don’t offer employer-sponsored health insurance have three years to comply; those that offer health insurance have four; smaller employers, up to seven. (That may be too long a phase-in.) My guess is **Seattle’**s businesses **will adapt without** any **net loss of employment**. Seattle’s **employers will** also **have more employees to choose from – as** the **$15** minimum **attracts** into the labor force some **people who otherwise haven’t been interested**. That means **they’ll end up with workers who are highly reliable and likely to stay longer, resulting in real savings**. Research by Michael **Reich** (no relation) **and** Arindrajit **Dube confirm**s **these results**. They examined employment in several hundred pairs of adjacent counties lying on opposite sides of state borders, each with different minimum wages, and found no statistically significant increase in unemployment in the higher-minimum counties, even after four years. (Other researchers who found contrary results failed to control for counties where unemployment was already growing before the minimum wage was increased.) They also found that employee turnover was lower where the minimum was higher.

Scenario A is econ.

Income inequality is the most important internal link to econ decline and also causes political instability.

Harkinson 11 Josh Harkinson (staff reporter). “Study: Income Inequality Kills Economic Growth.” Mother Jones. October 4th, 2011. http://www.motherjones.com/mojo/2011/10/study-income-inequality-kills-economic-growth

Corporate chieftains often claim that fixing the US economy requires signing new free trade deals, lowering government debt, and attracting lots of foreign investment. But a major new study has found that those things matter less than an economic driver that CEOs hate talking about: equality. "Countries where income was more equally distributed tended to have longer growth spells," says economist Andrew Berg, whose study appears in the current issue of Finance & Development, the quarterly magazine of the International Monetary Fund. **Comparing** six major economic variables across the **world's economies, Berg found** that **equality of incomes was the most important factor in preventing** a **major downturn.** (See top chart.) Andrew Berg & Jonathan Ostry Andrew Berg & Jonathan OstryAndrew Berg & Jonathan Ostry In their study, Berg and coauthor Jonathan Ostry were less interested in looking at how to spark economic growth than how to sustain it. "Getting growth going is not that difficult; it's keeping it going that is hard," Berg explains. For example, the bailouts and stimulus pulled the US economy out of recession but haven't been enough to fuel a steady recovery. Berg's research suggests that sky-high income inequality in the United States could be partly to blame. So how important is equality? According to the study, **making** an economy's **income distribution 10 percent more equitable prolongs** its typical **growth** spell **by 50 percent.** In one case study, Berg looked at Latin America, which is historically much more economically stratified than emerging Asia and also has shorter periods of growth. He found that closing half of the inequality gap between Latin America and Asia would more than double the expected length of Latin America's growth spells. Increasing income inequality has the opposite effect: "We find that more inequality lowers growth," Berg says. (See bottom chart.) Berg and Ostry aren't the first economists to suggest that income inequality can torpedo the economy. Marriner Eccles, **the Depression-era chairman of the Federal Reserve** (and an architect of the New Deal), **blamed the Great Crash on the nation's wealth gap.** "A giant suction pump had by 1929-1930 drawn into a few hands an increasing portion of currently produced wealth," Eccles recalled in his memoirs. "In consequence, as in a poker game where the chips were concentrated in fewer and fewer hands, the other fellows could stay in the game only by borrowing. When the credit ran out, the game stopped." Many economists believe a similar process has unfolded over the past decade. **Median wages grew too little** over **the past 30 years** to drive the kind of spending necessary **to sustain the** consumer **economy.** Instead, increasingly **exotic forms of credit filled the gap**, as **the wealthy offered** the middle class **alluring credit card deals and** variable-interest **subprime loans. This allowed rich investors to** keep **mak**ing **money and everyone else to feel like they were keeping up—until the** whole **system imploded.** Income inequality has other economic downsides. Research suggests that unequal societies have a harder time getting their citizens to support government spending because they believe that it will only benefit elites. A population where many lack access to health care, education, and bank loans can't contribute as much to the economy. And, of course, **income inequality goes hand-in-hand with crippling political instability, as we've seen during the Arab Spring** in Tunisia, Egypt, and Libya. History shows that "sustainable reforms are only possible when the benefits are widely shared," Berg says. "We hope that we don't have to relearn that the hard way."

$15/hour pumps 450 billion dollars into the economy and fuels job growth. Also it doesn’t cause outsourcing or automation.

**Hanauer 13** Nick Hanauer (billionaire). “The Capitalist’s Case for a $15 Minimum Wage.” Bloomberg View. June 19th, 2013. http://www.bloombergview.com/articles/2013-06-19/the-capitalist-s-case-for-a-15-minimum-wage

CULTIVATING CONSUMERS Traditionally, arguments for big minimum-wage increases come from labor unions and advocates for the poor. **I make the case as a businessman and entrepreneur** who sees our millions of low-paid workers as customers to be cultivated and not as costs to be cut. Here’s a bottom-line example: My investment portfolio includes Pacific Coast Feather Co., one of the largest U.S. manufacturers of bed pillows. Like many other manufacturers, pillow-makers are struggling because of weak demand. The problem comes down to this: My annual earnings equal about 1,000 times the U.S. median wage, but I don’t consume 1,000 times more pillows than the average American. Even the richest among us only need one or two to rest their heads at night. An economy such as ours that increasingly concentrates wealth in the top 1 percent, and where most workers must rely on stagnant or falling wages, isn’t a place to build much of a pillow business, or any other business for that matter. **Raising** the **minimum wage to $15** an hour **would inject** about **$450 billion into the economy each year. That would give more purchasing power to millions** of poor and lower-middle-class Americans, **and would stimulate buying, production and hiring**. Studies by the Economic Policy Institute show that a $15 minimum wage would directly affect 51 million workers and indirectly benefit an additional 30 million. That’s 81 million people, or about 64 percent of the workforce, and their families who would be more able to buy cars, clothing and food from our nation’s businesses. **This** virtuous cycle effect **is described in the research of** economists David **Card and** Alan **Krueger** (the current chairman of the White House Council of Economic Advisers) showing that, contrary to conventional economic orthodoxy, increases in the minimum wage increase employment. **In 60 percent of** the **states that raised** the **minimum wage during** periods of **high unemployment, job growth was faster than the national average**. Some business people oppose an increase in the minimum wage as needless government interference in the workings of the market. In fact, a big increase would substantially reduce government intervention and dependency on public assistance programs. FEDERAL BENEFITS No one earning the current minimum wage of about $15,000 per year can aspire to live decently, much less raise a family. As a result, almost all workers subsisting on those low earnings need panoply of taxpayer-supported benefits, including the earned income tax credit, food stamps, Medicaid or housing subsidies. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the federal government spent $316 billion on programs designed to help the poor in 2012. That means the current $7.25 minimum wage forces taxpayers to subsidize Wal-Mart Stores Inc. and other large employers, effectively socializing their labor costs. This is great for Wal-Mart and its shareholders, but terrible for America. It is both unjust and inefficient. A higher minimum wage would also make low-income families less dependent on government programs: The CBO report shows that the federal government gives about $8,800 in annual assistance to the lowest-income households but only $4,000 to households earning $35,500, which would be about the level of earnings of a worker making $15 an hour. **An objection** to a significant wage increase **is that it would force employers to shed workers. Yet** the **evidence points the other way: Workers earn** more **and spend more,** increasing demand and **helping businesses grow. Critics** of raising the minimum wage **also say** it will lead to more **outsourcing** and job loss. **Yet virtually all** of these **low-wage jobs are service jobs that can neither be outsourced nor automated**. Raising the earnings of all American workers would provide all businesses with more customers with more to spend. Seeing the economy as Henry Ford did would redirect our country toward a high-growth future that works for all.

US key to the global economy.

Caploe 9 David (CEO of the Singapore-incorporated American Centre for Applied Liberal Arts and Humanities in Asia) “Focus still on America to lead global recovery” April 7th 2009 The Strait Times

IN THE aftermath of the G-20 summit, most observers seem to have missed perhaps the most crucial statement of the entire event, made by United States President Barack Obama at his pre-conference meeting with British Prime Minister Gordon Brown: 'The world has become accustomed to the US being a voracious consumer market, the engine that drives a lot of economic growth worldwide,' he said. 'If there is going to be renewed growth, it just can't be the US as the engine.' While superficially sensible, this view is deeply problematic. To begin with, it ignores the fact that **the global economy has in fact been 'America-centred' for more than 60 years. Countries** - China, Japan, Canada, Brazil, Korea, Mexico and so on - **either sell to the US or they sell to countries that sell to the US**. This system has generally been advantageous for all concerned. America gained certain historically unprecedented benefits, but the system also enabled participating countries - first in Western Europe and Japan, and later, many in the Third World - to achieve undreamt-of prosperity. At the same time, **this** deep **inter-connection** between the US and the rest of the world also **explains how the collapse of a relatively small sector of the** US **economy** - 'sub-prime' housing, logarithmically exponentialised by Wall Street's ingenious chicanery - **has cascaded into the worst global economic crisis since the Great Depression**. To put it simply, Mr Obama doesn't seem to understand that there is no other engine for the world economy - and hasn't been for the last six decades. **If the US does not drive global economic growth, growth is not going to happen.** Thus, US policies to deal with the current crisis are critical not just domestically, but also to the entire world. Consequently, it is a matter of global concern that the Obama administration seems to be following Japan's 'model' from the 1990s: allowing major banks to avoid declaring massive losses openly and transparently, and so perpetuating 'zombie' banks - technically alive but in reality dead. As analysts like Nobel laureates Joseph Stiglitz and Paul Krugman have pointed out, the administration's unwillingness to confront US banks is the main reason why they are continuing their increasingly inexplicable credit freeze, thus ravaging the American and global economies.

Econ decline causes conflict-many statistical analyses.

Royal 10 Jedediah Royal (Director of Cooperative Threat Reduction at the U.S. Department of Defense) “Economic Integration, Economic Signaling and the Problem of Economic Crises” Economics of War and Peace: Economic, Legal and Political Perspectives p. 213-214 2010

Less intuitive is how periods of economic decline may increase the likelihood of external conflict. Political science literature has contributed a moderate degree of attention to the impact of economic decline and the security and defence behaviour of interdependent states. Research in this vein has been considered at systemic, dyadic and national levels. Several notable contributions follow. First, on the systemic level, Pollins (2008) advances Modelski and Thompson's (1996) work on leadership cycle theory, finding that rhythms in the global economy are associated with the rise and fall of a pre-eminent power and the often bloody transition from one pre-eminent leader to the next. As such, exogenous shocks such as economic crises could usher in a redistribution of relative power (see also Gilpin. 1981) that leads to uncertainty about power balances, increasing the risk of miscalculation (Feaver, 1995). Alternatively, even a relatively certain redistribution of power could lead to a permissive environment for conflict as a rising power may seek to challenge a declining power (Werner. 1999). Separately, Pollins (1996) also shows that global economic cycles combined with parallel leadership cycles impact the likelihood of conflict among major, medium and small powers, although he suggests that the causes and connections between global economic conditions and security conditions remain unknown. Second, on a dyadic level, Copeland's (1996, 2000) theory of trade expectations suggests that 'future expectation of trade' is a significant variable in understanding economic conditions and security behaviour of states. He argues that interdependent states are likely to gain pacific benefits from trade so long as they have an optimistic view of future trade relations. However, if the expectations of future trade decline, particularly for difficult to replace items such as energy resources, the likelihood for conflict increases, as states will be inclined to use force to gain access to those resources. Crises could potentially be the trigger for decreased trade expectations either on its own or because it triggers protectionist moves by interdependent states.4 Third, others have considered the link between economic decline and external armed conflict at a national level. Blomberg and Hess (2002) find a strong correlation between internal conflict and external conflict, particularly during periods of economic downturn. They write: The linkages between internal and external conflict and prosperity are strong and mutually reinforcing. Economic conflict tends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn returns the favour. Moreover, the presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which international and external conflicts self-reinforce each other. (Blomberg & Hess, 2002. p. 89) Economic decline has also been linked with an increase in the likelihood of terrorism (Blomberg, Hess, & Weerapana, 2004), which has the capacity to spill across borders and lead to external tensions. Furthermore, crises generally reduce the popularity of a sitting government. "Diversionary theory" suggests that, when facing unpopularity arising from economic decline, sitting governments have increased incentives to fabricate external military conflicts to create a 'rally around the flag' effect. Wang (1996), DeRouen (1995). and Blomberg, Hess, and Thacker (2006) find supporting evidence showing that economic decline and use of force are at least indirectly correlated. Gelpi (1997), Miller (1999), and Kisangani and Pickering (2009) suggest that the tendency towards diversionary tactics are greater for democratic states than autocratic states, due to the fact that democratic leaders are generally more susceptible to being removed from office due to lack of domestic support. DeRouen (2000) has provided evidence showing that periods of weak economic performance in the United States, and thus weak Presidential popularity, are statistically linked to an increase in the use of force. In summary, recent economic scholarship positively correlates economic integration with an increase in the frequency of economic crises, whereas political science scholarship links economic decline with external conflict at systemic, dyadic and national levels.5 This implied connection between integration, crises and armed conflict has not featured prominently in the economic-security debate and deserves more attention.

Escalates to nuke war and extinction.

**Bearden 2k** Lt Col. Beardon, PhD, 2000 http://www.cheniere.org/correspondence/042500%20-%20modified.htm Lt. Col Thomas E. Bearden (retd.) PhD, MS (nuclear engineering), BS (mathematics - minor electronic engineering) Co-inventor - the 2002 Motionless Electromagnetic Generator - a replicated overunity EM generator Listed in Marquis' Who'sWho in America, 2004 The Tom Bearden Website From: Tom Bearden To: (Correspondent) Subj: Zero-Point Energy Date: Original Tue, 25 Apr 2000 12:36:29 -0500 Modified and somewhat updated Dec. 29, 2000

History bears out that desperate nations take desperate actions. **Prior to** the final **economic collapse**, the stress on nations will have increased the intensity and number of their conflicts, to the point where the arsenals of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) now possessed by some 25 nations, are almost certain to be released. As an example, suppose a starving North Korea {[7]} launches nuclear weapons upon Japan and South Korea, including U.S. forces there, in a spasmodic suicidal response. Or suppose a desperate China — whose long-range nuclear missiles (some) can reach the United States — attacks Taiwan. In addition to immediate responses, the mutual treaties involved in such scenarios will quickly draw other nations into the conflict, escalating it significantly. Strategic nuclear studies have shown for decades that, under such extreme stress conditions, once a few nukes are launched, **adversaries** and potential adversaries **are** then **compelled to launch** on **perception of preparations by one's adversary**. The real legacy of the MAD concept is this side of the MAD coin that is almost never discussed. **Without effective defense, the only chance a nation has to survive at all is to launch immediate full-bore pre-emptive strikes** and try to take out its perceived foes as rapidly and massively as possible. As the studies showed, **rapid escalation to full WMD exchange occurs**. Today, a great percent of the WMD arsenals that will be unleashed, are already on site within the United States itself {[8]}. **The resulting great Armageddon will destroy civilization as we know it, and perhaps most of the biosphere**, at least for many decades.

Scenario B is food security.

Income inequality causes famine and societal collapse. We’re close to the brink-policy actions must be taken.

**Motesharrei et al 14** Safa Motesharrei and Eugenia Kalnay (University of Maryland researchers) and Jorge Rivas (University of Minnesota researcher). “Human and nature dynamics (HANDY): Modeling inequality and use of resources in the collapse or sustainability of societies.” Science Direct. May 2014. http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0921800914000615

The scenarios most closely reflecting the reality of our world today are found in the third group of experiments (see the scenarios for an unequal society in Section 5.3), where we introduced economic stratification. Under such conditions, we find that collapse is difficult to avoid, which helps to explain why **economic stratification is** one of the elements **recurrently found in** past **collapsed societies**. Importantly, in the first of these unequal society scenarios, 5.3.1, the solution appears to be on a sustainable path for quite a long time, but even using an optimal depletion rate (δ\*) and starting with a very small number of Elites, the **Elites eventually consume too much, resulting in** a **famine among Commoners that** eventually **causes** the **collapse of society**. It is important to note that this Type-L **collapse is due to** an **inequality-induced famine that causes** a **loss of workers**, rather than a collapse of Nature. Despite appearing initially to be the same as the sustainable optimal solution obtained in the absence of Elites, economic stratification changes the final result: Elites' consumption keeps growing until the society collapses. The Mayan collapse – in which population never recovered even though nature did recover – is an example of a Type-L collapse, whereas the collapses in the Easter Island and the Fertile Crescent – where nature was depleted – are examples of a Type-N collapse. In scenario 5.3.2, with a larger depletion rate, the decline of the Commoners occurs faster, while the Elites are still thriving, but eventually the Commoners collapse completely, followed by the Elites. It is important to note that in both of these scenarios, the **Elites – due to their wealth – do not suffer** the **detrimental effects of** the **environmental collapse until** much **later than** the **Commoners. This** buffer of wealth **allows Elites to continue “business as usual” despite** the **impending catastrophe**. It is likely that this is an important mechanism that would help explain how historical collapses were allowed to occur by elites who appear to be oblivious to the catastrophic trajectory (most clearly apparent in the Roman and Mayan cases). This buffer effect is further reinforced by the long, apparently sustainable trajectory prior to the beginning of the collapse. While some members of society might raise the alarm that the system is moving towards an impending collapse and therefore advocate structural changes to society in order to avoid it, **Elites and their supporters**, who opposed making these changes, **could point to the** long **sustainable trajectory “so far” in support of doing nothing**. The final two scenarios in this set of experiments, 5.3.3 and 5.3.4, are designed to indicate the kinds of policies needed to avoid this catastrophic outcome. They show that, in the context of economic stratification, **inequality must be greatly reduced** and population growth must be maintained below critical levels in order **to avoid** a **societal collapse** (Daly, 2008).

The US is key to global food supplies. Food crises cause war and instability.

**Klare 12** Michael T. Klare is a Five Colleges professor of Peace and World Security Studies, whose department is located at Hampshire College, defense correspondent of The Nation magazine, and author of Resource Wars and Blood and Oil: The Dangers and Consequences of America's Growing Petroleum Dependency (Metropolitan). Klare also teaches at Amherst College, Smith College, Mount Holyoke College, and the University of Massachusetts Amherst. Klare also serves on the boards of directors of Human Rights Watch, and the Arms Control Association. He is a regular contributor to many publications including The Nation, TomDispatch, Mother Jones, and is a frequent columnist for Foreign Policy In Focus. He also was the narrator of the movie, Blood and Oil which was produced by the Media Education Foundation, Professor of peace and world security studies at Hampshire College, As Food Prices Rise, Dangers of Social Unrest Seem Imminent, August 9, 2012.

The Great Drought of 2012 has yet to come to an end, but we already know that its consequences will be severe. With more than one-half of America’s counties designated as drought disaster areas, the 2012 **harvest of** corn, soybeans, and other **food** staples **is guaranteed to fall** far **short of predictions. This**, in turn, **will boost food prices** domestically and abroad, **causing** increased misery for farmers and low-income Americans and far greater **hardship for** poor people in **countries that rely on imported U.S. grain**s. This, however, is just the beginning of the likely consequences: If history is any guide, **rising** food **prices** of this sort **will** also **lead to widespread** social unrest and violent **conflict**. **Food**—affordable food—**is essential to human survival** and well-being. **Take that away,** and **people become** anxious, **desperate**, and angry. In the United States, food represents only about 13 percent of the average household budget, a relatively small share, so a boost in food prices in 2013 will probably not prove overly taxing for most middle—and upper-income families. It could, however, produce considerable hardship for poor and unemployed Americans with limited resources. “You are talking about a real bite out of family budgets,” commented Ernie Gross, an agricultural economist at Omaha’s Creighton University. This could add to the discontent already evident in depressed and high-unemployment areas, perhaps prompting an intensified backlash against incumbent politicians and other forms of dissent and unrest. It is in the international arena, however, that the Great Drought is likely to have its most devastating effects. Because so **many** nations **depend on** grain **imports from the U.S.** to supplement their own harvests, and because intense drought and floods are damaging crops elsewhere as well, food supplies are expected to shrink and prices to rise across the planet. “**What happens to the U.S. supply has immense impact around the world,”** **says** Robert **Thompson, a food expert** at the Chicago Council on Global Affairs. As the crops most affected by the drought, corn and soybeans, disappear from world markets, he noted, the price of all grains, including wheat, is likely to soar, causing immense hardship to those who already have trouble affording enough food to feed their families. The Hunger Games, 2007-2011 What happens next is, of course, impossible to predict, but if the recent past is any guide, it could turn ugly. In 2007-2008, when rice, corn, and wheat experienced prices hikes of 100 percent or more, sharply **higher prices**—especially for bread—**sparked** “food **riots**” **in** more than two dozen countries, including **Bangladesh**, **Cameroon, Egypt, Haiti, Indonesia, Senegal, and Yemen**. In Haiti, the rioting became so violent and public confidence in the government’s ability to address the problem dropped so precipitously that the Haitian Senate voted to oust the country’s prime minister, Jacques-Édouard Alexis. In other countries, angry protestors clashed with army and police forces, leaving scores dead. Those price increases of 2007-2008 were largely attributed to the soaring cost of oil, which made food production more expensive. (Oil’s use is widespread in farming operations, irrigation, food delivery, and pesticide manufacture.) At the same time, increasing amounts of cropland worldwide were being diverted from food crops to the cultivation of plants used in making biofuels. The next price spike in 2010-11 was, however, closely associated with climate change. An intense drought gripped much of eastern Russia during the summer of 2010, reducing the wheat harvest in that breadbasket region by one-fifth and prompting Moscow to ban all wheat exports. **Drought** also **hurt China’s** grain **harvest**, while intense flooding destroyed much of Australia’s wheat crop. Together with other extreme-weather-related effects, these disasters sent wheat prices soaring by more than 50 percent and the price of most food staples by 32 percent. Once again, a surge in food prices resulted in widespread social unrest, this time concentrated in North Africa and the Middle East. The earliest protests arose over the cost of staples in Algeria and then Tunisia, where—no coincidence—the precipitating event was a young food vendor, Mohamed Bouazizi, setting himself on fire to protest government harassment. Anger over rising food and fuel prices combined with long-simmering resentments about government repression and corruption sparked what became known as the Arab Spring. The rising cost of basic staples, especially a loaf of bread, was also a cause of unrest in Egypt, Jordan, and Sudan. Other factors, notably anger at entrenched autocratic regimes, may have proved more powerful in those places, but as the author of Tropic of Chaos, Christian Parenti, wrote, “The initial trouble was traceable, at least in part, to the price of that loaf of bread.” As for the current drought, **analysts are** already **warning of instability in Africa**, where corn is a major staple, **and** of increased popular **unrest in China**, where food prices are expected to rise at a time of growing hardship for that country’s vast pool of low-income, migratory workers and poor peasants.

Best studies point to food conflict.

Brinkman and Hendrix 11 Henk-Jan Brinkman (Chief, Policy, Planning and Application in the Peacebuilding Support Office of the United Nations.) and Cullen S. Hendrix (Assistant Professor, The College of William & Mary, and Fellow, Robert S. Strauss Center for International Security and Law, University of Texas at Austin) “Food Insecurity and Violent Conflict: Causes, Consequences, and Addressing the Challenges” World Food Programme Occasional Paper n° 24 July 2011 <http://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/newsroom/wfp238358.pdf> JW 2/21/15

Among major development organizations, the unchallenged consensus is that war and conflict are development issues: conflict ravages local economies, often leading to forced migration, refugee populations, disease, a collapse of social trust, and acute food insecurity. But is food insecurity itself a cause of conflict? Based on a review of recent research, the answer is a highly qualified yes. Food insecurity, especially when caused by higher food prices, heightens the risk of democratic breakdown, civil conflict, protest, rioting, and communal conflict. The evidence linking food insecurity to interstate conflict is less strong, though there is some historical evidence linking declining agricultural yields to periods of regional conflict in Europe and Asia.

Food wars go nuclear.

**Cribb 14** Julian, “Human extinction: it is possible?” Sydney Morning Herald, Published: April 2, 2014, p. http://www.smh.com.au/comment/human-extinction-it-is-possible-20140402-zqpln.html

However our own behaviour is liable to be a far more immediate determinant of human survival or extinction. Above two degrees – which we have already locked in – the world’s **food harvest is going to become increasingly unreliable**, as the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change warned this week. **That means** mid-century **famines in** places like **India, China, the Middle East and Africa**. But what scientists cannot predict is how humans living in the tropics and subtropics will respond to this form of stress. So let us turn to the strategic and military think tanks, who like to explore such scenarios, instead. The Age of Consequences study by the US Centre for Strategic and International Studies says that under a 2.6 degree rise “nations around the world will be overwhelmed by the scale of change and pernicious challenges, such as pandemic disease. The **internal cohesion** of nations **will be under** great **stress**…as a result of a dramatic rise in migration and changes in agricultural patterns and water availability. The flooding of coastal communities around the world… has the potential to challenge regional and even national identities. **Armed conflict** between nations **over resources**… **is likely and nuclear war is possible**. The social consequences range from increased religious fervour to outright chaos.” Of five degrees – which the world is on course for by 2100 if present carbon emissions continue – it simply says the consequences are "inconceivable". **Eighteen nations** currently **have nuclear weapons** technology or access to it, **raising the stakes on nuclear conflict** to the highest level since the end of the Cold War. At the same time, with more than 4 billion people living in the world’s most vulnerable regions, scope for refugee tsunamis and pandemic disease is also large. It is on the basis of scenarios such as these that scientists like Peter Schellnhuber – **science advisor to German President** Angela Merkel – and Canadian author Gwynne Dyer have **warned of the** potential **loss of most of the human population in the conflicts, famines and pandemics** spinning out of climate impacts. Whether that adds up to extinction or not rather depends on how many of the world’s 20,000 nukes are let off in the process. These issues all involve assumptions about human, national and religious behaviour and are thus beyond the remit of scientific bodies like the IPCC, which can only hint at what they truly think will happen. So you are not getting the full picture from them.

### Adv 2 = Soft Power

US soft power is declining now-economic policy is the key internal link

Fukuyama 14 Francis Fukuyama (Olivier Nomellini Senior Fellow at Stanford’s Freeman Spogli Institute for International Studies, and a member of the Hoover Foreign Policy Working Group on Grand Strategy) “American Power Is Waning Because Washington Won't Stop Quarreling” New Republic March 10th 2014 http://www.newrepublic.com/article/116953/american-power-decline-due-partisanship-washington

The problem as I see it is to define a different way of integrating economics and politics that avoids the exuberant neo-liberalism of the 1990s, while at the same time avoiding a return to growth-undermining populist or redistributive policies. No one to date in the United States or Europe has clearly articulated what such a model would be. It would have to dethrone growth as the single measure of the performance of the economy and raise the priority of employment and even distribution. It would have to define a new, larger role for the state, particularly in the regulation of financial markets. It would need to focus on middle-class employment, and perhaps consider ways of channeling innovation into labor-utilizing innovation. It would explicitly target preservation of a manufacturing base and keeping supply chains geographically close to the United States. Internationally, definition of such a model will be important in maintaining American leadership and “soft power.” re-regulation of the international banking sector is a critical requirement if we are to avoid another financial crisis of the sort we suffered five years ago. But neither domestic stability nor the projection of soft power abroad will be possible without a different approach to economic policy.

Minimum wage increase is key to US soft power. Soft power solves WMD terrorism.

Winkates 7 Jim Winkates (Research Professor at International Affairs Air War College) “Soft Power Contributiosn to U.S. Counterterrorism Strategy” Presented at the International Studies Association Annual MeetingChicago IL March 2nd 2007

External perceptions of policy legitimacy directly enhance a nation’s soft power. Because of domestic and foreign policy choices made by the U.S. government and even private business, America starts out disadvantaged in terms of perceived illegitimacy. The cutting difference is not the “rightness” or “wrongness” of the policy choices; rather it is that U.S. public and private decision selections are often at variance with the larger international community. National policy on capital punishment and gun ownership, for example, put America in a minority of governments on those issues. 15 With only 3% of world population, the U.S. uses nearly 25% of global petroleum supplies and we appear more self-indulgent in refusing to limit production of gas-guzzling vehicles. The U.S. has rejected the scientific validity of global warming, choosing not to sign the Kyoto environmental treaty. America has been very slow in raising the federal minimum wage as inflation has eroded previous income gains. The federal and state governments virtually ignore 43 million citizens who have no medical insurance whatever. Local governments and school systems often sidestep teaching evolution in schools. The corporate world turns a blind eye to extraordinary compensation and retirement packages for chief executive officers, compounded by the near-total loss of many company retirement accounts amid systemic greed, fraud, and embezzlement. The hard edges of capitalism, as practiced in U.S. business circles, diminish employer/employee loyalty and do not provide the “safety nets” common in other advanced industrial cultures to cushion layoffs, insure against major medical problems, and subsidize child care. In the foreign policy arena, the titanic defense of Israel and its settlement policy, the widely perceived indifference to Palestinian suffering, resort to “extraordinary rendition” of suspected terrorists, the persistent and public disparagement of the United Nations, and the preference for unilateral responses to perceived threats take a toll. There is a price to pay in external perceptions of arrogance, selfishness, and inequity that undergird soft power. A key, unstated assumption for the successful reliance on soft power is the resort to multilateral and institutional responses to problem solving. In the current national discussion on foreign policy, the framework of choice is labored by notions of how much unilateralism (US only) versus resort to more multilateralism (allies, coalitions, the UN), what historic US values and interests are at stake, and whether the perceived challenge or threat is more or less amenable to measures short of force and sanction. The unprecedented 9/11 attack on the US has polarized domestic debate over which policy instruments can best respond to anticipated near-term challenges to the proper ethical conduct and efficiency of the world’s lone superpower. The choice of how much hard or soft power to employ commands much time and energy of elected officials, strategic analysts, and indeed among the attentive citizenry. Always lurking in the background of public sentiment is the nostalgic preference for “just leave us alone” and solve your own problems. The optimal policy choice is not between hard and soft power, but rather how much of each to use , how best to employ those instruments, and when and with whom to engage . A concrete template is the set of responses outlined by James A. Thomson, President and CEO of RAND. He argued that in the long term the U.S. must fight the war on terrorism on at least nine fronts: counterproliferation, international cooperation, diplomacy, intelligence, image, police, development assistance; emergency planning, and lastly military power. Excluding the last element, the other eight foci call for the exercise of soft power. 16 His list of policy avenues came within a few months of 9/11. A s Nye further points out, “As for the sword, the United States will continue to need it from time to time in the struggle against terrorism . . . . Maintaining our hard power is essential to security, But we will not succeed by the sword alone.” 17 A cursory recounting of the use of the U. S. military instrument in the past twenty-five years (Lebanon, Grenada, Libya, Panama, Iraq [twice], Somalia, Bosnia, Haiti [twice], Kosovo, Afghanistan, Sudan, Philippines, and Liberia) reveals that overt reliance on military forces in every case has proven inadequate to achieve order and stability. Just as Senator J. William Fulbright, longest serving chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, warned of “the arrogance of power” during America’s Vietnam War, Nye cautioned of the dangers of “triumphalism” even before the euphoria that accompanied the initial US entry into Iraq in March 2003. 18 As he subsequently concluded, Winning the peace is harder than winning a war, and soft power is essential to winning the peace. Yet the way we went to war in Iraq proved to be as costly for our soft power as it was a stunning victory for our hard power. 19 Soft power uses neither threat/use of force nor reward/penalty of money to get others to want what we want in the broadest sense – peace, order, sustained economic development, preservation of human rights, international cooperation, and a world order that allows for diversity of political, economic, and cultural choices that can be accommodated without imposing one’s will on others. If hard power commands, coerces, and induces through the use of force, sanctions, payments, and bribes, soft power uses attraction, co-option, and agenda setting through promotion of institutional values, culture, and policies. Some middle size and smaller states have achieved considerable acceptance globally as niche actors using their soft power to lead by example. Canada (32 million people), for example, has carved out an attractive reputation as a multi-cultural nation that accommodates wide diversity at home and as a leader in international peacekeeping abroad. Three small Scandinavian countries (Norway, 4.5 million; Sweden, 9 million, and Denmark, 5.4 million) have earned plaudits for their consistently high annual per capita contributions in foreign economic aid and development assistance. These countries have acquired and maintained solid reputations over time for their national values and consistency of practice, both of which find considerable appeal in the global community. Nye points out that the soft power of a country derives from three sources: culture (attractive to others); political values (if it lives up to them at home and abroad); and foreign policies (if they are seen as legitimate and possessing of moral authority). 20 He acknowledges the conventional distinction between high culture (literature, art, and education) and popular culture (mass entertainment). The key to soft power success turns on the attractiveness of these elite and popular cultural values to others. 21 Universal versus parochial cultures and themes have more intrinsic appeal. Many foreign publics, even in countries at odds with US policies, have greatly admired US technology, music, movies, and television. Similarly, US universities and colleges have long been magnets for more than half a million international students who study on American campuses annually. 22 The Asian region remains the largest sending sector, accounting for 58% of all U.S. international enrollments. Six of the top ten sending countries are Asian (India, China, Korea, and Japan are the top four sources for international students). 23 No Middle Eastern state ranks in the top ten sending countries. In a recent public lecture, however, the Saudi Ambassador to the United States, Prince Turki Al-Faisal, noted that his country sends about 10,000 students annually to study in U.S. educational institutions. 24 U.S. student visas from the Middle East region understandably have been most reduced since the 9/11 terrorist attacks. Perhaps the most obvious yet underrated element of soft power is the significant advantage offered by the English language in a rapidly globalizing world. One long-time U.S. employee in the English language training field puts it this way: In recognition of the predominance of the English language, desperate parents around the globe are making huge financial sacrifices to provide English language instruction for their children . . . . demand for access to English language training gives the United States enormous leverage . . . . we have something the whole world desperately craves . . . . [Furthermore] English language proficiency is crucial to scientists, businessmen, merchants, doctors, scholars, and other professionals who want to stay abreast of the latest developments in their professions. 25 Language carries culture, values, norms, and ways of thought. The English language has become the world’s lingua franca and offers a pre-eminent vehicle for extending global outreach. US political values of democracy, minority rights, and free expression have acquired near universal appeal. In early 2004 the US Department of State created a new senior post responsible for all US public diplomacy ( the primary thrust is to “tell America’s story abroad”). Margaret Tutwiler in her first public testimony as officer in charge of the new program acknowledged that America’s standing abroad had badly deteriorated, and that “it will take us many years” to restore it. 26 Where those cherished ideals fall short, especially overseas, such as in the cases of prisoner abuses in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Guantanamo, Cuba, US esteem pays a heavy price. Governments can attract or repel international constituencies by their behavior, living up to announced ideals and standards or by failing to do so. Soft power is accrued only over long time intervals, so that observers can judge the measure of a country over time and through successive challenges and change of governments. World public opinion can be forgiving over specific failures if the pattern of attractive performance is mostly sustained over time. So, soft power is hard to accrue and not easily lost. It is also increasingly obvious that the US will need to husband and grow its soft power to maximize the cooperation with others to thwart the long-term challenge of the global terrorist threat. The Changing Nature of Global Threats New post-Cold War threats illustrate that the new enemies are very largely not sovereign states nor their armies, but increasingly failed states, terrorists, local warlords, petty tyrants, ad hoc militias, drug traffickers, organized and transnational crime syndicates, and even cyber outlaws. Unlike the traditional and conventional warfare threats of earlier decades, these new challenges often defy borders, and are characteristically dynamic, diverse, fluid, networked, and often unpredictable. Most cannot be subdued, or even controlled , by a single state , not even the remaining superpower. The more prominent characteristics of contemporary terrorism point to its transnational (not country specific) nature, reflecting loosely organized networks with spin offs and look-a-likes, increasingly inspired by deep religious convictions (mostly but not exclusively Islamist), often millenarian in philosophy (hastening end-of-the-world judgment), aimed to kill as many victims as possible, with some groups seeking weapons of mass destruction, and with victims very indiscriminately targeted (often including their own co-religionists and countrymen).

Terrorism causes extinction.

**Rhodes 9** RICHARD RHODES He has been a visiting scholar at Harvard and MIT, and currently he is an affiliate of the Center for International Security and Cooperation at Stanford University. Rhodes is the author of The Making of the Atomic Bomb (1986), which won the Pulitzer Prize in Nonfiction, National Book Award, and National Book Critics Circle Award. It was the first of four volumes he has written on the history of the nuclear age. Dark Sun: The Making of the Hydrogen Bomb (1995), Arsenals of Folly: The Making of the Nuclear Arms Race (2007), and The Twilight of the Bombs (forthcoming in autumn 2010) are the others. Reducing the nuclear threat: The argument for public safety 14 DECEMBER 2009

The response was very different among nuclear and national security experts when Indiana Republican Sen. Richard Lugar surveyed PDF them in 2005. This group of **85 experts judged that** the **possibility of** a **WMD attack** against a city or other target somewhere in the world **is real and increasing over time**. The median estimate of the risk of a nuclear attack somewhere in the world by 2010 was 10 percent. The risk of an attack by 2015 doubled to 20 percent median. **There was strong**, though not universal, **agreement that** a **nuclear attack is more likely** to be carried out **by a terrorist organization than by a government.** The group was split 45 to 55 percent on whether terrorists were more likely to obtain an intact working nuclear weapon or manufacture one after obtaining weapon-grade nuclear material. "The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction is not just a security problem," Lugar wrote in the report's introduction. "It is the economic dilemma and the moral challenge of the current age. On September 11, 2001, the world witnessed the destructive potential of international terrorism. But the September 11 attacks do not come close to approximating the destruction that would be unleashed by a nuclear weapon. Weapons of mass destruction have made it possible for a small nation, or even a sub-national group, to kill as many innocent people in a day as national armies killed in months of fighting during World War II. "The bottom line is this," Lugar concluded: "For the foreseeable future, the United States and other **nations will face an existential threat** from the intersection of terrorism and weapons of mass destruction." It's paradoxical that a diminished threat of a superpower nuclear exchange should somehow have resulted in a world where the danger of at least a single nuclear explosion in a major city has increased (and that city is as likely, or likelier, to be Moscow as it is to be Washington or New York). We tend to think that a terrorist nuclear attack would lead us to drive for the elimination of nuclear weapons. I think the opposite case is at least equally likely: **A terrorist nuclear attack would almost certainly be followed by a retaliatory nuclear strike** on whatever country we believed to be sheltering the perpetrators. That response would surely **initiat[ing]**e **a new round of nuclear armament** and rearmament in the name of deterrence, however illogical. Think of how much 9/11 frightened us; think of how desperate our leaders were to prevent any further such attacks; think of the fact that we invaded and occupied a country, Iraq, that had nothing to do with those attacks in the name of sending a message.

International credibility solves multiple extinction scenarios.

Nye and Armitage 7 Joseph Nye (Distinguished Service Professor at Harvard, and previous dean of Harvard’s John F. Kennedy School of Government) and Richard Armitage (13th United States Deputy Secretary of State, the second-in-command at the State Department, serving from 2001 to 2005), “CSIS Reports – A Smarter, More Secure America”, 11/6, 2007 http://www.csis.org/component/option,com\_csis\_pubs/task,view/id,4156/type,1/

Soft power is the ability to attract people to our side without coercion. Legitimacy is central to soft power. If a people or nation believes American objectives to be legitimate, we are more likely to persuade them to follow our lead without using threats and bribes. Legitimacy can also reduce opposition to—and the costs of—using hard power when the situation demands. Appealing to others’ values, interests, and preferences can, in certain circumstances, replace the dependence on carrots and sticks. Cooperation is always a matter of degree, and it is profoundly influenced by attraction…The information age has heightened political consciousness, but also made political groupings less cohesive. Small, adaptable, transnational networks have access to tools of destruction that are increasingly cheap, easy to conceal, and more readily available. Although the integration of the global economy has brought tremendous benefits, threats such as pandemic disease and the collapse of financial markets are more distributed and more likely to arise without warning. The threat of widespread physical harm to the planet posed by nuclear catastrophe has existed for half a century, though the realization of the threat will become more likely as the number of nuclear weapons states increases. The potential security challenges posed by climate change raise[s] the possibility of an entirely new set of threats for the United States to consider… States and non-state actors who improve their ability to draw in allies will gain competitive advantages in today’s environment. Those who alienate potential friends will stand at greater risk. China has invested in its soft power to ensure access to resources and to ensure against efforts to undermine its military modernization. Terrorists depend on their ability to attract support from the crowd at least as much

### Framework

The standard is maximizing life.

1. Actor specificity-key to the text of the resolution which is the basis for all burdens-the resolution is a question of government action for which there is no act/omission distinction.

Sunstein Cass Sunstein and Adrian Vermuele, “Is Capital Punishment Morally Required? The Relevance of Life‐Life Tradeoffs,” Chicago Public Law & Legal Theory Working Paper No. 85 (March 2005), p. 17.

The most fundamental point is that unlike individuals, **governments always** and necessarily **face a choice between** or among **possible policies for regulating third parties. The distinction between acts and omissions may not be intelligible in this context,** and even if it is, the distinction does not make a morally relevant difference. Most generally, government is in the business of creating permissions and prohibitions. When it explicitly or implicitly authorizes private action, it is not omitting to do anything or refusing to act. **Moreover, the distinction between authorized and unauthorized private action** – for example, private killing – **becomes obscure when government** formally **forbids private action but chooses a** set of **policy** instruments **that do[es] not** adequately or **fully discourage it.**

If there’s no act/omission-life comes first since its instrumental in pursuing all other values so means based frameworks collapse to the aff. Impacts-A. no skep or presumption-governments are always forced to take some action so deflationary arguments have no impact, B. no generic util indicts-policymakers can act in cases of uncertainty-they still have a general idea.

2. Moral uncertainty means we should preserve life to find ethical truth in the future.

Bostrom Nick Bostrom, 2001 prof of Philosophy, Oxford University Journal of Evolution and Technology, Vol. 9, March 2002. First version: 2001 March, JStor

These reflections on moral uncertainty suggest[s] an alternative, complementary way of looking at existential risk. Let me elaborate. Our present understanding of axiology might well be confused. We may not now know—at least not in concrete detail—what outcomes would count as a big win for humanity; we might not even yet be able to imagine the best ends of our journey. If we are indeed profoundly uncertain about our ultimate aims, then we should recognize that there is a great option value in preserving—and ideally improving—our ability to recognize value and to steer the future accordingly. Ensuring that there will be a future version of humanity with great powers and a propensity to use them wisely is plausibly the best way available to us to increase the probability that the future will contain a lot of value.

3. Empiricism. Morality must be based in empirical facts to avoid infinite regress.

Richards Robert, “A Defense of Evolutionary Ethics,” *Biology and Philosophy*, (1986) 265-293

This brief discussion of justification of ethical principles indicates how the concept of justification must, I believe, be employed. "To justify" means "**to demonstrate that a proposition** or system of propositions **conforms to a set of** acceptable **rules**, a set of acceptable factual propositions, or a set of acceptable practices. The order of justification is from rules to empirical propositions about beliefs and practices. That is, if **rules serving as** inference principles or the rules serving **as premises** (e.g., the Golden Rule) **of a justifying argument are themselves put to the test, then they must** be shown to **conform [to]** either to still **more general rules or** to **empirical propositions** about common beliefs and practices. **Barring an infinite regress, this procedure must end in** what are regarded as acceptable beliefs or **practices**. Aristotle, for instance, justified the forms of syllogistic reasoning by showing that they made explicit the patterns employed in argument by rational men. Kant justified the categorical imperative and the postulates of practical reason by demonstrating, to his satisfaction, that they were the necessary conditions of common moral experience: that is, he justified normative principles by showing that their application to particular cases reproduced the common moral conclusions of 18th century German burgers and Pietists. If this is an accurate rendering of the concept of justification, then the justification of first moral principles and inference rules must ultimately lead to an appeal to the beliefs and practices of [people], **which** of course **is an empirical appeal.** So **moral principles** ultimately **can be justified only by facts.**

The only morally accessible empirical facts are pain and pleasure-we can’t escape the fundamental fact that pleasure feels good and pain feels bad.

Sinhababu Neil (National University of Singapore) "The Epistemic Argument for Hedonism" http://philpapers.org/archive/SINTEA-3

One can form a variety of beliefs **using phenomenal introspection**. For example, one can believe that one is having sound experiences of particular noises and visual experiences of different shades of color. When looking at a lemon and considering the phenomenal states that are yellow experiences, one can form some beliefs about their intrinsic features – for example, that they are bright experiences. And **when considering experiences of pleasure, one can make** some **judgments about their intrinsic features** – for example, that they are good experiences. Just as one can look inward at one's experience of lemon yellow and appreciate its brightness, **one can look inward at one's experience of pleasure and appreciate its goodness.** When I consider **[in] a situation of increasing pleasure, I can form the belief that things are better than they were before**, in the same way I form the belief that there is more brightness in my visual field as lemon yellow replaces black. And when I suddenly experience pain, I can form the belief that things are worse in my experience than they were before. **"Pleasure"** here **refers to the hedonic tone of experience**. Having pleasure consists in one's experience having this hedonic tone. Without descending into metaphor, it is hard to give a further account of what pleasure is like than to say that when one has it, one feels good. As Aaron Smuts writes in defending the view of pleasure as hedonic tone, “to 'feel good' is about as close to an experiential primitive as we get.” Some philosophers, like Fred Feldman, see pleasure as fundamentally an attitude rather than a hedonic tone. But as long **as hedonic tones** – good and bad feelings – **are real components of experience, phenomenal introspection will reveal pleasure's goodness.** Opponents of the hedonic tone account of pleasure usually concede that hedonic tones exist, as Feldman seems to in discussing “sensory pleasures,” which he thinks his view helps us understand. Even on his view of pleasure, phenomenal introspection can produce the belief that some hedonic tones are good while others are bad. **There are many different kinds of pleasant experiences [like]**. There are **sensory pleasures,** like the pleasure of tasting delicious food, receiving a massage, or resting your tired limbs in a soft bed after a hard day. There are the **pleasures of seeing** that **our desires** are **satisfied**, like the **pleasure of winning a game, getting a promotion, or seeing a friend succeed**. These experiences differ in many ways, just as the experiences we have when looking at lemons and the sky on a sunny day differ. It is easy to see the appeal of Feldman's view that pleasures “have just about nothing in common phenomenologically” (79). **But** just as our experiences in looking at lemons and the sky on a sunny day have brightness in common, **pleasant experiences all have “a certain common quality – feeling good,” as Roger Crisp argues** (109). As the analogy with brightness suggests, hedonic tone is phenomenologically very thin, and usually mixed with a variety of other experiences. **Pleasure of any kind feels good, and displeasure of any kind feels bad**. These feelings may or may not have bodily location or be combined with other sensory states like warmth or pressure. “Pleasure” and “displeasure” mean these thin phenomenal states of feeling good and feeling bad. As Joseph Mendola writes, “the pleasantness of physical pleasure is a kind of hedonic value, a single homogenous sensory property, differing merely in intensity as well as in extent and duration, which is yet a kind of goodness” (442).

And, ethical frameworks must be theoretically legitimate-this is a topicality concern.

Overing 13 Bob Overing (TOC 2012 Finalist) “Head to Head: Theoretically Justified Frameworks” November 11th 2013 NSD Update <http://nsdupdate.com/2013/11/11/head-to-head-theoretically-justified-frameworks/> JW 2/20/15

Framework itself is only a subset of a theoretical category we already accept: topicality. It’s about defining the terms for the debate. Debaters have been reading T-Ought for years, but recently John Scoggin and I forwarded a version of the argument we called ‘parameters,’ which makes two claims: 1) any moral framework is an interpretation of the word ought or a similar evaluative term such as morally permissible in the resolution, and 2) any interpretation of a word in the resolution is subject to debate only on theoretical grounds. 1) is obviously true. The use of specific moral terms in the resolution is the only reason the types of frameworks in LD are necessary. If the resolution were “The sky is blue,” ethics would have nothing to do with it. 2) should be intuitive too. When we debate about words in the resolution, we do not appeal to the “truth” of our interpretation; rather, we make arguments about predictable limits or neg ground. Think how ridiculous it would be if the neg ran T-compulsory voting on the September-October 2013 topic, and the aff simply asserted, “but my understanding of compulsory voting is just true.” Such a line of argument would be out of place and insufficient. Before debate occurs, one must prove [their] his/her interpretation of the resolution is appropriate for debate in the first place. This burden has been a part of debate theory for decades and should not be discarded.

My framework defines ought as maximizing life. Prefer this definition:

1. Ground. Every single impact functions under util, whereas other ethics usually flow to one side exclusively. Equal ground access is key to fairness because we both need arguments to win.

2. Topic lit. Most of the articles in minimum wage literature are utilitarian.

Wilhelm 14 William Wilhelm “What Price Dignity?: The ethical side of the minimum wage” May 9th 2014 Hamilton County Business Magazine http://hamiltoncountybusiness.com/price-dignity-ethical-side-minimum-wage/

The minimum wage debate primarily presents arguments based on economic consequences: lost jobs versus reduced poverty, increased consumer spending, reduced government aid, reduced income inequality, and reduced job turnover. This cost-benefit approach focuses on consequences and choosing the action that will produce the greatest good and the least harm for the greatest number of people. While this approach is helpful, it suffers from the weaknesses of fallible measurement and debatable valuations. In other words, how does one measure the harm of half a million lost low-wage jobs versus the benefit of reduced poverty? How does one accurately calculate an incremental value that a higher minimum wage will add to reduced employee turnover?

Topic lit is key because it determines what arguments we can make and how we engage in the topic.

Fairness is a voter since it’s the axiomatic principle of competitive activities.

### EM MAYBE

Use an epistemically modest method of framework evaluation-that’s probability of the moral theory multiplied by the action’s value under the theory if it were true-3 reasons.

1. An ethically modest method of evaluation is most consistent with real world decision making.

Overing and Bistagne 14 Bob Overing (TOC finalist 2012) and Adam Bistagne (triple-major in Philosophy, Economics and Mathematics, coach for Loyola) “Ethical Modesty Part 1” Premier Debate Today August 31st 2014 <http://premierdebatetoday.com/2014/08/31/moral-modesty-part-1-by-bob-overing-and-adam-bistagne/>

First, ethical modesty seems consistent with everyday decision-making. The following example is taken from the dissertation of Andrew Sepielli, now a professor at the University of Toronto: Suppose that I am deciding whether to drink a cup of coffee. I have a degree of belief of .2 that the coffee is mixed with a deadly poison, and a degree of belief of .8 that it’s perfectly safe. If I act on the hypothesis in which I have the highest credence, I’ll drink the coffee. But this seems like a bad call. A good chance of coffee isn’t worth such a significant risk of death – at least, not if I assign commonsensical values to coffee and death, respectively.[1] It’s hard to argue that confidence gets it right here. We should think similarly when deliberating about normative theories. Employing some social-contract theory, we might think that the United States government should take only Constitutional action; however, some Constitutional violation might be permissible to protect a large city from a terrorist attack even if we care less about utilitarian reasons.

2. Letting the aff weigh the plan is key to structural reciprocity.

Overing and Bistagne 2 Bob Overing (TOC finalist 2012) and Adam Bistagne (triple-major in Philosophy, Economics and Mathematics, coach for Loyola) “Ethical Modesty Part 1” Premier Debate Today August 31st 2014 <http://premierdebatetoday.com/2014/08/31/moral-modesty-part-1-by-bob-overing-and-adam-bistagne/>

That’s all well and good but why should we adopt it in debate? Ethical modesty might remedy a lot of the fairness concerns with frameworks. Necessary/insufficient burdens, skepticism, and unturnable cases lose their force when the criterion is no longer all-or-nothing. Those arguments create reciprocity problems precisely because they exclude the opponent’s offense. Under a frame of ethical modesty, they would not be exclusive; the aff can weigh its offense. Status quo LD framework debate incentivizes finding frameworks that heavily favor one side such that winning the criterion is sufficient to vote. More reasonable, inclusive frameworks are crowded out in favor of more unfair ones. For instance, a deontological framework is a predictable, reasonable framework, but ethical confidence makes it much more likely to create structural unfairness. If the neg defends a narrow conception of deontology, a strong act/omission distinction, that perfect duties strictly precede imperfect duties, and that any risk of a violation of the standard is sufficient to negate, aff offense under the neg framework is effectively impossible. These arguments alone are not problematic, however. If the aff can weigh the advantages of the plan even when the framework debate favors the neg, then the aff still has options. Modesty makes the strength of the aff impacts matter at the end of the day. Perhaps such a method of evaluation will help the time-pressured 1AR beat back neg layering strategies without resorting to theory arguments.

3. Modesty causes innovative framework debates.

Overing and Bistagne 3 Bob Overing (TOC finalist 2012) and Adam Bistagne (triple-major in Philosophy, Economics and Mathematics, coach for Loyola) “Ethical Modesty Part 1” Premier Debate Today August 31st 2014 <http://premierdebatetoday.com/2014/08/31/moral-modesty-part-1-by-bob-overing-and-adam-bistagne/>

Ethical modesty might also encourage LDers to make multiple kinds of moral arguments in a given round. For instance, instead of defending utilitarianism to the death, a debater might also forward rights-based or contract-based reasons. This model would be a less dogmatic form of framework debating that largely reflects how applied philosophy is done. When thinking about abortion, drone strikes, or physician-assisted suicide, a comprehensive analysis would include justification from a variety of moral perspectives. Additionally, with more frameworks in any given debate, the cost to introducing an ethical principle would be much lower since a debater would have others to fall back on. If a framework can be ‘kicked’ at little strategic loss, debaters might be more willing to ditch their tired framework backfiles in favor of more innovative strategies. Ethical modesty might inject some life into deont vs. util debates that have largely characterized even the best framework debates in LD for some time.

Education is a voter since it’s the portable purpose of debate. Fairness is a voter since debate is a competitive activity so no debater ought to have an advantage.

### Underview

First, neg abuse outweighs aff abuse-neg won 66% of outrounds at VBT proving you have the advantage.

Second, T is an RVI for the aff if I win a counter interp-the nature of T makes it a NIB since it’s a layer before theory and the neg doesn’t have to be topical so I can’t turn it-outweighs other disads to the RVI since it’s intrinsic the structure of theory and not a side effect or substantive abuse.

Third, the role of the ballot is to evaluate the aff policy action. Acting like policymakers is educational.

Shaw PEDAGOGY IN INTERNATIONAL STUDIES Using Role-Play Scenarios in the IR Classroom: An Examination of Exercises on Peacekeeping Operations and Foreign Policy Decision Making CAROLYN M. SHAW Wichita State University 2004

The use of role-playing in the classroom provides an alternative method for presenting course materials in contrast to lecturing. Although some materials can be conveyed well through an oral presentation, many concepts in international relations only become less abstract when the student can apply them directly or experience them personally (Preston, 2000). ‘‘To the extent that they engage in constructing new knowledge or reconstructing given information, rather than simply memorizing it, they gain a deeper understanding’’ (King, 1994:16). Merryfield and Remy (1995:8) similarly note that ‘‘students master content not only by being exposed to information through readings and lectures...but also by engaging in a reflective process in which they make the information their own by evaluating and using it.’’ Since class trips abroad are beyond the scope of most courses, simulations can be used to place students in a unique international context or position which they would otherwise be unable to experience, and give them the opportunity to gain a deeper understanding of the material. One challenge that instructors face is the trade-off in terms of coverage of material and the time it takes to conduct an active learning exercise. Such exercises usually take more time than covering the same materials in lecture format (Boyer et al., 2000:4). The key to using role-playing effectively without sacrificing too much content is to plan the exercise carefully to provide interactive examples of the course materials. Frequently this can be done in coordination with a preparatory lecture. The concepts can be introduced prior to the exercise, and then participation in the exercise provides the students with concrete examples of more abstract theories and ideas presented in the lecture. For example, when learning about the bureaucratic politics model of foreign policy decision making, students are often frustrated that the government actors involved cannot simply ‘‘reach a consensual agreement and do what’s best for our country.’’ By actually taking on the roles of the different agencies involved in foreign policy making, students begin to understand the underlying conflicts between these actors and the challenge of clearly defining what is in our ‘‘national interest.’’

## T Stuff

It’s also a living wage.

**Pyke 14** Alan Pyke (deputy economic policy editor). “How A Millionaire, A Socialist, And Some Taco Bell Workers Brought A Living Wage To Seattle.” ThinkProgress. June 5th, 2014. http://thinkprogress.org/economy/2014/06/05/3445102/seattle-minimum-wage-deal-socialist-millionaire-workers/

“Everyone understood the mayor had committed to this policy on the campaign trail,” Rolf said. “The other three things that happened that created a huge amount of momentum for this were a wave of very successful fast food strikes beginning last May in Seattle, the **passage of the Seatac living wage ballot initiative** … and then the surprise election of a socialist city councilwoman who ran on a single-issue $15 platform.” “Those three things **created** a sense of **civic momentum** that said this thing’s leaving the station, you’re either on you’re not.” Where Do We Go From Here Ask four members of Seattle’s Income Inequality Advisory Committee how to make their successful minimum wage deal transferable to other parts of the country, and you’ll get four different answers. But the suggestions overlap one another, sketching an outline of what needs to happen in other cities and states to make something as dramatic as a $15 minimum wage possible. “We could have a really interesting beer over this,” the business-side co-chair Howard Wright said in response to the question of how to transport Seattle’s win elsewhere. For Wright, it comes down to political geography: “I would suggest that Boston, Chicago, Seattle, and San Francisco would be more open to this concept. I would suggest that perhaps Dallas Fort-Worth, Oklahoma, and other places might not be so open to this,” he said, chuckling. Even in Washington state, on the other side of the Cascades range that divides the urban from the rural, “I don’t think this would even grab traction there.” “**You shouldn’t** be **ask**ing **for fifty cents, you should** be **ask**ing **for five bucks**. That gets people’s attention.” Wright praised the process the mayor created as one that let all sides feel invested in doing something extraordinary, despite his reservations about the magnitude of the wage hike. The other men echoed those accolades for the IIAC’s work. “’Compromise’ doesn’t do justice to the result we got,” venture capitalist Hanauer said. “It wasn’t that we just split the baby, it was that we collectively thought through the problem” and forged “a civic solution that no one probably would’ve come up with individually on their own.” But to Hanauer, places like Dallas or eastern Washington or anywhere else are opportunities to revolutionize how Americans think about how the economy works. “It’s a pretty progressive place,” he said, and “we’re generally a little bit ahead of the curve. But I will tell you that while other places may not be as progressive as we are, when we enact this law and our state does not slide into the ocean, that will make it easier for people to be like ‘well, fuck, why shouldn’t we do that?’” People “look at the $27 billion in profit Walmart makes every year and they celebrate without connecting it to the fact that Walmart workers are the biggest recipients of food stamps in the country and are all in poverty,” Hanauer went on, “That’s on us. People don’t know that. But if you say to them, look we can live in a world where Walmart made $17 billion in profit and each one of the million lowest-paid Walmart workers would earn $10,000 more a year and none of them would be in poverty and all of them would be able to buy more stuff from your business, and by the way, you don’t have to pay food stamps now, and everybody’s gonna be better off? Then they’re like, ‘Oh, shit, we should do that!’” Rather than simply wait for Seattle’s good example to dispel the witchcraft around minimum wage hikes and economic growth, Hanauer urges progressives to get bolder. “You shouldn’t be asking for fifty cents, you should be asking for five bucks. That gets people’s attention.” Once you have their attention, the key is to present a different model for how to create prosperity. “Progresives have been so boxed-in by trickle-down economics,” Hanauer said, deriding the past generation of progressive economic arguments as “trickle-down lite.” **Over** the **several months of organizing and persuasion** work that set the stage **for Seattle’s victory**, “we weren’t out making social justice arguments, **we were saying if we pay people a living wage then they can afford to shop** in the businesses **in our city and we won’t have to support** the **poverty programs that they now** all **live on**. So that is a completely different argument than what progressives have advanced for 30 years, which is ‘Ohh, I feel so sorry for those people, we should help them!’