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#### TPA will pass with Obama’s capital---key to the trade agenda and the Asia pivot

MarketWatch 2-17

“Opinion: Stronger commitment could win bipartisan votes in Congress,” 2/17/14, <http://www.truthabouttrade.org/2014/02/19/obamas-half-hearted-effort-on-trade-deals-not-enough/>

Congressional Republicans generally favor freer trade and their support is vital for TPA to win. Experts say with decisive leadership the president could still build a winning bipartisan coalition. But as yet it isn’t happening. Gary Hufbauer, trade specialist at Washington’s Peterson Institute for International Economics, says in order for trade deals to get done the president needs TPA this spring, preferably before his April visit to Japan, South Korea, the Philippines and Malaysia. That delayed visit is intended to solidify the administration’s pivot to Asia, of which TPP, the Trans-Pacific Partnership, is the centerpiece. TPP would broaden market access and promote trade by standardizing disparate regulations on hundreds of products and services. The negotiations involving 12 Asia and Pacific nations are well advanced but the sensitive issues like opening up Japan’s rice market, say trade experts, won’t be put on the table without the U.S. administration having fast track. Japan’s reformist Prime Minister Shinzo Abe favors TPP as he views trade liberalization as a vital component of the structural reforms he is championing to boost Japan’s competitiveness against a rising China. The U.S. and Japan are the major players in TPP but South Korea is considering joining and the door is open for China to eventually join. TPP negotiators meet in Singapore on Feb. 22 and in the best-case scenario a deal could be struck soon thereafter. Michael Froman, the White House trade negotiator, says Obama is fully committed to both TTIP and TPP. Republicans and trade analysts doubt it. This year marks the 20th anniversary of NAFTA, the North American Free Trade Agreement, the last major trade liberalization measure to become law. Popular in Canada and Mexico, NAFTA remains fiercely controversial here and is loathed in the Rust Belt. Sold by Bush 41, who negotiated it and by Bill Clinton who signed it, as a job creation measure, its promise is unfulfilled. Twenty years afterwards there is still no consensus on NAFTA’s impact on U.S. jobs.Carla Hills, the U.S. NAFTA negotiator, points to Federal Reserve data showing a net job gain. Democrats and the AFL-CIO say nonsense. They claim that at least half a million manufacturing jobs have been lost to Mexico. They blame NAFTA for hollowing out Rust Belt cities and holding down U.S. wages that have been stagnant for a decade. Clyde Prestowitz, a Reagan administration official and trade policy maverick, says U.S. jobs will be lost under TPP just as they were with NAFTA and a smaller free trade deal with South Korea. “TPP,” says Prestowitz, “isn’t about trade, it’s about monopoly control.” He complains that TPP is being negotiated in secret with only U.S. corporate leaders privy to its provisions. Mack McLarty, President Clinton’s chief of staff until 1994, recently told a Washington forum that, “passing NAFTA was a very close call.” It required, he said, close bipartisan cooperation and extensive arm-twisting by the president. “We took Carla Hills’s advice,” he said, “of having every NAFTA proponent call five members of Congress to assure a yes vote.” Read McLarty’s op-ed in the WSJ. In today’s acrimonious milieu, it’s hard to envisage that kind of bipartisanship. Assuming the president gets TPA — a heroic assumption — will he emulate Bill Clinton and fight for TPP and perhaps TTIP in 2015? Some trade analysts, including Fred Bergsten and Jeffrey Schott, say yes. They argue that after the mid-term elections an administration short on big achievements will turn to freer trade with Europe and Asia as a positive and durable legacy of the Obama presidency. The jury is out and the debate is only now beginning. One by one the president will have to win the battle of the acronyms. And without vocal, decisive presidential leadership, even the first — TPA — is unlikely to be won.

#### PC is key—failure guts economy, leadership, trade deals

Thomas F. Mack, former Chief of Staff for President Clinton and Nelson W. Cunningham, “A Critical Test of Leadership,” HUFFINGTON POST, 2—2—14, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/thomas-f-mclarty/a-critical-test-of-leader\_b\_4705623.html

In his State of the Union address last week, President Obama took a good first step in asking Congress to provide the tools he needs to close two of the most ambitious trade deals in U.S. history. But he faces an immediate challenge from within his party that could imperil negotiations, with huge stakes for the U.S. globally and for our economy at home. At issue is Trade Promotion Authority (TPA), which allows the president to send a trade agreement to Congress for an up-or-down vote, without amendments. Many Republicans reflexively oppose granting any request from the administration. But the biggest opposition is coming from Democrats skeptical of the value of free trade. The day after the president's address, Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid said he opposed "fast track" authority. His remarks revealed the depth of a gulf among Democrats over trade, and sparked new criticism from Republicans as a sign that the president's party couldn't be lined up behind a major administration initiative. For President Obama, this is a critical test of his leadership. Can he muster enough support for his trade agenda within his own party, and then assemble a bipartisan majority in both houses of Congress? Failure would be a great setback for U.S. prestige internationally, and a dismal signal for the president's remaining three years in office. We've seen this movie before -- and it didn't end well. The last Democratic president to seek fast track authority on trade was Bill Clinton in 1997. The effort collapsed when then House Speaker Newt Gingrich was unable to marshal his Republican majority. It was an opportunity lost, ending a period of bipartisan cooperation on trade and stalling momentum created a few years earlier by the North American Free Trade Agreement. Repeating this history would be a mistake, especially as our economy struggles to create good jobs at high wages. But the president faces an uphill battle. Now is the moment for Democrats to pause and take full measure of the stakes involved in opposing fast track. It's time for Republican supporters of trade to rally. And it is essential that the president and his cabinet exert persistent, focused leadership to persuade the skeptics. President Obama deserves much credit for advancing the most far-reaching trade agenda in a generation. The administration is nearing the finish line in negotiations of the Trans Pacific Partnership, an agreement with 11 Pacific Rim nations, including Japan and perhaps South Korea and others. Simultaneous talks are underway between the United States and the European Union over the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership -- creating an economic NATO and the largest liberalized trade zone in the world. Together, the agreements would lower barriers in markets accounting for more than 60 percent of the global economy. Neither negotiation would survive a failure to renew Trade Promotion Authority, which expired in 2007. TPA reassures our negotiating partners that they will not agree to difficult concessions only to see Congress later force unilateral changes. Under TPA, Congress establishes negotiating goals and must be regularly consulted by the president. In exchange, Congress promises an up-or-down vote without amendment. No major trade legislation has passed Congress in decades without it. President Clinton knew that because trade was so hard, its support had to be bipartisan. To push for NAFTA, he assembled a high-profile war room in the White House, led by a prominent Democrat, Bill Daley, and former Republican Congressman Bill Frenzel. The president worked members tirelessly. The bill eventually passed with 102 Democratic and 132 Republican votes, and a similarly bipartisan total in the Senate. By contrast, the 1997 effort to renew fast-track authority lacked that high-profile White House push -- helping seal its doom. Over the last decades, global trade has proven essential to building employment and reducing inequality at home. One of every five jobs in the United States is tied to exports. More significantly for the long run, 95 percent of the world's customers live outside our borders. While many Americans have concerns about free trade, they say the benefits of U.S. involvement in the global economy outweigh the risks (by a 2-1 margin in a poll last month by the Pew Research Center). Even so, last fall 151 House Democrats signed a letter expressing their opposition to granting President Obama Trade Promotion Authority. Almost three dozen House Republicans followed suit. When the bill to renew TPA was introduced earlier this month, a number of Democratic Senators announced their opposition. They have now been joined by Sen. Reid. The warning signs are clear, but so is the path forward. Now is the time for a full-court press from the White House. President Obama should be clear about the imperative of TPA and make the strong case for trade as a catalyst for job growth. Then he must press his cabinet to the task. Ambassador Froman is a skilled negotiator and advocate. His cabinet colleagues include many effective proponents of free trade and international engagement, including Secretary of State John Kerry, Treasury Secretary Jack Lew, and Commerce Secretary Penny Pritzker. Without a concerted effort, TPA may well fail, embarrassing us abroad, casting a shadow on the president's second term and hurting our economy in the long run. Why not instead show America and the world that the president and Congress, including leaders of his own party, can work together?

#### Heg prevents extinction

Thomas P.M. Barnett**,** chief analyst, Wikistrat, “The New Rules: Leadership Fatigue Puts U.S. and Globalization, at Crossroads,” WORLD POLITICS REVIEW, 3—7—11, www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/8099/the-new-rules-leadership-fatigue-puts-u-s-and-globalization-at-crossroads

Events in Libya are a further reminder for **Americans** that we **stand at a crossroads in our continuing evolution as the** world's sole full-service **superpower.** Unfortunately, we are increasingly seeking change without cost, and shirking from risk because we are tired of the responsibility. We don't know who we are anymore, and our president is a big part of that problem. Instead of leading us, he explains to us. Barack Obama would have us believe that he is practicing strategic patience. But many experts and ordinary citizens alike have concluded that he is actually beset by strategic incoherence -- in effect, a man overmatched by the job. It is worth first examining the larger picture: We live in a time of arguably the greatest structural change in the global order yet endured, with this historical moment's most amazing feature being its relative and absolute lack of mass violence. That is something to consider when Americans contemplate military intervention in Libya, because if we do take the step to prevent larger-scale killing by engaging in some killing of our own, we will not be adding to some fantastically imagined global death count stemming from the ongoing "megalomania" and "evil" of American "empire." We'll be engaging in the same sort of system-administering activity that has marked our stunningly successful stewardship of global order since World War II. Let me be more blunt: **As the guardian of globalization, the U.S. military has been the greatest force for peace the world has ever known. Had America been removed from the global dynamics** that governed the 20th century, the mass murder never would have ended. Indeed, it's entirely conceivable **there would now be no** identifiable **human civilization left, once nuclear weapons entered the killing equation. But the world did not keep sliding down** that path of **perpetual war**. Instead**, America** stepped up and **changed everything by ushering in** our now-perpetual **great-power peace. We introduced** the international liberal trade order known as **globalization** and played loyal Leviathan over its spread. **What resulted was the collapse of empires, an explosion of** **democracy**, the **persistent spread of** **human rights, the liberation of women, the doubling of life expectancy, a roughly 10-fold increase in adjusted global GDP and a profound and persistent reduction in battle deaths from state-based conflicts.** That is what American "hubris" actually delivgered. Please remember that the next time some TV pundit sells you the image of "unbridled" American military power as the cause of global disorder instead of its cure. With self-deprecation bordering on self-loathing, we now imagine a post-American world that is anything but. Just watch who scatters and who steps up as the Facebook revolutions erupt across the Arab world. While we might imagine ourselves the status quo power, we remain the world's most vigorously revisionist force. As for the sheer "evil" that is our military-industrial complex, again, let's examine what the world looked like before that establishment reared its ugly head. The last great period of global structural change was the first half of the 20th century, a period that saw a death toll of about 100 million across two world wars. That comes to an average of 2 million deaths a year in a world of approximately 2 billion souls. Today, with far more comprehensive worldwide reporting, researchers report an average of less than 100,000 battle deaths annually in a world fast approaching 7 billion people. Though admittedly crude, these **calculations suggest a 90 percent absolute drop and a 99 percent relative drop in deaths due to war**. We are clearly headed for a world order characterized by multipolarity, something the American-birthed system was designed to both encourage and accommodate. But given how things turned out the last time we collectively faced such a fluid structure, we would do well to keep U.S. power, in all of its forms, deeply embedded in the geometry to come. To continue the historical survey, after salvaging Western Europe from its half-century of civil war, the U.S. emerged as the progenitor of a new, far more just form of globalization -- one based on actual free trade rather than colonialism. America then successfully replicated globalization further in East Asia over the second half of the 20th century, setting the stage for the Pacific Century now unfolding.

### 2nc Heg impact o/v

#### leadership is key to global stability and preventing great power wars

Yuhan Zhang, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, and Lin Shi, Columbia University, “America’s Decline: A Harbinger of Conflcit and Rivalry,” EAST ASIA FORUM, 1—22—11, <http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2011/01/22/americas-decline-a-harbinger-of-conflict-and-rivalry/>

This does not necessarily mean that the US is in systemic decline, but it encompasses a trend that appears to be negative and perhaps alarming. Although the US still possesses incomparable military prowess and its economy remains the world’s largest, the once seemingly indomitable chasm that separated America from anyone else is narrowing. Thus, the global distribution of power is shifting, and the inevitable result will be a world that is less peaceful, liberal and prosperous, burdened by a dearth of effective conflict regulation. Over the past two decades, no other state has had the ability to seriously challenge the US military. Under these circumstances, motivated by both opportunity and fear, **many actors have bandwagoned with US hegemony** and accepted a subordinate role. Canada, most of Western Europe, India, Japan, South Korea, Australia, Singapore and the Philippines have all joined the US, **creating a status quo that has tended to mute great power conflicts**. However, **as** the **hegemony** that drew these powers together **withers,** so will the pulling power behind the US alliance. **The result will be an** international **order where power is more diffuse,** American interests and influence can be more readily challenged, **and conflicts or wars may be harder to avoid. As history attests, power decline and redistribution result in military confrontation.** For example, in the late 19th century America’s emergence as a regional power saw it launch its first overseas war of conquest towards Spain. By the turn of the 20th century, accompanying the increase in US power and waning of British power, the American Navy had begun to challenge the notion that Britain ‘rules the waves.’ Such a notion would eventually see the US attain the status of sole guardians of the Western Hemisphere’s security to become the order-creating Leviathan shaping the international system with democracy and rule of law. Defining this US-centred system are three key characteristics: enforcement of property rights, constraints on the actions of powerful individuals and groups and some degree of equal opportunities for broad segments of society. As a result of such political stability, free markets, liberal trade and flexible financial mechanisms have appeared. And, with this, many countries have sought opportunities to enter this system, proliferating stable and cooperative relations. However, what will happen to these advances as America’s influence declines? Given that America’s authority, although sullied at times, has benefited people across much of Latin America, Central and Eastern Europe, the Balkans, as well as parts of Africa and, quite extensively, Asia, the answer to this question could affect global society in a profoundly detrimental way. Public imagination and academia have anticipated that **a post-hegemonic world would return to** the problems of the 1930s: **regional blocs, trade conflicts and strategic rivalry.** Furthermore, multilateral institutions such as the IMF, the World Bank or the WTO might give way to regional organisations. For example, Europe and East Asia would each step forward to fill the vacuum left by Washington’s withering leadership to pursue their own visions of regional political and economic orders. **Free markets would become more politicised — and, well, less free — and major powers would compete for supremacy.** Additionally, such power plays have historically possessed a zero-sum element. In the late 1960s and 1970s, US economic power declined relative to the rise of the Japanese and Western European economies, with the US dollar also becoming less attractive. And, as American power eroded, so did international regimes (such as the Bretton Woods System in 1973). **A world without American hegemony is one where great power wars re-emerge,** the liberal international system is supplanted by an authoritarian one, and trade protectionism devolves into restrictive, anti-globalisation barriers. This, at least, is one possibility we can forecast in a future that will inevitably be devoid of unrivalled US primacy.

#### TPA vital to global trade momentum

Robert Zoellick, President, World Bank and former USTR, Payoff from the World Trade Agenda, Peterson Institute for International Economics, 6—14—13, <http://www.piie.com/publications/papers/transcript-20130614.pdf>

Robert Zoellick: Yeah. Well, I guess I’ll expand on some of the remarks I made at the close. Well sometimes people like big bang concepts; that it all gets done at once. My experience is that you try to get some wins, you kind of start to build momentum; you show that it’s real, but you need to combine it with, particularly in representing the United States, a broader strategy where you’re trying to go. You need to try to explain the types of interconnections that I was describing today. So I hope that Mike or his counterparts, as they pursue the elements the president has set out, include a global agenda as well as the TTIP and the TPP and frankly look for bilateral steps that they can use. As I’ve said, the strategic economic dialogue with China could have some opportunities here. But then they explain what they’re doing and explain to the world and frankly, this will require a little diplomacy, you could start to make some early moves that show that it’s real. So again, to give you sort of a historical comparison, after the breakdown in Cancun, those of you that are the scholars of this will recall that—I kind of use the story of the FT, a letter to all of the WTO people and a trip around the world, as sort of a symbolic way of trying to reframe the issue. So it’s a combination of substance and positioning, which you have to be in international politics. So the challenge is not just to get lost in the negotiating details, you have to know that, but you have to frame this. And then what I would look for ways on the agenda where I could show that we’re getting something done. Now one possibility is the trade promotion authority. That would show a great sense of momentum. Now it’ll be messy and everybody will want to throw everything into it and so on and so forth.But that’s in some ways a signaling system and if you get it done, it show—and I believe you can get it done. You’ve got more interest on this than a bipartisan fashion than the other items—that would show momentum. The points in this paper about the Bali meeting. People are skeptical but if the United States set out this strategy and then you started to get a couple of these things done in Bali, that would show that things can be done. What I’ve encountered is the world has lots of critics and analysts and naysayers and so and so forth, and that’s the way in which we have a live debate and they’re always going to be out there and most vocal and those who are a little bit wary of following, those that are a little cautious, those who don’t quite have the same political will, they’re going to step back until they see something happening, but I think if you start to move some of these issues globally, you can start to get some other allies.

#### Interdependence is the vital conflict dampener—trade collapse makes all conflicts more likely

Panzner 8 Michael, faculty at the New York Institute of Finance, 25-year veteran of the global stock, bond, and currency markets who has worked in New York and London for HSBC, Soros Funds, ABN Amro, Dresdner Bank, and JPMorgan Chase “Financial Armageddon: Protect Your Future from Economic Collapse,” pg. 136-138

Continuing calls for curbs on the flow of finance and trade will inspire the United States and other nations to spew forth protectionist legislation like the notorious Smoot-Hawley bill. Introduced at the start of the Great Depression, it triggered a series of tit-for-tat economic responses, which many commentators believe helped turn a serious economic downturn into a prolonged and devastating global disaster. But if history is any guide, those lessons will have been long forgotten during the next collapse. Eventually, fed by a mood of desperation and growing public anger, restrictions on trade, finance, investment, and immigration will almost certainly intensify. Authorities and ordinary citizens will likely scrutinize the cross-border movement of Americans and outsiders alike, and lawmakers may even call for a general crackdown on nonessential travel. Meanwhile, many nations will make transporting or sending funds to other countries exceedingly difficult. As desperate officials try to limit the fallout from decades of ill-conceived, corrupt, and reckless policies, they will introduce controls on foreign exchange. Foreign individuals and companies seeking to acquire certain American infrastructure assets, or trying to buy property and other assets on the cheap thanks to a rapidly depreciating dollar, will be stymied by limits on investment by noncitizens. Those efforts will cause spasms to ripple across economies and markets, disrupting global payment, settlement, and clearing mechanisms. All of this will, of course, continue to undermine business confidence and consumer spending. In a world of lockouts and lockdowns, any link that transmits systemic financial pressures across markets through arbitrage or portfolio-based risk management, or that allows diseases to be easily spread from one country to the next by tourists and wildlife, or that otherwise facilitates unwelcome exchanges of any kind will be viewed with suspicion and dealt with accordingly. The rise in isolationism and protectionism will bring about ever more heated arguments and dangerous confrontations over shared sources of oil, gas, and other key commodities as well as factors of production that must, out of necessity, be acquired from less-than-friendly nations. Whether involving raw materials used in strategic industries or basic necessities such as food, water, and energy, efforts to secure adequate supplies will take increasing precedence in a world where demand seems constantly out of kilter with supply. Disputes over the misuse, overuse, and pollution of the environment and natural resources will become more commonplace. Around the world, such tensions will give rise to full-scale military encounters, often with minimal provocation. In some instances, economic conditions will serve as a convenient pretext for conflicts that stem from cultural and religious differences. Alternatively, nations may look to divert attention away from domestic problems by channeling frustration and populist sentiment toward other countries and cultures. Enabled by cheap technology and the waning threat of American retribution, terrorist groups will likely boost the frequency and scale of their horrifying attacks, bringing the threat of random violence to a whole new level. Turbulent conditions will encourage aggressive saber rattling and interdictions by rogue nations running amok. Age-old clashes will also take on a new, more heated sense of urgency. China will likely assume an increasingly belligerent posture toward Taiwan, while Iran may embark on overt colonization of its neighbors in the Mideast. Israel, for its part, may look to draw a dwindling list of allies from around the world into a growing number of conflicts. Some observers, like John Mearsheimer, a political scientist at the University of Chicago, have even speculated that an “intense confrontation” between the United States and China is “inevitable” at some point. More than a few disputes will turn out to be almost wholly ideological. Growing cultural and religious differences will be transformed from wars of words to battles soaked in blood. Long-simmering resentments could also degenerate quickly, spurring the basest of human instincts and triggering genocidal acts. Terrorists employing biological or nuclear weapons will vie with conventional forces using jets, cruise missiles, and bunker-busting bombs to cause widespread destruction. Many will interpret stepped-up conflicts between Muslims and Western societies as the beginnings of a new world war.

## Uniqueness

### 2nc will pass

#### TPA will pass now – Obama’s push ensures he builds a bipartisan coalition which generates momentum for passage – that’s marketwatch

#### 2 framing issues to filter UQ through ---

#### 1 – The GOP will vote for TPA, only a question of democratic support

Garrett 2/25 Major, National Journal Correspondent-at-Large and Chief White House Correspondent for CBS News. Prior to National Journal, Garrett reported for Fox News, where he was the Chief White House Correspondent, Rahm on Trade: You Want to Sell Cars or Tanks?, National Journal, <http://www.nationaljournal.com/all-powers/rahm-on-trade-you-want-to-sell-cars-or-tanks-20140225>

These products will need buyers. That means an export market. I asked the Democratic mayor about congressional opposition to Obama’s push for Trade Promotion Authority (fast track) as a prelude to a final deal on the [Trans-Pacific Partnership](https://mail.google.com/mail/?shva=1#apps/major/1446ac609654fd01?projector=1) and the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership. Rahm wanted to argue that the opposition is bipartisan. Intellectually, it is. But as he well knows (he advised President Clinton on the North American Free Trade Agreement and Obama on deals with South Korea, Colombia, and Panama), Republicans in the House and Senate will provide a vast majority of votes for TPA. House Speaker John Boehner has asked Obama for 50 House Democratic votes but could probably pass TPA with slightly fewer.¶ Rahm knows the problem is Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid and House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi, both of whom have told Obama to back off (which he has). Emanuel’s message: national security.¶ “You look at Asia today,” he said. “We have allies from Australia, Japan, Taiwan, Vietnam, Indonesia, South Korea. Everybody in the Joint Chiefs supports it. Why do they support it? ‘Cause it’s either tanks or cars. And I’d rather be exporting cars than trying to figure out how we’re gonna move tanks over there or send five [aircraft] carriers there.”¶ In an era of [defense cuts](http://www.reuters.com/article/2014/02/24/us-usa-defense-budget-idUSBREA1N1IO20140224) and a smaller Army, Emanuel sees free trade as the way around big defense budgets and dead-end weapons systems.¶ “Those are our allies around that are part of the Asia Pacific. If they’re economically tied to the United States, it’s in our national security interest. Trade is a good thing if you do everything else right.”¶ The White House is trying. In a very important but largely overlooked speech on Feb. 18, U.S. Trade Representative Michael Froman told the Center for American Progress (the White House policy and political sounding board) that more progressive voices would be added to trade negotiations. Froman duly noted, because USTR keeps numbers like these, that there have been more than 1,150 separate trade consultations with Congress. He even dryly mentioned that USTR staff conducted 18 briefings with lawmakers—drum roll, please—on a snow day.¶ But Froman and the White House know that Democrats remain unmoved: They want more voices at or near the negotiations and more transparency about environmental and labor requirements. Yes, Obama says he’s committed to baking these issues into the negotiating cake. Democrats don’t trust Obama. They want inside the trade kitchen.¶ To that end, Froman announced, the Commerce Department will revive dormant trade advisory committees to gather more progressive input. He also said the administration would create the Public Interest Trade Advisory Committee to join the standing Labor Advisory Committee as a place where progressives can learn more about trade negotiations and offer input. Democrats have long complained of being outnumbered by industry-backed groups working with USTR.¶ Obama fought for TPA in the [State of the Union](http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2014/01/28/president-barack-obamas-state-union-address) and was rebuffed. Froman huddled with progressives and lawmakers who could eventually be supportive, but not without more voices at the table and more transparency in the process. Froman knows the Left will never be entirely placated. He also knows it doesn’t need to be. Obama just needs to get enough votes at the margins to win TPA approval after the midterm elections. Meeting the demands of liberals, or at least being seen as trying to, is the new formula for TPA and the Asia and Europe deals.¶ It also probably won’t be long before White House officials themselves start saying, “It’s either tanks or cars.”

#### 2 – PC controls UQ – decisive leadership is key to attract dems

WALL STREET JOURNAL, “Obama’s Trade Test: A Bipartisan Victory Is Possible if He Can Deliver Some Democrats,” Editorial, 1—28—14, <http://online.wsj.com/news/articles/SB10001424052702304347904579312942307977408>.

President Obama says free-trade deals with Asia and Europe are a top priority in his second term. Sounds good, but the test of his sincerity will be whether he'll spend the political capital to persuade a skeptical Congress. Ways and Means Chairman Dave Camp and Senate Finance powers Max Baucus and Orrin Hatch recently introduced Trade Promotion Authority legislation, also known as fast-track, which would let Congress approve trade agreements by up-or-down vote without amendment. The President needs this to negotiate accords with 11 Pacific Rim countries and the European Union, which won't consent to deals that 535 Members of Congress can later rewrite. The accords would provide a major economic stimulus at no cost to taxpayers and especially to U.S. manufacturers that have become more competitive amid the surge in domestic natural gas and oil production. The proposed fast-track legislation isn't perfect but it ought to be good enough for sincere free traders. One useful provision directs the Obama Administration to negotiate labor and environmental provisions similar to those that were included in recent accords with Panama, Colombia, Peru and South Korea. That ought to allay GOP concerns that Mr. Obama could use the trade deals to override U.S. domestic law. More problematic is a directive that U.S. trade partners avoid manipulating exchange rates. This is a sop to unions and auto makers that blame currency shifts for their competitive woes, but the good news is that the legislative language is general and shouldn't poison negotiations with Japan and South Korea. The bill also targets state-owned enterprises, which unions complain unfairly benefit from government aid. Presumably they don't mean GM and the U.S. renewables industry. Silicon Valley is cheering the legislation's new trade goals to protect intellectual property and digital trade (e.g., e-books, mp3s). U.S. farmers would also benefit from a directive aimed at eliminating regulatory barriers to American products like the EU's bans on certain genetically-modified products and hormone-treated beef. One potential trouble spot is the proposal's larger opening for Congressional involvement in trade talks. Members have always been able to view the negotiating texts of trade agreements upon request, but this language would enshrine their access in statute. The danger is if Members become de facto co-negotiators with executive-branch officials, who would never be able to close a deal with 535 kibitzers in the hallway. Even with these concessions, House Democrats remain unsatisfied. "Congress will not be a rubber stamp for another flawed trade deal that will hang the middle class out to dry," Democratic Reps. Rosa DeLauro, Louise Slaughter and George Miller said in a statement. Ways and Means Ranking Member Sander Levin plans to introduce a rival bill to establish a special Congressional committee to determine whether a particular agreement would be eligible for fast-track. Mr. Levin is also demanding legislation that bars currency manipulation (as if the U.S. can push around foreign central banks) and "provides direct relief to U.S. industries materially injured by imports." These are all protectionist poison pills from the AFL-CIO, and free-traders are right to reject them. GOP leaders are supportive and will produce a majority of Republicans, but they want Mr. Obama to deliver some Democratic votes too. If Republicans are going to help Mr. Obama, he ought to be able to provide some political cover against union protectionists. George W. Bush personally made the fast-track case to Members in 2002, but Mr. Obama has so far outsourced the job to U.S. Trade Representative Michael Froman. The President could also make it harder to pass fast-track by insisting that Republicans extend Trade Adjustment Assistance (i.e., another form of jobless insurance), which expires at the end of the year. The last line of a White House December press release on trade commits to working with Congress to "protect and strengthen Trade Adjustment Assistance for America's workers." The White House and Harry Reid might also demand an extension of unemployment benefits as part of the deal, but they shouldn't treat fast-track as a vehicle for the rest of their liberal agenda. Expanded trade is its own reward. Mr. Obama can get a bipartisan victory that would help the economy and his legacy, but he's going to have to work for it.

#### PC key – push gets it passed

John Thune 2/25 “Democrats must give Obama trade promotion authority”, Reuters,

<http://blogs.reuters.com/great-debate/2014/02/25/give-obama-trade-promotion-authority/>

President Barack Obama declared in his State of the Union speech, “We need to work together on tools like bipartisan trade promotion authority to protect our workers, protect our environment and open new markets to new goods stamped ‘Made in the USA.’ China and Europe aren’t standing on the sidelines. Neither should we.”¶ Republicans agree. But the president has not followed through on his call for legislative action. Giving him trade promotion authority would put two large trade deals on a fast track to completion.¶ It appears politics have intruded. The president has given in to members of his party who oppose granting fast-track authority because the trade deals might alienate friendly special-interest groups in an election year. He reportedly did not even mention the issue when speaking to the House Democratic Caucus at its annual retreat. Then Vice President Joe Biden, addressing the same group, said the White House would be backing off the issue in deference to Democrats’ political concerns.¶ After five years of economic stagnation and high unemployment, we should be seizing every opportunity to create more jobs and get the economy growing at a faster pace. We could do that today in both the Senate and House by passing legislation giving the president the authority to wrap up the two trade pacts — all without adding a dime to the deficit.¶ Presidents of both parties have in the past used trade promotion authority to negotiate trade agreements that help American farmers, ranchers, entrepreneurs and job creators gain access to new consumers around the globe. By renewing the authority, which expired in 2007, Congress sets the rules for the proposed trade agreements and, in return, agrees to allow for a straight up-or-down vote when the agreements come before it.¶ The Department of Commerce recently announced that the United States exported $2.3 trillion of goods and services in 2013, setting another record for the fourth consecutive year. According to economists, every billion dollar of additional exports creates about 5,000 well-paying U.S. jobs. Roughly 10 million jobs nationwide are tied directly to exports. In fact, exports have created 1.3 million new jobs just since 2010.¶ Exports of U.S. agricultural products reached a record $141 billion in 2012, up from less than $90 billion five years earlier. More than 1 in 5 jobs in South Dakota is tied to trade, according to estimates in a recent Business Roundtable study, up from 11 percent in 1992.¶ But we can do better.¶ The trade agreements with 11 Asia-Pacific countries and the 28 European Union nations would open up access to one billion consumers around the globe. That could translate into thousands of new jobs and faster economic growth.¶ This opportunity can only become reality, however, if the president has the authority to close the deals. Foreign nations won’t put their best offers on the table if they believe Congress will renegotiate an agreement.¶ Trade promotion authority, and the trade agreements it will enable, is the best way to bring down foreign barriers to U.S. products and services. Our market is already largely open to foreign imports. Shouldn’t we demand that other nations return the favor?¶ Fast-tracking trade agreements has another big benefit. It would promote the creation of high-paying, research-intensive jobs in the U.S. by better protecting intellectual property — everything from life-saving medicines to cutting-edge software and computing — of U.S. companies doing business overseas.¶ The president is the only person who can ensure that the United States will keep pace in the global competitive economy. If he is serious about seeing this important legislation passed, he should stop paying lip service to trade promotion authority and pick up the phone and urge Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.) and members of Congress to support it.

#### Will pass – internal politics

Vicki Needham 3/2 “US-Japanese relationship key to talks”, The Hill,

<http://thehill.com/blogs/global-affairs/trade/199620-us-japanese-relation-key-to-pacific-trade-talks>

Obama also may use the visit to quell any broader concerns about his ability to convince Congress to provide him with trade promotion authority (TPA), which is being slow-walked by congressional Democrats. ¶ Fast-track authority would smooth passage in Congress for any trade deal that reaches Capitol Hill. ¶ Last month, Obama sought to reassure his Mexican and Canadian counterparts that Congress would give him those trade powers if the TPP emerges as a strong agreement. ¶ Robb said he expects Washington will eventual sort out its "internal politics" on the issue and that TPP negotiations need to continue in the meantime.

#### And, Obama will continue to push

Reuters 2/18 “Obama to continue to push for trade deals: White House”, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2014/02/18/us-usa-obama-trade-idUSBREA1H1RN20140218>

President Barack Obama will continue to press for legislation needed to conclude trade agreements because those accords are beneficial to the economy even if they are controversial politically, White House spokesman Jay Carney said on Tuesday.¶ "We're going to continue to press for this priority as we have in the past, mindful of course in recognizing that there are differing views on these issues in both political parties, not just the Democratic Party," he told reporters at a briefing.

### Obama Pushing

#### Obama pushing

Shawn Donnan, “US Trade Debate Prompts Fears of Delay in Talks,” FINANCIAL TIMES, 1—20—14, <http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/60506de0-7f9c-11e3-b6a7-00144feabdc0.html#axzz2rMdqUyrF>

Administration officials remain confident that they can get the bill through Congress and Michael Froman, the US trade representative, said there was no reason for the fast-track debate in Washington to affect the progress of any trade negotiations. “Every TPP partner has domestic politics, from elections to legislative battles over various policies that could impact the agreement,” he said. “We trust our partners to manage their own domestic processes and we will be working with our Congress to pass broadly supported trade promotion authority here. In the meantime, there is no reason talks should slow.”

#### TPP is a top Obama priority

Dave Boyer, “Trans-Pacific Trade Pact Hit by Hill Gridlock, Tough Talks,” WASHINGTON TIMES, 1—2—14, p. A3.

White House press secretary Jay Carney said TPP "remains a top priority of the president because of the positive economic benefits that come from it." A week before leaving for his Christmas vacation in Hawaii, Mr. Obama held a meeting on the status of the Asia trade talks with Cabinet members and other top advisers at the White House.¶ One of the topics at that meeting was Mr. Obama's desire to obtain "fast-track" trade promotion authority (TPA) from Congress, where many Democrats and some Republicans oppose such a move. The fast-track authority expired in 2007. Under fast-track authority, lawmakers cannot amend or filibuster trade deals; they can only vote to approve or reject them.

### Dems Key

#### Dems key

Eric Bradner, “Hill Democrats MIA on Obama’s Trade Agenda,” POLITICO, 1—15—14, <http://www.politico.com/story/2014/01/obama-trade-agenda-hill-democrats-102177.html>

The situation is the latest example of the administration’s struggles to corral Democrats who are “driven to distraction” by many of his policies, said Norm Ornstein, a political scientist and resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute. “He has been embarrassed by members of his own party in a number of votes in the House, including most recently some votes on Obamacare, where dozens of Democrats defected,” Ornstein said. “The most significant thing that the president needs to do in this case is to convince enough of his Democrats in a party that is growing less pro-trade, but also with a real challenge that always occurs for a second-term president, which is that your own base really begins to get unhappy and pushes back,” Ornstein said.

### PC Key—2NC

#### Obama push key to getting enough Dems on board

James Politi, “Obama Challenge on Selling Trade Deals to Resurgent Left,” FINANCIAL TIMES, 1—5—14, <http://www.ft.com/intl/cms/s/0/ae053274-7604-11e3-b028-00144feabdc0.html#axzz2phAKQRSk>

That shyness surrounding Mr Obama’s public pronouncements on trade may have to be shed soon. In the next few weeks, the leaders of the Senate finance committee, who generally support Mr Obama’s trade policy, are expected to unveil legislation that would ensure a much smoother ride on Capitol Hill for trade deals. Known as “Trade Promotion Authority”, this legislation could prove critical to ensuring the agreements do no get caught in political gridlock in Washington. This will be the first big political test for Mr Obama on trade – and it may take a much higher level of engagement from him to get it passed. Mr Obama could succeed. Liberal critics, including labour unions, remain unconvinced that the administration’s approach to the negotiations, particularly with regard to the more controversial Trans-Pacific Partnership, is really any different than what has been done in the past. But they could still change their minds, or not fight as ardently as expected. And moderate, pro-trade Democrats may well come on board enthusiastically. Meanwhile, business groups will lobby feverishly for the deals. In addition, geopolitical arguments rather than economic ones can help carry the day on Capitol Hill. The TPP is seen as essential to Mr Obama’s “pivot to Asia” and could help bolster strategic ties with Japan and others to help contain China. The EU deal could revive transatlantic relations and help set new standards for global trade that may ultimately apply to emerging markets such as China in the future.

#### PC key

BUSINESS TIMES SINGAPORE, “Chance for Obama to Push Trade Agenda,” 1—23—14, LN.

AS US President Barack Obama prepares to deliver his sixth State of the Union address next Tuesday evening, he may already be regarded by his adversaries as a lame-duck president whose dwindling power discourages other political players from cooperating and making deals with him. While Mr Obama is expected to serve three more years in office, there is a sense among Washington insiders that his ability to continue pursuing his policy agenda has been considerably curtailed after his performance during the first year of his second term. Indeed, despite his impressive re-election victory, a determined Republican-controlled House of Representatives continued rejecting all of Mr Obama's major initiatives, ranging from new gun control legislation to immigration reform and new environmental rules, not to mention resistance to a bipartisan deal to put America's fiscal house in order. At the same time, even the White House's most ardent supporters agree that the Obama administration has botched the rollout of the Affordable Care Act (ACA), aka "Obamacare", which was considered to be Mr Obama's signature legislative achievement. And while Mr Obama has resisted pressure to entangle the United States in new military conflicts, his handling of several crucial foreign policy challenges has been less than effective. No surprise then that he has been experiencing a plummeting in his popularity in recent months. There is a growing perception that he may lack the skills or the resolve to get things done according to his wishes. But starting with his prime-time State of the Union address, Mr Obama has an opportunity to launch a course correction and push forward new policy initiatives. In a way, the perception that he is a lame duck gives him a political advantage. Since he won't be running for another term, he is now in a stronger position to advance policies and even make unpopular decisions. In this context, he may have a unique strategic advantage if he decides to use some of his remaining political capital to pursue his ambitious global trade agenda, which includes negotiating historic free trade deals with the Pacific Rim economies and the European Union. These ideas are backed by a coalition of pro-free trade members of Congress, including the majority of Republicans, but have been resisted by a large number of Democratic lawmakers. The president could highlight during his address next week the contribution that growing trade would make in strengthening the American economy. His first step in that direction should be to call on Congress to extend his trade promotion authority. That could help recreate a bipartisan pro-free trade coalition and mobilise support for policies that would not only revitalise the Obama presidency, but also strengthen US global leadership and boost the world economy.

## impacts

### Protectionism

#### TPA’s key to prevent backsliding on globalization and protectionism

Economist 2-22

The Economist 2-22, “How to make the world $600 billion poorer,” 2/22/14 (Print Edition), http://www.economist.com/news/leaders/21596934-barack-obamas-unwillingness-fight-free-trade-expensive-mistake-how-make-world

IN JULY 2008 Barack Obama, then a candidate for the presidency, declared before an adoring crowd in Berlin that “true partnership and true progress [require] constant work and sustained sacrifice.” So it is with free trade. If not championed by leaders who understand its broad benefits, it will constantly be eroded by narrow economic nationalism. Mr Obama now appears to be surrendering to protectionists within his own party. If he cannot drag Democrats back to their senses, the world will lose its best opportunity in two decades for a burst of liberalisation. It will also be a signal that America is giving up its role as defender of an open global economy in the same way that Mr Obama has retreated in foreign policy. ¶ Mr Obama did little to promote free trade during his first term, but has seemed bolder in his second. He launched America into ambitious new deals with large Pacific economies and the European Union, breathing new life into global trade talks. Momentum built up; the “constant work and sacrifice” paid dividends. Members of the World Trade Organisation agreed on a package of trade reforms in December—the first truly multilateral deal in the organisation’s 20-year history. Diplomats credit the White House’s new resolve for helping to bring stubborn parties to the table. Progress suddenly seemed possible in other areas, such as liberalising trade in services and information technology, and reducing barriers to the exchange of “environmental goods and services”, which would make it cheaper to curb carbon emissions.¶ First, shoot yourself in the foot. Then repeat…¶ The hitch is that Congress must approve trade agreements. Previous presidents had the advantage of “fast-track” trade promotion authority, which let them present deals to Congress for a simple yes or no vote. Without it, lawmakers can wreck carefully negotiated deals with toxic amendments. No country would engage in serious talks with America under such circumstances. Fast-track is therefore essential—and elusive. Congress last granted it in 2002; it expired in 2007. The Obama administration blithely asserted that Congress would renew it, but many lawmakers, primarily Democrats, have signed letters opposing it. Harry Reid, the Senate majority leader, has all but ruled out a vote this year. And on February 14th Joe Biden, the vice-president, told a gathering of Democratic leaders that he understood their opposition. The White House appears to have given up with scarcely a fight. A fast-track vote before November’s mid-term elections seems unlikely (see article). ¶ Why panic about this? Tactically, it could just be another piece of Washington politicking: some optimists claim that Congress will return after the mid-terms ready to back fast-track, providing Mr Obama allows some boilerplate language in the bill chiding China for allegedly manipulating its currency. Others wonder whether the trade deals are really so vital. Indeed, the idea that they will not do much to help the economy is one excuse for Democrats undermining their president. ¶ In fact, the deals on the table are big. Reasonable estimates say that the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) and the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) could boost the world’s annual output by $600 billion—equivalent to adding another Saudi Arabia. Some $200 billion of that would accrue to America. And the actual gains could be even larger. The agreements would clear the way for freer trade in services, which account for most of rich countries’ GDP but only a small share of trade. Opening up trade in services could help reduce the cost of everything from shipping to banking, education and health care. Exposing professional occupations to the same global competition that factory workers have faced for decades could even strike a blow against the income inequality that Mr Obama so often decries. ¶ Tactically, even a short delay could prove fatal to both deals. Pacific negotiations have been extended while America and Japan hammer out compromises on agriculture. Why should Japanese politicians risk infuriating their farmers when any agreement can be torn up on Capitol Hill? The deal with the EU was meant to be done swiftly—perhaps in as little as two years—to keep politics from mucking it up. Europe’s leaders will now doubt America’s commitment, given how feebly Mr Obama has fought for fast-track. Trade sceptics, such as French farmers, are drooling. Angela Merkel, Germany’s chancellor, who is already furious about American spying, may decide that a trade deal is not worth battling for. ¶ The greatest risk of all is that the political momentum in America, having swung against free trade, will be hard to reverse. Some Tea Party Republicans oppose fast-track because they are loth to grant Mr Obama the authority to do anything. Democrats, keen to brand themselves as the anti-inequality party, may find economic nationalism an easy sell on the campaign stump: and, once pledged to that cause in November, candidates will not vote for the opposite in Congress. ¶ And for this Mr Obama deserves some blame. He is far more ardent in bemoaning inequality than in explaining why an American retreat from the world would be the wrong way to address it. He seldom mentions, for example, that cheap imports help the poor by cutting their shopping bills, and so reduce inequality of consumption. ¶ It’s not a zero-sum world¶ There is nothing inevitable about globalisation. Governments have put up barriers before—with disastrous consequences during the 1930s—and could do so again. So it is alarming when America, the mainstay of an open global economy, gives off isolationist signals. Only recently Congress childishly refused to honour an agreed-upon increase in America’s financial commitment to the International Monetary Fund. The Federal Reserve is pushing forward with new banking regulations that could penalise foreign banks and further Balkanise global finance (see article). Mr Obama continues to delay approval of a critical oil pipeline from Canada, and is slow to grant permits to export American natural gas.¶ “America cannot turn inward,” the Obama of 2008 said in Berlin. The Obama of 2014 is now responding: “Yes we can.”

#### Protectionism escalates – causes extinction

Panzner 8

Michael, Panzner 8 faculty at the New York Institute of Finance, 25-year veteran of the global stock, bond, and currency markets who has worked in New York and London for HSBC, Soros Funds, ABN Amro, Dresdner Bank, and JPMorgan Chase Financial Armageddon: Protect Your Future from Economic Collapse, Revised and Updated Edition, p. 136-138, Google Books

Continuing calls for curbs on the flow of finance and trade will inspire the United States and other nations to spew forth protectionist legislation like the notorious Smoot-Hawley bill. Introduced at the start of the Great Depression, it triggered a series of tit-for-tat economic responses, which many commentators believe helped turn a serious economic downturn into a prolonged and devastating global disaster, But if history is any guide, those lessons will have been long forgotten during the next collapse. Eventually, fed by a mood of desperation and growing public anger, restrictions on trade, finance, investment, and immigration will almost certainly intensify. Authorities and ordinary citizens will likely scrutinize the cross-border movement of Americans and outsiders alike, and lawmakers may even call for a general crackdown on nonessential travel. Meanwhile, many nations will make transporting or sending funds to other countries exceedingly difficult. As desperate officials try to limit the fallout from decades of ill-conceived, corrupt, and reckless policies, they will introduce controls on foreign exchange, foreign individuals and companies seeking to acquire certain American infrastructure assets, or trying to buy property and other assets on the (heap thanks to a rapidly depreciating dollar, will be stymied by limits on investment by noncitizens. Those efforts will cause spasms to ripple across economies and markets, disrupting global payment, settlement, and clearing mechanisms. All of this will, of course, continue to undermine business confidence and consumer spending. In a world of lockouts and lockdowns, any link that transmits systemic financial pressures across markets through arbitrage or portfolio-based risk management, or that allows diseases to be easily spread from one country to the next by tourists and wildlife, or that otherwise facilitates unwelcome exchanges of any kind will be viewed with suspicion and dealt with accordingly. The rise in isolationism and protectionism will bring about ever more **heated arguments and** dangerous confrontations over shared sources of oil, gas, and other key commodities as well as factors of production that must, out of necessity, be acquired from less-than-friendly nations. Whether involving raw materials used in strategic industries or basic necessities such as food, water, and energy, efforts to secure adequate supplies will take increasing precedence in a world where demand seems constantly out of kilter with supply. Disputes over the misuse, overuse, and pollution of the environment and natural resources will become more commonplace. Around the world, such tensions will give rise to full-scale military encounters, often with minimal provocation. In some instances, economic conditions will serve as a convenient pretext for conflicts that stem from cultural and religious differences. Alternatively, nations may look to divert attention away from domestic problems by channeling frustration and populist sentiment toward other countries and cultures. Enabled by cheap technology and the waning threat of American retribution, terrorist groups will likely boost the frequency and scale of their horrifying attacks, bringing the threat of random violence to a whole new level. Turbulent conditions will encourage aggressive saber rattling and interdictions by rogue nations running amok. Age-old clashes will also take on a new, more healed sense of urgency. China will likely assume an increasingly belligerent posture toward Taiwan, while Iran may embark on overt colonization of its neighbors in the Mideast. Israel, for its part, may look to draw a dwindling list of allies from around the world into a growing number of conflicts. Some observers, like John Mearsheimer, a political scientist at the University of Chicago, have even speculated that an "intense confrontation" between the United States and China is "inevitable" at some point. More than a few disputes will turn out to be almost wholly ideological. Growing cultural and religious differences will be transformed from wars of words to battles soaked in blood. Long-simmering resentments could also degenerate quickly, spurring the basest of human instincts and triggering genocidal acts. Terrorists employing biological or nuclear weapons will vie with conventional forces using jets, cruise missiles, and bunker-busting bombs to cause widespread destruction. Many will interpret stepped-up conflicts between Muslims and Western societies as the beginnings of a new world war.

### Competitiveness

#### TPA key to competitiveness

Bryan Riley, senior analyst and Anthony B. Kim, senior policy analyst, “Advancing Trade Freedom: Key Objective of Trade Promotion Authority Renewal,” ISSUE BRIEF n. 3912, Heritage Foundation, 4—16—13, [www.heritage.org/research/reports/2013/04/advancing-trade-freedom-key-objective-of-trade-promotion-authority-renewal](http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2013/04/advancing-trade-freedom-key-objective-of-trade-promotion-authority-renewal)

The Obama Administration often seems to regard trade as a zero-sum game of capturing value that would otherwise go elsewhere. However, trade liberalization is about creating and adding value, capitalizing on competitive advantages, and further harnessing the power of freedom and choice. Trade has been an integral part of America’s extraordinary economic progress over the past decades. Since 1929, trade volume has increased from less than 9 percent of U.S. gross domestic product (GDP) to around 30 percent, while real U.S. GDP per person increased from $8,000 to more than $43,000.¶ This progress faces continuing threats, mainly from special-interest groups that malign free trade in an attempt to seek protection from competition at the expense of everyone else. Some lawmakers have even viewed TPA legislation as a vehicle to address the perceived costs of free trade for the U.S. economy. However, using TPA renewal to redress the suspected costs of trade is an ill-advised idea.¶ TPA is an instrument that not only enables America to secure increased access to overseas markets but also provides the unique opportunity for the U.S. to reduce its own barriers and advance economic freedom. Congress and the President can help the American economy by removing barriers that limit its competitiveness. With open trade and investment ensured, the interplay of low tax rates and efficient regulations could effectively enhance America’s economic freedom. Entangling TPA with a protectionist agenda, on the other hand, would not serve America’s interests in the global market.

### Credibility 2NC

#### Key to global trade momentum

Robert Zoellick, President, World Bank and former USTR, Payoff from the World Trade Agenda, Peterson Institute for International Economics, 6—14—13, <http://www.piie.com/publications/papers/transcript-20130614.pdf>

Robert Zoellick: Yeah. Well, I guess I’ll expand on some of the remarks I made at the close. Well sometimes people like big bang concepts; that it all gets done at once. My experience is that you try to get some wins, you kind of start to build momentum; you show that it’s real, but you need to combine it with, particularly in representing the United States, a broader strategy where you’re trying to go. You need to try to explain the types of interconnections that I was describing today. So I hope that Mike or his counterparts, as they pursue the elements the president has set out, include a global agenda as well as the TTIP and the TPP and frankly look for bilateral steps that they can use. As I’ve said, the strategic economic dialogue with China could have some opportunities here. But then they explain what they’re doing and explain to the world and frankly, this will require a little diplomacy, you could start to make some early moves that show that it’s real. So again, to give you sort of a historical comparison, after the breakdown in Cancun, those of you that are the scholars of this will recall that—I kind of use the story of the FT, a letter to all of the WTO people and a trip around the world, as sort of a symbolic way of trying to reframe the issue. So it’s a combination of substance and positioning, which you have to be in international politics. So the challenge is not just to get lost in the negotiating details, you have to know that, but you have to frame this. And then what I would look for ways on the agenda where I could show that we’re getting something done. Now one possibility is the trade promotion authority. That would show a great sense of momentum. Now it’ll be messy and everybody will want to throw everything into it and so on and so forth.But that’s in some ways a signaling system and if you get it done, it show—and I believe you can get it done. You’ve got more interest on this than a bipartisan fashion than the other items—that would show momentum. The points in this paper about the Bali meeting. People are skeptical but if the United States set out this strategy and then you started to get a couple of these things done in Bali, that would show that things can be done. What I’ve encountered is the world has lots of critics and analysts and naysayers and so and so forth, and that’s the way in which we have a live debate and they’re always going to be out there and most vocal and those who are a little bit wary of following, those that are a little cautious, those who don’t quite have the same political will, they’re going to step back until they see something happening, but I think if you start to move some of these issues globally, you can start to get some other allies.

#### TPA is key to trade leadership—key to revitalizing WTO and saving global trade

Jeffrey Schott, Senior Fellow, Peterson Institute, “Payoff from the World Trade Agenda,” Peterson Institute for International Economics, 6—14—13, http://www.piie.com/publications/papers/transcript-20130614.pdf

Now, what are the prospects for Bali? Well, they’re not so good. Trade ministers are prone to accentuate the positive. But when APEC trade leaders met in Surabaya, Indonesia in April of this year, they admitted, and I need to quote this. This is what they said: “The negotiation as it stands now is not on course to lead to a successful outcome at the Ministerial Conference 9 in Bali.” And then even more ominously they said: “The continued viability of the WTO’s negotiating function is at serious risk.” So that’s what our trade leaders, our optimistic trade leaders are saying about the prospects for moving forward later this year in Bali. And it underscores the task that Terry and others have. And it has to be more than the business community, but as Fred said it has to be certainly pushed hard by the business community to just get the officials and the negotiators to recognize that there’s a lot at stake and a big window of opportunity to make progress, but a big cost if they don’t. Now, what are the reasons for the impasse? And this is something that goes beyond what we put in our study. It’s more of a postscript to our study to look at the task going forward. And there are a number of problems that beset the preparations for the Bali Ministerial. You can call them Bali aches if you like. Oh, yeah, I was wondering whether to say that, and obviously I shouldn’t have. The first is issue with linkages. These are tactical gambits that risk blocking agreement like similar moves blocked agreement on the overall DOHA agenda over the past 10 years. And the key problem going forward for Bali is linking what is called food security subsidies with the trade facilitation agreement. There are important issues with regard to food security. There are important issues with regard to agricultural subsidies. But they should not be used in a way that blocks the ability to get the big deliverable out of Bali. And negotiators are still tied up in knots on how to do that. The second problem regards imbalances. Each country has a different idea of what is a balanced accord. Now, the terminology is important. In the past, we talked in trade negotiations about reciprocity. Reciprocity is an ambiguous term, but it’s a lot clearer than talking about balanced because each country hastheir own idea of what balanced is and there’s no consistent standard to set it on. So the first imbalance derives from differences in how countries value the benefit of policy change, basically taking what’s going on now and changing what countries do in order to open up more opportunities from trade and investment and how they value the increase in policy predictability that comes when new obligations constrain the ability of governments to reverse liberalization and to add new protectionism. So those are important. How do you value those things? In fact, the appreciation of the value of those two aspects is sometimes not well understood. The second imbalance comes between the level of progress that is needed on market access across agriculture and manufacturing and services, and the progress on commitments to new rule-making obligations, which often also encompass reforms that result in improved market access. This is part of the problem with the duty-free, quota-free issue and the resistance to going to a 100 percent coverage of tariff lines in a number of countries. There needs to be progress both on the coverage of the tariff preferences for the least developed countries. But there also needs to be progress on the eligibility rules for qualifying for the preferential rates. I mean, there are some countries that provide a 100 percent duty-free, quota-free treatment for least developed countries, but those countries don’t get access to that market because the eligibility rules, the content requirements and the like, basically block them from access to those markets. So those two things have to be done. There has to be a greater liberalization of the eligibility requirements to make those LDC preferences meaningful. And third, there are leadership lapses. And this has been throughout the DOHA Round, so this is nothing new. The big players, developed and developing, need to put their chips on the table. For the U.S. and the EU, this means real constraints on farm supports and real new access for the exports of the least developed countries. These countries should be more responsive with regards to cuts of agricultural export subsidies—that’s one of our initiatives in our study. And indeed, there has been suggestions for 16 Bali that developing countries want the U.S. and Europe to commit to a 50 percent down payment on reductions of agricultural export subsidies, but that’s actually doable given the current climate of high commodity prices and should be acceptable if the deal included a snapback clause. But it seems to be resisted so far. And this is one area where the negotiators are being a bit too risk-averse. For China, it means dropping the charade that they are recently a ceded member to the WTO, and therefore, don’t have to do anymore. They need to do more. They need to commit to broader liberalization than other developing countries. And they have the ability to do that. For all the BRICs, it means advancing services negotiations as a means to unblock the negotiating impasse on agriculture and on NAMA. Now, this audience probably is focusing on, well, how the heck is the United States going to do in any of this. And it leads to the question of what about trade promotion authority. For the U.S., passage of new trade promotion authority would send a very positive signal that we were willing and able to make these commitments and follow through on them, and it should be done soon. And I was pleased that Mike Froman in these confirmation hearings gave the committee assurances that he would work closely with the Finance and Ways and Means Committee that are already doing preparatory work on new legislation. Now, soon in this context given legislative realities means that a bill should be either passed or at least well advanced before Bali. I think if there’s a clear sign that the Congress is moving forward and will enact trade promotion authority that this will make it easier for the U.S. negotiators to put together the type of deal that serves our broad interest and those of the trading system. But, passage of the farm bill could send exactly the opposite signal, at least the way it is being considered right now and if key Senate provisions are enacted. It’s interesting that legislators hardly take into consideration at all international trade negotiations when they put together a farm bill. And while they should deal with the concerns of their constituents, their constituents are operating in global markets. And it’s interesting that while there’s interesting cutting subsidies in the Congress, the subsidies that they’re considering cutting are the only ones that are actually legal under the WTO system. So they’re cutting the legal subsidies and proposing new subsidies that would, if not be illegal, would be actionable and considered trade distorting under the WTO. So this is a problem and for Bali, if Congress doesn’t act on the farm bill, that may be a positive thing. So in sum, I think what has come out of our study is that there are a lot of important things that should and can be done. A Bali deal is critical to rebuilding confidence in WTO negotiations. And simply put, officials need to demonstrate that WTO talks can produce results. That used to be why everyone went to Geneva during the GATT era. But there has been a great deal of skepticism in recent years that negotiators recognized the urgency of getting something done. And second, Bali needs to produce a solid down payment on a bigger WTO package that would be pulled together and accelerated negotiations post Bali.

## Econ impacts

### Brzezinski ‘12

**Economic decline triggers every impact imaginable**

**Brzezinski, 12**

(Zbigniew, National Security Advisor under President Carter, “After America How does the world look in an age of U.S. decline? Dangerously unstable,” Jan/Feb 2012, <http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/01/03/after_america?page=0,0>)

While **a sudden, massive crisis of the American system** -- for instance, another financial crisis -- **would produce a fast-moving chain reaction leading to global political and economic disorder,** a steady drift by America into increasingly pervasive decay or endlessly widening warfare with Islam would be unlikely to produce, even by 2025, an effective global successor. No single power will be readyby then to exercise the role that the world, upon the fall of the Soviet Union in 1991, expected the United States to play:the leader of a new, globally cooperative world order. **More probable would be a protracted phase of rather inconclusive realignments of both global and regional power, with** no grand winners and **many** more **losers**, in a setting of international uncertainty and even of potentially fatal risks to global well-being. Rather than a world where dreams of democracy flourish, a Hobbesian world of enhanced national security based on varying fusions of authoritarianism, nationalism, and religion could ensue. **The leaders of the world's second-rank powers,** among them India, Japan, Russia, and some European countries, **are already assessing the potential impact of U.S. decline on their respective national interests.** The Japanese, fearful of an assertive China dominating the Asian mainland, may be thinking of closer links with Europe. Leaders in India and Japan may be considering closer political and even military cooperation in case America falters and China rises. **Russia**, while perhaps engaging in wishful thinking (even schadenfreude) about America's uncertain prospects, **will** almost **certainly have its eye on the independent states of the former Soviet Union.** **Europe**, not yet cohesive, **would likely be**: Germany and Italy toward Russia because of commercial interests, France and insecure Central Europe in favor of a politically tighter European Union, and Britain toward manipulating a balance within the EU while preserving its special relationship with a declining United States**. Others may move more rapidly to carve out their own regional spheres: Turkey in the area of the old Ottoman Empire, Brazil in the Southern Hemisphere, and so forth. None of these countries, however, will have the requisite combination of economic, financial, technological, and military power even to consider inheriting America's leading role**. China, invariably mentioned as America's prospective successor, has an impressive imperial lineage and a strategic tradition of carefully calibrated patience, both of which have been critical to its overwhelmingly successful, several-thousand-year-long history. China thus prudently accepts the existing international system, even if it does not view the prevailing hierarchy as permanent. It recognizes that success depends not on the system's dramatic collapse but on its evolution toward a gradual redistribution of power. Moreover, the basic reality is that **China is not yet ready to assume in full America's role in the world.** Beijing's leaders themselves have repeatedly emphasized that on every important measure of development, wealth, and power, China will still be a modernizing and developing state several decades from now, significantly behind not only the United States but also Europe and Japan in the major per capita indices of modernity and national power. Accordingly, Chinese leaders have been restrained in laying any overt claims to global leadership. At some stage, however, a more assertive Chinese nationalism could arise and damage China's international interests. A swaggering, nationalistic Beijing would unintentionally mobilize a powerful regional coalition against itself. **None of China's key neighbors -- India, Japan, and Russia -- is ready to acknowledge China's entitlement to America's place on the global totem pole. They might even seek support from a waning America to offset an overly assertive China. The resulting regional scramble could become intense**, especially given the similar nationalistic tendencies among China's neighbors. **A phase of acute international tension in Asia could ensue.** **Asia** of the 21st century **could then begin to resemble Europe of the 20th century -- violent and bloodthirsty**. At the same time, **the security of a number of weaker states located geographically next to major regional powers also depends on the international status quo reinforced by America's global preeminence -- and would be made significantly more vulnerable in proportion to America's decline**. The states in that exposed position -- including **Georgia, Taiwan, South Korea, Belarus, Ukraine, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Israel, and the greater Middle East** -- are today's geopolitical equivalents of nature's most endangered species. Their fates are closely tied to the nature of the international environment left behind by a waning America, be it ordered and restrained or, much more likely, self-serving and expansionist. **A faltering United States could also find its strategic partnership with Mexico in jeopardy**. America's economic resilience and political stability have so far mitigated many of the challenges posed by such sensitive neighborhood issues as economic dependence, immigration, and the narcotics trade. A decline in American power, however, would likely undermine the health and good judgment of the U.S. economic and political systems. **A waning United States would likely be more nationalistic, more defensive about its national identity, more paranoid about its homeland security, and less willing to sacrifice resources for the sake of others' development. The worsening of relations between a declining America and an internally troubled Mexico could even give rise to a particularly ominous phenomenon: the emergence, as a major issue in nationalistically aroused Mexican politics, of territorial claims justified by history and ignited by cross-border incidents**. **Another consequence of American decline could be a corrosion of the generally cooperative management of the global commons -- shared interests such as sea lanes, space, cyberspace, and the environment, whose protection is imperative to the long-term growth of the global economy and the continuation of basic geopolitical stability**. In almost every case, **the potential absence of a constructive and influential U.S. role would fatally undermine the essential communality of the global commons because the superiority and ubiquity of American power creates order where there would normally be conflict.**

### Royal ’10

#### Econ decline causes war

**Royal 10** (Jedediah, Director of Cooperative Threat Reduction – 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, Ed. Goldsmith and Brauer, p. 213-215)

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, particularlyduring 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 externalmilitary 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 theuse 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 conflictat 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.

### Harris & Burrows ’09

#### Econ decline causes nuke war

**Harris and Burrows 9** Mathew, PhD European History @ Cambridge, counselor in the National Intelligence Council (NIC) and Jennifer is a member of the NIC’s Long Range Analysis Unit “Revisiting the Future: Geopolitical Effects of the Financial Crisis” http://www.ciaonet.org/journals/twq/v32i2/f\_0016178\_13952.pdf Increased Potential for Global Conflict

Of course, the report encompasses more than economics and indeed believes the future is likely to be the result of a number of intersecting and interlocking forces. With so many possible permutations of outcomes, each with ample Revisiting the Future opportunity for unintended consequences, there is a growing sense of insecurity. Even so, **history may be more instructive than ever.** While we continue to believe that **the Great Depression** is not likely to be repeated, the **lessons** to be drawn from that period **include the harmful effects on fledgling democracies and multiethnic societies (think Central Europe in 1920s and 1930s) and on the sustainability of multilateral institutions** (think League of Nations in the same period). **There is no reason to think that this would not be true in the twenty-first as much as in the twentieth century.** For that reason, the ways in which **the potential for greater conflict could grow** would seem to be even more apt **in a constantly volatile economic environment** as they would be if change would be steadier. In surveying those risks, the report stressed the likelihood that terrorism and nonproliferation will remain priorities even as resource issues move up on the international agenda. **Terrorism’s appeal will decline if economic growth continues in the Middle East and youth unemployment is reduced.** For those terrorist groups that remain active in 2025, however, the diffusion of technologies and scientific knowledge will place some of the world’s most dangerous capabilities within their reach. **Terrorist groups** in 2025 **will** likely be a combination of descendants of long established groups\_inheriting organizational structures, command and control processes, and training procedures necessary to conduct sophisticated attacks\_and newly emergent collections of the angry and disenfranchised that **become self-radicalized, particularly in the absence of economic outlets that would become narrower in an economic downturn. The most dangerous casualty of any economically-induced drawdown of U.S. military presence would** almost certainly **be the Middle East**. Although Iran’s acquisition of nuclear weapons is not inevitable, **worries** about a nuclear-armed **Iran** **could lead states in the region to develop new security arrangements with external powers, acquire additional weapons, and consider pursuing their own nuclear ambitions.** It is not clear that the type of stable deterrent relationship that existed between the great powers for most of the Cold War would emerge naturally in the Middle East with a nuclear Iran. Episodes of low intensity **conflict** and terrorism taking place under a nuclear umbrella **could lead to an unintended escalation and broader conflict** if clear red lines between those states involved are not well established. **The close proximity of potential nuclear rivals** combined with underdeveloped surveillance capabilities and mobile dual-capable Iranian missile systems also **will produce inherent difficulties** in achieving reliable indications and warning of an impending nuclear attack. The lack of strategic depth in neighboring states like Israel, **short warning and missile flight times, and uncertainty** of Iranian intentions **may place more focus on preemption** rather than defense, potentially **leading to escalating crises.** 36 Types of **conflict** that the world continues to experience, such as **over resources, could reemerge**, particularly if **protectionism grows and there is a resort to neo-mercantilist practices. Perceptions** of renewed energy scarcity will drive countries to take actions to assure their future access to energy supplies. In the worst case, this **could result in interstate conflicts if government leaders deem assured access to energy resources,** for example, to be **essential for** maintaining domestic stability and the **survival of their regime**. Even actions short of war, however, will have important geopolitical implications. Maritime security concerns are providing a rationale for naval buildups and modernization efforts, such as China’s and India’s development of blue water naval capabilities. **If** the **fiscal stimulus focus for** these **countries indeed turns inward, one of the most obvious funding targets may be military. Buildup of regional** naval **capabilities could lead to increased tensions, rivalries, and counterbalancing moves**, but it also will create opportunities for multinational cooperation in protecting critical sea lanes. **With water** also **becoming scarcer in Asia and the Middle East, cooperation to manage changing water resources is likely to be increasingly difficult both within and between states in a more dog-eat-dog world.**

### Econ Decline Bad: China War

#### Economic collapse causes war with China – growth is key to deterrence

Jeremy Hsu, "Economic Ties Could Help Prevent US-China War," TECH NEWS DAILY, 11--1--11, http://www.technewsdaily.com/5318-china-military-cyber-national-security.html, accessed 5-19-13.

**As the U.S. faces China's economic and military rise, it** also **holds a dwindling hand of cards to play in the** unlikely **case of open conflict. Cyberattacks aimed at computer networks**, **targeted disabling of satellites or economic warfare could end up bringing down both of the frenemies**. **That means ensuring the U.S. economy remains strong and well-balanced,** **with China's economy** possibly **representing the best deterrent,** according to a new report. **The Rand Corporation's analysts** put low odds on a China-U.S. military conflict taking place, but still **lay out danger scenarios where the U.S. and China face greater risks of stumbling into an unwanted war with one another. They point to the economic codependence of both countries as the best bet against open conflict, similar to** how **nuclear weapons** ensured mutually assured destruction for the U.S. and Soviet Union **during the Cold War**. "It is often said that **a strong economy is the basis of a strong defense**," the Rand report says. "**In the case of China, a strong U.S. economy is not just the basis for a strong defense, it is itself** perhaps **the best defense against an adventurous China**." Such "**mutually assured economic destruction" would devastate both the U.S. and China, given how China represents America's main creditor and manufacturer. The economic fallout could lead to a global recession worse than that caused by the financial crisis of** 2008-**2009**.

#### China war goes global and nuclear

Hunkovic, American Military University, 09 [Lee J, 2009, “The Chinese-Taiwanese Conflict Possible Futures of a Confrontation between China, Taiwan and the United States of America”, http://www.lamp-method.org/eCommons/Hunkovic.pdf]

A **war between China**, Taiwan **and the U**nited **S**tates **has the potential to escalate into a nuclear conflict and a third world war,** therefore, **many countries other than the primary actors could be affected by such a conflict**, **including Japan, both Koreas, Russia,** Australia, **India and Great Britain,** if they were drawn into the war, as well as all other countries in the world that participate **in the global economy,** in which **the U**nited **S**tates **and China are the two most dominant members**. If China were able to successfully annex Taiwan, the possibility exists that they could then plan to attack Japan and begin a policy of aggressive expansionism in East and Southeast Asia, as well as the Pacific and even into India, which could in turn create an international standoff and deployment of military forces to contain the threat. In any case, **if China and the United States engage in a full-scale conflict, there are few countries in the world that will not be economically and**/or **militarily affected by it.** However, China, Taiwan and United States are the primary actors in this scenario, whose actions will determine its eventual outcome, therefore, other countries will not be considered in this study.

### Econ Decline Bad: Russia War

#### Econ collapse turns Russian war

Nyquist 5 (J.R., Author and Geopolitical Columnist – Financial Sense Online, "The Political Consequences of a Financial Crash," 2-4, http://www.financialsense.com/stormwatch/geo/pastanalysis/2005/0204.html)

Should the United States experience a severe economic contraction during the second term of President Bush, the American people will likely support politicians who advocate further restrictions and controls on our market economy – guaranteeing its strangulation and the steady pauperization of the country. In Congress today, Sen. Edward Kennedy supports nearly all the economic dogmas listed above. It is easy to see, therefore, that the coming economic contraction, due in part to a policy of massive credit expansion, will have serious political consequences for the Republican Party (to the benefit of the Democrats). Furthermore, an economic contraction will encourage the formation of anti-capitalist majorities and a turning away from the free market system. The danger here is not merely economic. The political left openly favors the collapse of America's strategic position abroad. Thewithdrawal of the United States from the Middle East, the Far East and Europe would catastrophically impact an international system that presently allows 6 billion people to live on the earth's surface in relative peace. Should anti-capitalist dogmas overwhelm the global market and trading system that evolved under American leadership, the planet's economy would contract and untold millions would die of starvation. Nationalistic totalitarianism, fueled by a politics of blame, would once again bring war to Asia and Europe. But this time the war would be waged with mass destruction weapons and the United States would be blamed because it is the center of global capitalism. Furthermore, if the anti-capitalist party gains power in Washington, we can expect to see policies of appeasement and unilateral disarmament enacted. American appeasement and disarmament, in this context, would be an admission of guilt before the court of world opinion. Russia and China, above all, would exploit thisadmission to justify aggressive wars, invasions and mass destruction attacks. A future financial crash, therefore, must be prevented at all costs. But we cannot do this. As one observer recently lamented, "We drank the poison and now we must die."

### Econ Decline Bad: Terror

#### Turns terrorism---causes backsliding and protectionism---causes nuclear war

Harris & Burrows 9 Mathew, PhD European History @ Cambridge, counselor of the U.S. National Intelligence Council (NIC) and Jennifer, member of the NIC’s Long Range Analysis Unit “Revisiting the Future: Geopolitical Effects of the Financial Crisis” http://www.ciaonet.org/journals/twq/v32i2/f\_0016178\_13952.pdf

Of course, the report encompasses more than economics and indeed believes the future is likely to be the result of a number of intersecting and interlocking forces. With so many possible permutations of outcomes, each with ample Revisiting the Future opportunity for unintended consequences, there is a growing sense of insecurity. Even so, history may be more instructive than ever. While we continue to believe that the Great Depression is not likely to be repeated, the lessons to be drawn from that period include the **harmful effects on fledgling democracies** and multiethnic societies (think Central Europe in 1920s and 1930s) and on the sustainability of multilateral institutions (think League of Nations in the same period). There is no reason to think that this would not be true in the twenty-first as much as in the twentieth century. For that reason, the ways in which **the potential for** greater **conflict could grow** would seem to be even more apt in a constantly volatile economic environment as they would be if change would be steadier. In surveying those risks, the report stressed the likelihood that terrorism and nonproliferation will remain priorities even as resource issues move up on the international agenda. **Terrorism**’s appeal will decline if economic growth continues in the Middle East and youth unemployment is reduced. For those terrorist groups that remain active in 2025, however, the diffusion of technologies and scientific knowledge will place some of the world’s most dangerous capabilities within their reach. Terrorist groups in 2025 will likely be a combination of descendants of long established groups\_inheriting organizational structures, command and control processes, and training procedures necessary to conduct sophisticated attacks and newly emergent collections of the angry and disenfranchised that become self-radicalized, particularly in the absence of economic outlets that would become narrower in an economic downturn. The most dangerous casualty of any **economically-induced drawdown** of U.S. military presence would almost certainly be the Middle East. Although Iran’s acquisition of nuclear weapons is not inevitable, worries about a nuclear-armed Iran could lead states in the region to develop new security arrangements with external powers, **acquire additional weapons**, and consider pursuing their own **nuclear ambitions**. It is not clear that the type of stable deterrent relationship that existed between the great powers for most of the Cold War would emerge naturally in the Middle East with a nuclear Iran. Episodes of low intensity conflict and terrorism taking place under a nuclear umbrella could lead to an **unintended escalation** and **broader conflict** if clear red lines between those states involved are not well established. The close proximity of potential **nuclear rivals** combined with underdeveloped surveillance capabilities and mobile dual-capable Iranian missile systems also will produce inherent difficulties in achieving reliable indications and warning of an impending nuclear attack. The lack of strategic depth in neighboring states like Israel, short warning and missile flight times, and uncertainty of Iranian intentions may place more focus on **preemption** rather than defense, potentially leading to **escalating crises**. 36 Types of conflict that the world continues to experience, such as over resources, could reemerge, particularly if protectionism grows and there is a resort to neo-mercantilist practices. Perceptions of renewed energy scarcity will drive countries to take actions to assure their future access to energy supplies. In the worst case, this could result in **interstate conflicts** if government leaders deem assured access to energy resources, for example, to be essential for maintaining domestic stability and the survival of their regime. Even actions short of war, however, will have important geopolitical implications. Maritime security concerns are providing a rationale for naval buildups and modernization efforts, such as China’s and India’s development of blue water naval capabilities. If the fiscal stimulus focus for these countries indeed turns inward, one of the most obvious funding targets may be military. Buildup of regional naval capabilities could lead to increased tensions, rivalries, and counterbalancing moves, but it also will create opportunities for multinational cooperation in protecting critical sea lanes. With water also becoming scarcer in Asia and the Middle East, cooperation to manage changing water resources is likely to be increasingly difficult both within and between states in a more dog-eat-dog world.

#### Decline spurs terrorism.

Warrick 8—Joby Warrick, Washington Post Staff Writer [November 15, 2008, “Experts Warn of Security Risks in Financial Downturn,” http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/11/14/AR2008111403864.html]

Intelligence officials say they have no hard evidence of a pending terrorist attack, and CIA Director Michael V. Hayden said in a news conference Thursday that his agency has not detected increased al-Qaeda communications or other signs of an imminent strike.

But many government and private terrorism experts say the financial crisis has given al-Qaeda an opening, and judging from public statements and intercepted communications, senior al-Qaeda leaders are elated by the West's economic troubles, which they regard as a vindication of their efforts and a sign of the superpower's weakness.

"Al-Qaeda's propaganda arm is constantly banging the drum saying that the U.S. economy is on the precipice -- and it's the force of the jihadists that's going to push us over the edge," said Bruce Hoffman, a former scholar-in-residence at the CIA and now a professor at Georgetown University.

Whether terrorist leader Osama bin Laden is technically capable of another Sept. 11-style attack is unclear, but U.S. officials say he has traditionally picked times of transition to launch major strikes. The two major al-Qaeda-linked attacks on U.S. soil -- the World Trade Center bombing in 1993 and the 2001 hijackings -- occurred in the early months of new administrations.

This year, the presidential transition is occurring as American households and financial institutions are under severe economic strain, and political leaders are devoting great time and effort to that crisis. Frances Fragos Townsend, who previously served as Bush's homeland security adviser, told a gathering of terrorism experts last month that the confluence of events is "not lost" on bin Laden.

"We know from prior actions that this is a period of vulnerability," Townsend said.

As bad as economic conditions are in the United States and Europe, where outright recessions are expected next year, they are worse in developing countries such as Pakistan, a state that was already struggling with violent insurgencies and widespread poverty. Some analysts warn that a prolonged economic crisis could trigger a period of widespread unrest that could strengthen the hand of extremists and threaten Pakistan's democratically elected government -- with potentially grave consequences for the region and perhaps the planet.

Pakistanis were hit by soaring food and energy prices earlier in the year, and the country's financial problems have multiplied since late summer. Islamabad's currency reserves have nearly evaporated, forcing the new government to seek new foreign loans or risk defaulting on the country's debt. The national currency, the rupee, has been devalued, and inflation is squeezing Pakistan's poor and middle class alike.

Shahid Javed Burki, a native Pakistani and former World Bank official, said job cuts and higher food costs are behind much of the anger and desperation he witnessed during a recent trip. "I'm especially worried about the large urban centers," said Burki, author of several books on Pakistan's economy. "If they are badly hurt, it creates incentives for people to look to the extremists to make things better. It's a very dicey situation."

### Econ Decline Bad: A2 “Resilient”

#### The recovery is fragile--external shocks risk crippling the U.S. economy for the next decade

Michael D. Swaine et al., Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, CHINA'S MILITARY & THE U.S.-JAPAN ALLIANCE IN 2030: A STRATEGIC NET ASSESSMENT, 5--3--13, p. 203.

On the more pessimistic end, experts warn that a mixture of domestic and external shocks could trigger a second recession that, if accompanied by worsening political paralysis, could usher in a period of sustained economic decline lasting until at least 2025–2030. The U.S. economy could see average growth fall to as low as 1.5 percent during this period, suppressing living standards and gradually diminishing the U.S. share of the world economy. Given the halting and uncertain nature of the present recovery, experts note that external or domestic shocks of sufficient magnitude could quite easily push the U.S. economy into another recession. Mounting sovereign debt, harsh austerity programs, and contracting credit in the eurozone could spill over into the U.S. economy, cutting annual growth by more than 1 percent in a particularly catastrophic downturn. Expiring tax cuts and sequestration could produce a similar contraction, sending the U.S. economy into another recession by mid-2013. The impact of any economic shocks would be particularly severe if congressional leaders proved unable to overcome partisan paralysis to mobilize a response to such a crisis, given that the Federal Reserve’s recent interventions may have exhausted the limited capacity of its policy instruments. Of course, economic shocks would reinforce the underlying weaknesses in the U.S. economy, such as an anemic housing market, widespread job insecurity, and limited consumer spending.

#### The next recession risks collapse--we have no remaining safeguards in place

Joel L. Naroff, economist, "'Fiscal Cliff' Poses Risks of Another Recession," PHILADEPHIA INQUIRER, 11--12--12, http://articles.philly.com/2012-11-12/business/35050819\_1\_fiscal-cliff-tax-cuts-alternative-minimum-tax

The problem with falling into another recession is that there are no policies left to stimulate the economy. The Federal Reserve is out of bullets, and fiscal policy is restrictive. It is hard to cut interest rates when they already are at zero percent. While Federal Reserve Chairman Ben S. Bernanke and his merry band of monetary policymakers keep telling us they have more tricks up their sleeves, few believe they would be very effective. As for fiscal policy, it is spending cuts and tax increases that would be implemented, the exact opposite of what you would want to see being put in place in a recession. In other words, the economy would have to fix itself without any help. While it is not unreasonable to think that would happen, the ability to adjust would depend on how badly consumer and business confidence would be hurt. Estimates, which don't include any impacts on confidence, are that going off the cliff would cause the unemployment rate to rise above 9 percent. But if confidence tanks, the jobless rate could easily go back to double digits. The recession would become longer and steeper. Is there an upside to the austerity imposed by the tax increases and spending cuts? Yes, the budget deficit would be cut. And there are few who don't realize that the current deficits are unsustainable. Once growth resumes, we would be in better fiscal shape and have the potential to grow even faster. That is the source of the argument that says we would have some short-term pain with some long-term gain. Of course, we would also have a lot higher taxes and less spending. Though it is nice to hope that we could get out of the recession in a short period of time, when you start with an economy that has been weakened as much as ours has, it is not clear how long it would take to turn it around. The Great Depression was a series of recessions and failed recoveries that lasted a decade. The Great Recession and its disappointing recovery have already lasted five years. Another recession could put us in the same time frame as the Great Depression, and that is a risk most people don't want to take.

#### Not resilient

Nadler 9 [Jon Nadler, Senior Metals Market Analyst, “Easy Money. Who Needs It?,” <http://www.ibtimes.com/articles/20090213/easy-money-who-needs-it_2.htm>]

The first line of defense is gone. The economy is not resilient and is not stable. And the second line of defense is eroding.The Fed already has taken interest rates to zero, and lent out nearly $2 trillion in fruitless attempts to revive demand. In his speech, Bernanke proposed that the central bank "can always generate higher spending and hence positive inflation" by simply printing money as fast as possible. We're nowhere near that point yet. But the Fed hasn't demonstrated convincingly that lowering rates to zero and lending out trillions of dollars has had any impact on increasing final demand. It turns out that the Fed can print all the money it wants, but it can't make anyone spend it."

#### Economy not resilient – next economic collapse will be permanent

Jan Lundberg was previously Senior Vice President, Head of Global Discovery, a position he had since the Astra-Zeneca merger in 1999, June 12, 2006, “A Call to Action: The Necessity Defense,” http://www.culturechange.org/cms/index.php?option=com\_content&task=view&id=58&Itemid=65

Let there be a call to action for everyone to consider immediate direct action on behalf of the world's climate. If a small percentage of people actually do it, this would bring the polluting economy to a grinding halt. Due to the nature of our Humpty-Dumpty infrastructure and lack of self-sufficiency, global economic collapse will be permanent. The cheap oil to fuel the scope and levels of today’s trade is already mostly gone, and so a new economics and politics will emerge. Granted, a message or goal that would sacrifice industry as we know it - along with the global economy - is an impossible message or goal for the present powers that be. This does not mean the idea is premature, except in terms of widespread acceptance.