## \*\*\* CIR Politics

### CIR Will Pass

#### Will Pass—McConnell push, More Republicans on Board—Border Security reform provides an incentive

Bolton 7-14-13-(Alexander Bolton, “McConnell urges House GOP to move immigration legislation,” The Hill, 7-14-13, http://thehill.com/homenews/senate/310881-mcconnell-urges-house-republicans-to-move-immigration-legislation)

Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (Ky.) on Sunday urged Republicans in the House to move on immigration reform legislation.¶ Even though McConnell voted against the Senate immigration reform bill, he hopes the House will pass something that can be melded with the Senate proposal in conference negotiations.¶ “I don't think anybody's satisfied with the status quo on immigration,” he said in an NBC “Meet the Press” interview. “And I hope the House will be able to move forward on something and we can get this into conference and get an outcome that will be satisfactory for the American people.”¶ He said the Senate bill is “deficient” on border security, even though it included an amendment to double the number of border patrol agents to 40,000 and spend an additional $38 billion on border security. The bill spends a total of $46 billion on securing the U.S.-Mexico border.¶ McConnell said border security is a bigger issue for him than the question of putting an estimated 11 million illegal immigrants on a path to citizenship.¶ “The question is can we actually get the border secure and not have this happen again? That's the stickiest issue,” he said. “And I think the House will concentrate on that, I hope they will. We need to seriously beef up the border security part. I think that's the key to getting a final outcome.”¶ Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) has said he will not schedule a vote on the Senate bill in the House and that any bill that he brings to the floor must have majority support within the House Republican conference.¶ House Republicans are expected to move immigration reform piecemeal with a series of smaller bills. Legislation eventually granting citizenship to millions of illegal immigrants is not expected to be one of the proposals advanced by the House GOP leadership.¶ The lower chamber may consider committee-passed proposals to bolster border security and interior enforcement before the August recess.¶ The House Judiciary and Homeland Security Committees have approved five pieces of immigration legislation, so far.¶ Not all of the estimated 11 million illegal immigrants living in the country are expected to apply for the path to citizenship as defined in the Senate bill.¶ The Congressional Budget Office projected that there could still be as many as seven million illegal immigrants living in the United States in 2023 if the Senate bill became law.¶ Conservative critics of the bill have noted that 40 percent of illegal immigrants are in the country because they overstayed visas.¶ Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.) predicted on “Meet the Press” that the House would act on the issue.¶ “They will act,” he said. “They have to. This is something that — the vast, vast majority of the Republicans, Democrats, and Independents support. And John Boehner should let the House vote. That's all he has to do. If the House voted, it would pass overwhelmingly.”

#### Will Pass—Obama Public Address, their evidence will not assume this

Economic Times 7-14-13-(“ Barack Obama urges Republicans to pass immigration bill; 240,000 Indians to benefit,” The Economic Times, 7-14-13, http://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/nri/visa-and-immigration/barack-obama-urges-republicans-to-pass-immigration-bill-240000-indians-to-benefit/articleshow/21068887.cms)

WASHINGTON: US President Barack Obama has asked Americans to use all communication means to prod their Republican lawmakers to pass a landmark immigration reform bill that would boost economy and create a pathway to citizenship for 11 million illegal immigrants, including over 240,000 Indians. ¶ In his latest weekly Internet and radio address, Obama recalled that two weeks ago, a large bipartisan majority of Senators voted to pass commonsense, comprehensive immigration reform - taking an important step towards fixing our broken immigration system once and for all. ¶ "This bill was a compromise, and neither side got everything they wanted. But it was largely consistent with the key principles of commonsense reform that most of us in both parties have repeatedly laid out," Obama said. ¶ "If passed, the Senate's plan would build on the historic gains we've made in border security over the past four years with the most aggressive border security plan in our history. ¶ "It would offer a pathway to earned citizenship for the 11 million people who are in this country illegally - a pathway that includes paying penalties, learning English, and going to the end of the line behind everyone trying to come here legally. And it would modernise our legal immigration system to make it more consistent with our values," he said. ¶ Obama's message aired on Saturday was aimed at the Republican-controlled House of Representatives, which has balked at approving the bipartisan Senate bill. ¶ Long supportive of the Senate measure, Obama and his aides have pushed the House of Representatives to take up the immigration reform bill, which includes a pathway to citizenship for 11 million undocumented immigrants and strict border security provisions. There are some 240,000 Indians in the category of undocumented immigrants in the US. ¶ Some House Republicans have been resistant of the Senate -approved legislation, however, saying any pathway to citizenship amounts to amnesty. ¶ But Obama said, the US House of Representatives must act now on the immigration bill. ¶ "Now the House needs to act so I can sign commonsense immigration reform into law. And if you agree, tell your Representatives that now is the time. Call or email or post on their Facebook walls and ask them to get this done. Because together, we can grow our economy and keep America strong for years to come," the US President said. ¶ Obama also underlined that the Senate's plan would also provide a big boost to recovery of the US economy. ¶ Pointing to a report released Wednesday by independent, nonpartisan economists and experts, Obama noted that the study concluded that, if the Senate's plan becomes law, the US economy will be 5 per cent larger in two decades compared to the status quo. ¶ "That's USD 1.4 trillion added to our economy just by fixing our immigration system," the US President said. ¶ "Here in America, we've always been a nation of immigrants. That's what's kept our workforce dynamic, our businesses on the cutting edge, and our economy the strongest in the world. But under the current system, too many smart, hardworking immigrants are prevented from contributing to that success," he said. ¶ He emphasised that immigration reform would make it easier for highly-skilled immigrants and those who study at American colleges and universities to start businesses and create jobs in the country. ¶ "Foreign companies would be more likely to invest here. The demand for goods and services would go up - creating more jobs for American workers," he said. ¶ Every worker and business would be required to pay their fair share in taxes, reducing our deficit by nearly USD 850 billion over the next two decades, Obama said. ¶ "That's what immigration reform would mean for our economy - but only if we act. If we don't do anything to fix our broken system, our workforce will continue to shrink as baby boomers retire. ¶ "We won't benefit from highly-skilled immigrants starting businesses and creating jobs here. American workers will have to make due with lower wages and fewer protections. And without more immigrants and businesses paying their fair share in taxes, our deficit will be higher and programmes like Social Security will be under more strain," Obama warned. ¶ "If Democrats and Republicans - including President (George W) Bush and I - can agree on something, that's a pretty good place to start," Obama added.

#### Will Pass—Interview with Gutiérrez proves that Momentum for CIR is still very much alive—Despite Minor Setbacks

Gonzalez and Goodman 7-11-13-(Amy Goodman and Juan Gonzalez, “Rep. Luis Gutiérrez: House GOP Obstruction Won’t Stop Momentum of Immigration Reform,” Democracy Now, 7-11-13, http://www.democracynow.org/2013/7/11/rep\_luis\_gutierrez\_house\_gop\_obstruction)

The push to pass a comprehensive immigration reform bill this year faced a major setback Wednesday after House Republicans gathered behind closed doors to discuss whether they would support a bill passed just last month in the Senate. During a two-hour session, Speaker John Boehner urged his fellow Republicans to take action in a way that reflected the party’s principles. Afterwards, he joined Majority Leader Eric Cantor and others in issuing a statement, saying, quote, "rather than take up the flawed legislation rushed through the Senate, House committees will continue their work on a step-by-step, common-sense approach to fixing what has long been a broken system."¶ As House Republicans met to discuss immigration reform, a flash mob of immigrants and their allies took over the House Visitor Center and broke out into the national anthem as they unfurled an American flag.¶ IMMIGRANT FLASH MOB: [singing] ...by the dawn’s early light, What so proudly we hailed at the twilight’s last gleaming, Whose broad stripes and bright stars through the perilous fight, O’er the ramparts we watched, were so gallantly streaming?¶ AMY GOODMAN: Earlier Wednesday, hundreds of DREAMers and their parents participated in an "aspirational citizenship ceremony" at a park near the Capitol. One of the speakers at the event was Congressmember Luis Gutiérrez, Democrat of Illinois. He joins us now from the Cannon Rotunda at the Capitol. Congressmember Gutiérrez is the chair of the Immigration Task Force of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, member of the bipartisan House Gang of Seven that’s been working on a broad immigration reform bill. He has an upcoming tour planned in which he’ll visit Republican congressional districts to build bipartisan support for immigration reform.¶ Are reports of the immigration bill being dead exaggerated, Congressmember Gutiérrez?¶ REP. LUIS GUTIÉRREZ: Well, you know, in Washington, D.C., it’s kind of the favorite of journalists around here. They love—I mean, they—I guess they should use the funeral business or be morticians, because they love to kill everything. Of course, this movement is far from dead. It’s alive. It’s well. Look, it’s a very broad, expansive, deep movement. I mean, when you get The New York Times and The Wall Street Journal editorial boards almost singing synonymously the praises of comprehensive immigration, when you have the AFL-CIO sitting down with the Chamber of Commerce and reaching an agreement, when you have the United Farm Workers and the growers across this country reaching an agreement, when you have evangelicals and very progressive on the religious front together, working together, look, it’s very broad, it’s very deep, and we’re going to be successful.¶ So, here’s what I think. I think the Republican Party is just going to have to make a decision. I think that’s really the quandary they find themselves in, and I think that’s really a reflection of yesterday’s meeting. There are those who want to take the party forward. Paul Ryan, Congressman Paul Ryan, says we should not have a two-tier society where we have a permanent underclass. He wants to end that permanent underclass. He wants to bring them out of the shadows into American citizenship. And then you have others who simply do not like immigrants. Look, you could make—you could put as many people as you want on the border. That border could be sealed and impenetrable. They still would not vote for comprehensive immigration reform or any reform. They just don’t want—to them, one immigrant is one immigrant too many, and they’re never going to come around. So that’s the quandary of the Republican Party. I think there are good, solid voices in the Republican Party that are going to, in the end, prevail on this issue.¶ Lastly, there’s something very unique about this moment. And that is, I’ve been here 20 years. There are more than 218 votes. That is, there is a majority in the House of Representatives for comprehensive immigration reform. That’s never been there before. There are dozens of Republicans that are ready to join a couple of hundred of Democrats to get this done. All Speaker Boehner has to do is actually allow democracy to flourish in the House of Representatives and allow us to vote.¶ Lastly, let’s not buy into this the Senate bill, the Senate bill, the Senate bill. No one—the only one saying that we should adopt the Senate bill is Schumer, the senator from New York. Apart from Schumer, I think everybody else understands that you need to be respectful of a legislative process in the House of Representatives. So stop using that as an excuse. We are working on a bipartisan basis. We’ll work with Paul Ryan. We’ll work with Congressman Carter. We’ll work with Congressman Johnson. We’ll work with Congressman Diaz-Balart. We will work with them and others to formulate a bipartisan proposal—distinct, different, but conferencable with the Senate version.¶ JUAN GONZÁLEZ: Well, Congressman Gutiérrez, the proposals in the House, though, none of the separate portions of the—of legislation that they presented include legislation that would provide a path to citizenship. And I think Raúl Labrador, the congressman, Republican congressman, last night on the NewsHour said that he doesn’t believe your estimate that there is a majority support for a pathway to citizenship exists in the House. Could you respond to both those issues?¶ REP. LUIS GUTIÉRREZ: Sure. Number one, let me just say this: Then let’s have a vote. Then, if your position is—let’s have a vote. The only way you’re really going to answer this question is to allow a vote. Why is it—they say that they want a majority of the majority to be for something. In other words, 125 out of 435 members dictate the future of policy in the House of Representatives? I mean, that’s a minority. That’s 30 percent. Now 30 percent dictates the future of legislation in the House of Representatives?¶ I think, look, the American public spoke clearly and unequivocally on November the 4th. The Republican Party has a decision to make. There are many—former President Bush, his brother Jeb Bush, Karl Rove—you name them, they are ready and working and advancing the cause of comprehensive immigration reform. For whatever reason—I believe many of them believe that there should be a solution to our broken immigration system. Others simply want to take it off the table. Doesn’t matter what the motivation is. The fact is, they’re looking for a solution.¶ And the Republican Party—look, I want to be very, very clear. There is a demographic tsunami coming towards the Republican Party, and it’s reflected in George Bush in 2004, got over 40 percent of the Latino vote. The last election, the Republican nominee Romney barely got over 20 percent of the vote. And more Latinos are voting. Not only is the percentage going down, but the number of Latinos actually participating in the electoral system is increasing. They will no—look, do they want to be a party of provinces and counties and areas of the United States, or do they want to be a national party? That’s the decision they’re going to have to make as they move forward on this issue.¶ JUAN GONZÁLEZ: And you are supposedly, I understand, going on another one of your national tours on immigration reform, and you’re going into some of these Republican House districts in the coming months?¶ REP. LUIS GUTIÉRREZ: Yeah, I’m going to leave tomorrow, and we’ll be going out, and it’s cherry-picking season. I mean, I want to be with the workers. And I want to be with the actual producers, right? So, we want to combine the workers with the actual farmers that are there and the growers to show America this is about economic security and vitality. And I want to show the nation, at least attempt to show the nation—you know something? That’s hard, backbreaking work. Somebody’s got to work in those fields every day. In Washington, we’ll go out and meet with the growers in Washington state, and we’ll see—and we’ll be with people who pick apples. And then, next weekend—then I want to go to the NAACP. Let me tell you something. The Black Caucus and the black community in the United States has been stellar. It’s been such a foundation for our immigration system. I want to go out there and continue to coordinate.¶ Look, the movement is broad, the movement is very deep, and it will not be denied. You can delay this. You can delay it. I agree you can delay. But you can’t stop it. It is inevitable. Fifty thousands Latinos turn 18 every year. And I know the question of some of your viewers: How many of them are citizens? I’m only talking about the ones that are citizens. Look, this is growing. We’re going to achieve it. And the Republican Party, in the end—all Boehner has to do is give us a vote. If he gives us a vote, there will be more than 218 votes. Of that, I am sure.¶ AMY GOODMAN: Congressmember Bob Goodlatte, the chair of the House Judiciary Committee, spoke earlier this week about his party’s reasons for opposing immigration reform passed by the Senate. He began by referencing the last immigration reform bill that passed in 1986 and was signed into law by President Reagan.¶ REP. BOB GOODLATTE: First of all, in 1986 they gave an easy pathway to citizenship to nearly three million people with the promise of greater enforcement—border enforcement, employer sanctions, other new things—to prevent a repeat of illegal immigration. Well, obviously, that was never put into effect, not just by this president, but by all the interceding presidents, as well. So, this Senate bill now gives a legal status. It’s a longer pathway to citizenship, but it gives a legal status almost immediately to maybe 11 million or more people and then says, "We’ll fix the border, we’ll put in E-Verify, we’ll put in an entry-exit visa system, we’ll do the other interior enforcement things that we’ve all said we need to have." They don’t do it until after they’ve given them legal status, and most people think that the legal status is what most people who are not lawfully present in the United States want anyway. So, a repeat of 1986.¶ I also think the special pathway to citizenship in the Senate bill, giving people who have entered the country illegally something that people who have come legally for decades and followed the rules and gone through and been the beneficiary of particular types of petitions, where they get the status automatically just by virtue of having been here illegally and then legally for a period of time, is a bad way, a bad precedent, as well. And then, finally, there’s not any kind of significant interior enforcement. About 35 to 40 percent of the people who are here illegally entered the country legally on visitors’ visas, business visas, student visas, visa waivers, and simply overstayed. So, the border itself, securing that, is not enough.¶ AMY GOODMAN: So that’s Republican Congressmember Bob Goodlatte, chair of the House Judiciary Committee.¶ Republican Congressman Tom Cotton of Arkansas wrote a piece in today’s Wall Street Journalheadlined "It’s the House Bill or Nothing on Immigration." He wrote, quote, "The House of Representatives will reject any proposal with the Senate bill’s irreparably flawed structure, which is best described as: legalization first, enforcement later ... maybe. ... [T]he best solution is to abandon the Senate bill’s flawed framework and proceed with an enforcement-first approach that assures Americans that the border is secure and immigration laws are being enforced."¶ And then you’ve got that tweet that was just put out there, a Twitter message posted last night by Congressmember Tim Huelskamp of Kansas, who wrote—and he refers to Republicans as Rs—"Most House Rs agree w/ most Senate Rs and Americans. Trusting Obama w/ border security is like trusting Bill Clinton w/ your daughter."¶ So where is this headed, Congressmember Gutiérrez? Yet you have George W. Bush supporting your position.¶ REP. LUIS GUTIÉRREZ: Sure. Look, I think Chairman Goodlatte is just wrong. They talk about the 1986 legislation. And here’s what happened in 1986. It was an amnesty. Basically, three million people got green cards and five years later could apply for American citizenship. In that sense, he’s correct. But this thing about border enforcement and that they were going to—look, the only thing it has was employer sanctions. That is, you were going to sanction employers. And let me tell you what happened as soon as the bill was passed. Because there was no pathway for new workers to come and fill the economic vacuums that exist in our economy and exist in certain localities in the United States, because there was no way for new workers and new immigrants to come to America to fill that vacuum, they came undocumented to the United States in order to fill that stuff. But, guess who were the first people to call? It was Republican members of Congress calling and saying, "I don’t have enough people to pick apples. I don’t have enough people to pick grapes. I don’t have enough people to work and toil in my factory. I don’t have enough people in the meatpacking plants in my district. I need you to set aside." They were the ones calling on the Department of Labor.¶ What we are doing, how can you say that this is not monumentally different, when Democrats, who have never been for enforcement only, allow 700 miles of fences, as they have in the Senate proposal, 20,000 more Border Patrol agents? Look, you can say that there’s no enforcement in there. The fact is that they are militarizing the border between the United States and Mexico in order to reach an agreement to allow 11 million people to live in the United States and have some semblance of justice and fairness, number one. And Mr. Goodlatte should understand that. And our proposals have always been about enforcement.¶ What they are saying—look, they are using positions that have been completely discredited and discarded. November 6—it’s almost as though in the House of Representatives nothing happened November 6th, there wasn’t an electoral demand for comprehensive immigration reform. Let me just reiterate. Mr. Goodlatte is an outlier, and so are the Republicans in the House of Representatives.The New York Times, Wall Street Journal, AFL-CIO, Chamber of Commerce, the growers and the union representing the farm workers, the evangelicals and Presbyterians, Catholics and Mormons, all together, the movement has brought. Everybody is compromising. Everybody is sitting at a table and saying, "What do we have to do to work together?" The only ones that—in the Senate, compromise in the Senate: 14 Republicans, 54 Democrats get together, 68 of them. Everywhere there is compromise, and there are people working together to solve the problem, except the House of Representatives. And in the end, they have to simply allow us a vote. Leave the rhetoric aside, allow us a vote, and we can fix our broken immigration system.¶ JUAN GONZÁLEZ: Congressman Gutiérrez, just a few seconds we have left. You’ve been an ally now on this issue with Paul Ryan, and you’re close to him. Do you think that Paul Ryan would lead the—will lead the charge in the House to be able to get some kind of a pathway to citizenship in the legislation that the House considers?¶ REP. LUIS GUTIÉRREZ: Number one, he believes in it. He has stated it. And I’m very, very—I’m very, very proud of him that in spite of this very ugly rhetoric from some sectors of his party, he has stood up and consistently said we need a pathway to citizenship. And like Paul Ryan, there are dozens of other Democrats—I mean, I’m sorry, dozens of other Republicans in the House of Representatives that are ready to vote. Simply allow us a vote. Why are you afraid? If you don’t believe that there are sufficient numbers of Democrats and Republicans to pass comprehensive immigration reform, then maybe you’re right. No, you’re saying it’s your way or no way. Everyone else is compromising. Everyone else is compromising. The only place where people say, "It’s the status quo, and I don’t want to fix this," is in the House of Representatives, and it’s in the Republican caucus of the House of Representatives. My view is, allow democracy to flourish, allow a vote. Two hundred and eighteen people will vote—more. More than—Juan, more than 218 will vote for comprehensive immigration reform. And they know we have the votes.¶ AMY GOODMAN: We want to thank you very much, Congressmember Gutiérrez, for joining us, Democratic congressmember from Illinois, chair of the Immigration Task Force of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus and member of the bipartisan House Gang of Seven that’s been working on this broad immigration reform bill. He is planning this tour, starting tomorrow, visiting Republican congressional districts to drum up support for immigration reform. This is Democracy Now! Stay with us.

### CIR Good—Military Readiness

CIR allows undocumented immigrants to enlist in the U.S. military

Foley 13—Elise Foley is correspondent for Huffington Post, January 2013 (Elise Foley is a reporter for the Huffington Post in Washington,  
D.C. She previously worked at The Washington Independent, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/25/immigrants-military-deferred-action\_n\_2553726.html)

Undocumented immigrants are barred from enlisting. But these young people all came to the United States as children and are now trying to gain legal status. Under a recent directive called Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals they are allowed to work -- now they want President Barack Obama to allow that work to be in the military.¶ But the Dream Act has a specific provision for military service while deferred action does not. Dreamers could either go to college or join the military in order to benefit from the Dream Act, but deferred action looks only at college. Although immigrants are eligible for deferred action if they have been honorably discharged from the military, undocumented immigrants are not eligible to join up, meaning the policy would only apply if they had already served. ¶ A number of members of Congress and other leaders, including former Secretary of Defense Robert Gates and former Secretary of State Colin Powell, have spoken in support of allowing immigrants covered by the Dream Act to join the military as part of that bill. Vargas said the groups are hoping some of those same officials will back their effort to allow deferred action recipients to enlist.

#### Immigrants are key to fill crucial high skilled positions in the Army which the US cannot produce

Preston 9—Correspondent for the New York Times, Julia (Correspondent for the New York Times) http://www.nytimes.com/2009/02/15/us/15immig.html?pagewanted=all&\_r=0

Military officials want to attract immigrants who have native knowledge of languages and cultures that the Pentagon considers strategically vital. The program will also be open to students and refugees. For foreigners who come to work or study in the United States on temporary visas, the path to citizenship is uncertain and at best agonizingly long, often lasting more than a decade. The military also waives naturalization fees, which are at least $675. Recruiters expect that the temporary immigrants will have more education, foreign language skills and professional expertise than many Americans who enlist, helping the military to fill shortages in medical care, language interpretation and field intelligence analysis.¶ “The American Army finds itself in a lot of different countries where cultural awareness is critical,” said Lt. Gen. Benjamin C. Freakley, the top recruitment officer for the Army, which is leading the pilot program. “There will be some very talented folks in this group.”

#### Our military is at an all time low in readiness, filing positions is key

Lyons 6/11 - Commander in Chief of the U.S. Pacific Fleet James A. 2013(Officer of the U.S. Navy for thirty-six years, most recently as Commander in Chief of the U.S. Pacific Fleet, He is currently the Chief Executive Officer of LION Associates LLC) (http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2013/jun/11/restoring-military-readiness-512223544)

#### ¶ The impact of fighting two wars over the past decade has taken its toll on our military forces. They have been run hard and put away wet. Sequestration has only compounded the problem. Our military services are already reeling from previously approved $800 billion in defense cuts over the next decade and are now faced with $500 billion in additional budget cuts now that sequestration has been implemented.¶ All this means that we will have the smallest Army since prior to World War II. The Navy, with its anemic shipbuilding program, will most likely be left with the smallest fleet since prior to World War I. The U.S. Air Forcewill suffer a similar adverse impact. Selected aircraft squadrons from both the Air Force and the Navy have been ordered to stand down and not fly. It will take several months to restore their readiness. Our combat readiness in today’s world must be our first priority. Since our top military leadership is complicit in the administration’s social engineering of our military, Congress must exercise its constitutional responsibility to “provide for the common defense” and make policy for the armed forces. As a first order of business, Congress should reinstate the “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell” policy.

#### Readiness is key to hegemony—global power signal

SPENCER 2k—Policy Analyst for Defense and National Security at Heritage - Jack, September 15, (http://www.heritage.org/Research/MissileDefense/BG1394.cfm)

Military readiness is vital because declines in America’s military readiness signal to the rest of the world that the United States is not prepared to defend its interests. Therefore, potentially hostile nations will be more likely to lash out against American allies and interests, inevitably leading to U.S. involvement in combat. A high state of military readiness is more likely to deter potentially hostile nations from acting aggressively in regions of vital national interest, thereby preserving peace.

### CIR Good—US-India Relations

#### Obama’s efforts to expand US relations with India by issuing visas

**Foda and Prasad**, Prasad is the Tolani Senior Professor of Trade Policy at Cornell University and a Research Associate at the National Bureau of Economic Research, and Foda is a Senior Research Assistant at the Brookings Institution in Washington, D.C. [Karim Foda and Eswar Prasad, The U.S.-India Relationship, Brookings, http://www.brookings.edu/research/papers/2010/11/04-india-prasad]

President Obama’s visit to the world’s largest democracy comes at a time when prospects for the world economy are becoming increasingly reliant on leading emerging markets like India, and when India’s economic and political clout in global affairs is growing. Flows of goods, services and people have strengthened the economic interdependence between the two countries, although this is still an order of magnitude smaller than the U.S.-China interdependence. There are natural alliances between the two countries on a range of economic and political issues, but the relationship still needs some careful nurturing. This visit by President Obama provides an opportunity to build trust and convince Indian leaders that the U.S. has a genuine interest in promoting a more cooperative approach on issues where the two sides agree and dealing with some irritants in the relationship. The nature of the strategic relationship between the U.S. and India could play an important role in shaping a number of international policy debates, especially as the U.S. sees India as a counterweight to China.   Here are some highlights of the strategic and economic aspects of the bilateral relationship:  Economic ties between the two countries are growing. Trade in services and skilled migration are the key components of these growing linkages. Trade between the two countries is roughly balanced, reducing the potential for conflict on currency and trade issues. Indian officials are now very concerned about loose monetary policy in the U.S., which is fueling surges in capital flows into India and creating concerns about an unsustainable boom in equity markets. Indian citizens are by far the largest skilled migrant group in the U.S., accounting for over one-third of U.S. H-1B visas issued in recent years. Even as the U.S. benefits enormously from this import of skills, tensions are rising about high-end service sector employment that is moving from the U.S. to India. This could become a potent issue if employment growth remains weak in the U.S. President Obama needs to reassure India that the U.S. is not just a fair-weather friend. India has major concerns about security on its borders with Pakistan and China. Indian leaders are not convinced that, in the event of rising tensions on either of these borders, the U.S. will throw in its lot with India. India has so far taken a relatively passive role in international policy debates where the U.S. would like it to be more assertive—for instance, in the currency wars. Here again, India is hesitant to lead the charge on behalf of other emerging markets as it feels somewhat isolated and is nervous about being left out in the cold, including by the U.S., if it takes an aggressive position against China. Most of the conflicts between India and the U.S. are in fact played out on the international stage rather than on specific bilateral issues. The U.S. sees India as blocking progress on the trade liberalization and climate change agendas. This is one area where constructive cooperation and give-and-take between the two economies could have global implications.

Key Elements of the Bilateral Economic Relationship

U.S.-India trade has expanded in recent years but took a hit during the crisis and has only recently begun to rebound. Trade in goods and services between the countries has been quite balanced, with India running a surplus of around $7 billion. The share of total Indian exports going to the U.S. has declined steadily from around 20 percent at the beginning of the decade to about 11 percent over the last two years. The increase in India’s exports to China, especially minerals such as iron ore, accounts for part of this shift. Less than 2 percent of U.S. exports go to India. Services trade between the two economies has been growing rapidly—the share of total U.S. services imports that come from India has risen from less than 1 percent in 2000 to 3.4 percent in 2009.   Migration   Indian citizens are by far the largest skilled migrant group in the U.S. In 2009, the number of H-1B visas awarded to Indian citizens totaled 123,002, or 36 percent of all H-1B visas awarded that year, up from a share of about 25 percent in 2005 (See Figures 3 and 4 in pdf). The bias toward Indians in the allocation of H1B visas to the U.S. is no coincidence—it reflects the complementary relationship between skilled Indian immigrants and advanced, high growth sectors in the U.S., most notably information technology services.   Travel and Tourism   In addition to the flow of migrant workers and services, tourism is another area that is helping to foster rising linkages between the U.S. and India. American tourist expenditures (both business and leisure) in India amounted to about $2.5 billion in 2009, accounting for roughly 20 percent of U.S. services imports from India in 2009. Indian tourist expenditures in the U.S. have increased to $3 billion, or 30 percent of services exports to India. These numbers are another testament to the small and growing but relatively balanced nature of the U.S. and Indian economic relationship.

#### US visas are key to solve US-India relations

**Kripalani and Deo**, Kripalani is the former India Bureau chief of Businessweek magazine, and Deo is a 1975 batch Indian Foreign Service (IFS) officer who served as India’s Ambassador to Denmark and Côte d'Ivoire.[ Manjeet Kripalani and Neelam Deo, Ending the Drift in India-US ties, Live mint and THE WALLSTREET JOURNAL,  http://www.livemint.com/Opinion/tXv7d1Htv35bPXcsEg3jyK/Ending-the-drift-in-IndiaUS-ties.html]

The US secretary of state, John Kerry is in India. Among other engagements, Kerry will take part in the fourth India-US strategic dialogue in New Delhi. On the agenda are a slew of bilateral issues, from the status of the civil nuclear agreement, to H1B visas, to increased access for US companies in India.  It may sound like more of the same old stuff. But this bilateral comes at a politically significant moment, when a) the Taliban has established an embassy-cum-government in exile in Qatar, with US blessing; b) India and the US have both been paid a visit by the new Chinese leadership; c) the Nuclear Suppliers Group has met without including India, thereby leaving the civilian nuclear issue hanging; and d) US immigration reforms can negatively affect visas for India’s software engineers—and our biggest export to the US.  The visit also comes at an economically critical time, when India’s growth has slowed to 5% but the US is starting to recover—so the two countries have different needs at this time. India’s fractured politics has affected its economics, forcing even domestic businesses abroad, rather than investing at home. US business wants India to open its doors—but can it succeed where even stout-hearted locals can’t? Kerry will surely be carrying in his pocket the 7 June crib list spelled out to the US President Barack Obama by trade and industry groups, accusing India of protectionism, market entry restrictions and patent violations. Since India is in no position to make such one-sided concessions at this time, pushing for it will be an inauspicious start to Kerry’s India engagement. To check the bilateral drift and mutual frustration, it is necessary to move beyond the same old stuff. India must stop viewing the US through the narrow prism of H1B visas, and the US must stop seeing India through the granular lens of market access for its industry alone. The US-India nuclear deal was a unique ice-breaker between two democracies. Its immediate benefit was political and symbolic; its operationalization is a very long-term gain. This, the lawmakers and chambers of commerce on both sides must understand. The US shouldn’t be stuck on the nuclear deal, seeing that both the Russian and French projects in India are mired in local protest. Besides, it has not used much political capital to bring India into the four technology-control regimes.

### CIR Won’t Pass

#### Hastert Rule prevents Immigration reform from passing, Republicans prefer personal success over party success

Salvanto and Hendin, (Anthony Salvanto and Robert Hendin) 7-13-13**,** CBS News, (Why Immigration reform faces an uphill battle in the House)

http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-250\_162-57593521/why-immigration-reform-faces-an-uphill-battle-in-the-house/

We haven't seen any polling on this, but we'd wager that few Americans outside D.C. know what the "Hastert Rule" is. And who could blame them? It isn't even a written rule. But it does help highlight the pressures in the Republican conference right now as it wrangles with immigration reform, and the way Congress operates in this new era. When they assembled this week to map out their approach, House Republicans made clear they won't be taking up the Senate's "gang of eight" bill because not all House GOP members support it. Many expressed principled disagreement with the policy; still others said they were skeptical that the Senate bill's plan for border enforcement - which they prioritize - would really happen. Many national Republicans see an immigration measure as a step toward making inroads with Hispanic voters, who have growing clout and have voted overwhelmingly Democratic. But House members' political calculus can be - by design - very different from the Senate's, and probably from those looking to steer the national party's "brand." The thought of primaries or voter anger back home might outweigh the allure of any gains for the national party from appealing to Hispanic voters (or, at least, by not continuing to do things unappealing to Hispanic voters). On "Face the Nation" two weeks ago, host Bob Schieffer pointed out the conservative and non-minority composition of many GOP districts, adding he's "noticed over the years that when politicians of either party are given the choice between personal survival and party survival, they usually choose personal." Republicans' districts average just 10 percent Hispanic voting age population. (By contrast, Democrats' districts average more than twice that, on average.) There simply aren't many Hispanic voters for many of these members to appeal to. Here's the kicker: even the handful of GOP districts that do have a sizeable Hispanic share (greater than 20 percent) are not even swing districts. They have a CBS average partisan rating of +9 so Republicans don't usually need the Hispanic voters in them, anyway. All told, this is only 14 percent of their conference, or 32 seats. There are some - particularly in Texas, California, and perhaps Florida - where a GOP House member might breathe a little easier if they got more of the Hispanic vote, but those are not numerous enough that those members can force the conference. No one is saying the House can't pass immigration reform. The question is: Can it pass something with a path to citizenship for those immigrants in the country illegally, which is a requirement of the Senate Democrats and the president? Some members might fear conservative primary challenges in their district should they go the wrong way on this, coming from partisans who'd balk at anything that looks like amnesty. So policy concerns aside, they face the question of a vote for a hypothetical, unproven potential help to the party's future in upcoming Presidential or Senatorial elections or risk their own political future in their own district. The peril in their own district may be more tangible, or at least more imminent. Business interests in favor of reform might pressure the House. They might be pitted against outside conservative groups opposed to it who readily boast of multimillion dollar campaign spending against Republicans who don't stay in their good graces. Today's PACs can and do reach into any district in the country to target members, often taking sides in primaries or runoffs between candidates of the same party, for the candidate who best fits the policy goals. We've seen outside groups repeatedly back one Republican candidate over another in the last few cycles, and this is the kind of issue that could open the door to those scenes again. Many of the House Republican seats are safely Republican (the average GOP member won with about two-thirds of the vote) but that just means more conservative voters to rally against them in a primary, more so than in moderate districts. There's yet another way this is particular to the House and districts: Republican voters nationwide have generally shown some support for a combination of bolstered border-security and conditional path to citizenship. An April CBS News poll didn't find much difference between Republicans, Democrats and independents on the matter. Moreover, to the extent this is supposedly about conservative voters who'd be upset, it didn't find a significant difference between conservative Republicans and the rest of the party, though sample sizes somewhat limit the ability to test this fully, and the political reality is that it doesn't take a majority of Republicans to generate a primary challenge, only a handful of committed ones. And outside money can help turn a small movement into a force. This is all another example of how parties are increasingly nationalized, too, and it's especially interesting against the backdrop of immigration policy. Immigration issues have often crossed party lines and split members as much by region, or by ties to particular businesses, at least as much as by party. They just did again: in the Senate, Republican senators from border and high-immigration states were in favor, like Sens. John McCain, R-Ariz., and Marco Rubio, R-Fla.; and opposed, like Sens. Ted Cruz and John Cornyn from Texas. House Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, said "it's always in the party's best interest when we're doing the right thing for the country." But not everyone defines what's best for the party - or for that matter the country - the same way. And the House of Representatives doesn't naturally foster broad governing coalitions of supporters across the electorate. Redistricting has made it likely the GOP can keep control of the House for a while, but it also means more conservative districts electing more conservative members. There's a twist here, too, on the classic tension of district representation versus the national party, in that many Republicans in the House, especially those elected through the help of tea party groups, aren't strongly aligned with the dictates, such as they are, of the national party on this or many issues. Rather they see themselves as part of a national movement that is rejecting what they see as the status-quo national party and its apparatus. That, in turn, has put extra pressure on Boehner to try to hold together the conference. And hence, the "Hastert rule:" a bill or a series of bills, as may be the case here, won't come to the floor until most Republicans are behind it, so the House GOP will speak with one voice on this, despite its divisions. Or as Rep. Tom Cotton, R-Okla., stated in a Wall Street Journal editorial, there will be a House Republican bill, or no bill at all.¶ Whether or not that would pass the whole chamber is another matter. Getting a House bill becomes a harder climb because it won't simply be a matter of finding a majority of House members in support (some combination of Republicans and Democrats) it'll be a matter of finding something a majority of Republicans will support. And their pressures, in this era of nationalized parties, outside money, and local voters, are simply different mix than many others.

#### Immigration Reform’s “time” is up, it won’t pass this year

Fawn, Johnson 6, 24, 2013, edition of National Journal Daily,(Time’s Up, Immigration Won’t pass this year Plenty of efforts will be devoted to reform over the next month, but it will die in August, like last time*)* Fawn Johnson is a correspondent for National Journal, covering a range of issues including immigration, transportation and education. Johnson is a long-time student of Washington policymaking, previously reporting for Dow Jones Newswires and the Wall Street Journal where she covered financial regulation and telecommunications. She is an alumnus of CongressDaily, where she covered health care, labor, and immigration. Johnson first covered Congress at BNA Inc., where she covered labor, welfare, immigration, and asbestos liability. She has an M.A. from the Annenberg School for Communication at University of Pennsylvania and a B.A. from Bates College

Nothing less than a miracle will get major immigration legislation through Congress this year. It’s not the Senate’s fault, not this time. The upper chamber is well on track to comfortably pass this week a sweeping bill that would legalize millions of undocumented immigrants and dramatically boost troops on the border. Sen. Chuck Schumer, D-N.Y., a leader in the immigration effort, said on CNN's*State of the Union* that two-thirds of the Senate is already in favor of the bill. But the House is slogging along on a piece-by-piece approach that does nothing but stretch out the debate until all that’s left are wisps of ideas on work visas, local police enforcement, and electronic verification of workers. Indeed, the House might not kill the bill outright, but the GOP players are passing the ball around until the clock runs out. What’s that clock look like? After senators get the bill done – probably in time to make their weekend barbeques -- they have a weeklong July 4 break. And then they get to wait for colleagues on the other side of the Capitol who will have four weeks – *four weeks* – to deliberate before Congress takes off for an even lengthier recess in August. Once Washington meets autumn, immigration falls off the priority track thanks to the reemergence of fiscal crisis. The House Judiciary Committee has yet to tackle the most difficult issues on immigration—what to do with the current undocumented population and how to handle the future flow of low-skilled immigrants. There are no signs that the committee is working on any such bills. We don't know who would sponsor them or, on the off chance that someone actually puts pen to paper, that such measures could even get out of committee. What about the House floor? The best hope for the immigration legislation to continue moving forward would be an "immigration week" in the House in July, in which members vote on several different bills to set up a far more conservative proposal than the solution posed in the Senate. Under this theoretical "immigration week," the House would vote on a severe enforcement measure to give local police the authority to apprehend, investigate, and detain people suspected of residing in the country illegally. Members would vote to mandate electronic verification of employees. The House might vote on a decidedly anti-union agriculture bill to give temporary work visas to undocumented farm workers but not a path to citizenship. But last week's unexpected and embarrassing defeat of the farm bill, courtesy of 62 feisty tea partiers, may give House GOP leaders pause before they bring up that one. Only one of the smaller immigration bills that the Judiciary Committee will have ready for the floor in early July, on high-skill work visas, has the slightest chance of getting help from Democrats. The pro-business New Democrat Coalition has gone out of its way to praise Rep. Darrell Issa, R-Calif., and Judiciary Committee Chairman Bob Goodlatte, R-Va., for proposing to boost the number of H-1B visas available for tech firms, but there are parts of the bill they don't support. Yet even the moderate Democrats are lining up behind the Senate immigration bill instead of the House approach on high-skilled immigration. Rep. Jared Polis, D-Colo., who leads the immigration task force for the New Democrats, told *National Journal* that he does not want a high-tech bill to be a "distraction" from the comprehensive legislation being embraced by the Senate. Somewhere in there, a bipartisan group of seven House members could release their own comprehensive proposal on immigration reform. But none of the members of this "gang" can tell you what happens to it next. They have no commitment from Goodlatte to push it through the Judiciary Committee, and all they know from House Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, is that Goodlatte calls the shots. Then comes August, the month in which legislation dies. The last time the Senate passed a major immigration bill in 2006, House Republicans used the August recess to kill it by staging a series of hearings around the country that did nothing but rile up conservatives against it. Let's not forget the health care bill, which only passed after President Obama forced it through the Senate with Democratic votes using a parliamentary tactic that isn't available on immigration. It was in August of 2009 that Sen. Chuck Grassley, R-Iowa, then the ranking member of the Finance Committee, definitively announced his opposition to the health care bill, ensuring that GOP senators would line up behind him. And at that time, Democrats controlled the House, which is how Obama pushed that bill over the finish line. When lawmakers return to the Capitol in September, they will be facing another financial crisis as they debate raising the country's debt ceiling. The four- to six-week countdown toward extreme limitations on government payments to Social Security or military operations will do two things: It will suck all the life out of any deliberative legislative effort, immigration included, and it will polarize the political parties. It will be far from fertile ground for the biggest immigration overhaul in 30 years. Proponents of the Senate's immigration package are hoping that a strong vote this week among senators will push the more reluctant House Republicans to act, if only to get the emotional issue out of the way. "We know there's going to be hard-line opponents. We know there's a number of people, [Rep.] Paul Ryan, [D-Wis.], and others, who are in favor of this and will be pitching it to their colleagues.… That's going to be the group that's interesting to watch," said America's Voice Executive Director Frank Sharry. But Sharry acknowledged the most problematic hurdle to passing an immigration overhaul—support from a majority of House Republicans—still eludes proponents. "The House leadership will try to muster 120 votes for a path to citizenship. I find it hard to think they will get there," he said. If House Republicans keep deliberating at their current pace, the bill will die from sheer talk.

#### GOP won’t pass immigration reform

**The Hill 7-10-13,** (GOP Leaders have no coherent message for passing immigration reform)

http://thehill.com/homenews/house/310187-hoyer-gop-leaders-have-no-coherent-message-for-passing-immigration-reform

***The Hill***, a subsidiary of News Communications Inc., is a newspaper published in Washington, D.C. since 1994.[2][3][4]¶ Its first editor was Martin Tolchin, a veteran correspondent in the Washington bureau of *The New York Times*.[4]¶ It is written for and about the U.S. Congress, with a special focus on business and lobbying, political campaigns and other events on Capitol Hill. The newspaper features investigative reporting, profiles of lawmakers and aides, features describing the sociology and politics of the Hill, book and restaurant reviews and a weekly column about the Capitol Hill neighborhoods

Facing a fractured GOP conference, House Republican leaders have no coherent message for passing immigration reform this year, Rep. Steny Hoyer (D-Md.) charged Wednesday.¶ Hoyer, the Democratic whip, said he remains "hopeful" that Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) can rally his troops behind a comprehensive plan for fixing the nation's defective immigration system. But with Republicans on and off Capitol Hill deeply divided on the issue, Hoyer said GOP leaders have no cohesive design for bridging the gaps and passing reforms anytime soon.¶ "I don't know that the Republican leadership has a strategy that is workable," Hoyer said Wednesday during a press briefing in the Capitol.¶ Hoyer cited an editorial in *The Wall Street Journal*, published Wednesday, declaring that Republicans are "splintered and confused on immigration," leaving the party "with no coherent or winning message."¶ "That's the *Wall Street Journal*, I want to make it clear," Hoyer said.¶ House Republicans are meeting Wednesday afternoon for a high-stakes discussion on the party's immigration strategy moving forward. The Senate last month passed a comprehensive reform bill with a strong bipartisan vote of 68-32, but House conservatives have rejected the citizenship and border-security provisions of that package, and Boehner has vowed not to bring it to the floor.¶ Instead, House Republicans have focused on more limited proposals largely designed to bolster border security and internal enforcement of existing immigration laws. Sen. Charles Schumer (D-N.Y.) warned this week, however, that upper-chamber Democrats won't be willing to go to conference with any House package that lacks the citizenship benefits.¶ The immigration reform issue gained a great deal of steam after November's elections, with GOP leaders like Boehner vowing to join President Obama in passing reforms this year. But the recent impasse has raised real doubts whether Congress can get over its differences and send a bill to the president's desk.¶ Hoyer said he's holding out hope, even as neither side seems prepared to budge on the citizenship issue.¶ "I am hopeful that John Boehner will find a way to get to a positive response to the Senate bill, and that we can move forward on a comprehensive package which will, in fact, provide a pathway to citizenship [for illegal immigrants]," Hoyer said.

#### Immigration reform is split in the House, a bill won’t come out

Gaven **Aronsen 7-10-13,** (Gaven Aronsen: A reporter at Mother Jones.) The state of Immigration Reform in the House “Who the hell knows”

http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2013/07/fate-immigration-reform-house-unclear

The immigration reform debate has heated up again this week on Capitol Hill, but a flurry of activity in the House on Wednesday ended with no clear path forward for comprehensive reform. In the words of Rep. Raul Grijalva (D-Ariz.), a member of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus and co-chair of the Congressional Border Caucus, "Who the hell knows what's going to come out of [the House]?" This morning Grijalva and other members of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, all Democrats, met with President Obama at the White House to discuss reform. Later in the day, Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.), the House minority leader, held a press conference with four members of the Congressional Border Caucus, including Grijalva, who voiced their concerns about the Senate bill's $40 billion-plus border security measures and urged a more humanitarian approach. Meanwhile, from Dallas, former president George W. Bush, whose own immigration reform efforts fell short in 2007, urged Congress to reach a "positive resolution." But the day's most-anticipated event was a closed-door meeting of House Republicans who are unlikely to heed the ex-president's advice. Republicans emerging from Wednesday's meeting indicated that they still plan to take a piecemeal approach, passing a series of law enforcement-centric bills through committees rather than a comprehensive bill mirroring the Senate's. "Today House Republicans affirmed that rather than take up the flawed legislation rushed through the Senate, House committees will continue their work on a step-by-step, common-sense approach to fixing what has long been a broken system," Rep. John Boehner (R-Ohio), the House speaker, said in a joint statement with other Republican leaders. (The House's bipartisan "Group of Seven," which includes three Republicans, has been working on a comprehensive bill but has yet to unveil it after a series of delays.) Rep. Bob Goodlatte (R-Va.), who chairs the House Judiciary Committee, told reporters that Republicans remained concerned that the Senate bill's border security measures don't go far enough because they would not have to be implemented before up to 11 million undocumented immigrants are granted provisional legal status. As the Senate bill stands, Goodlatte said, Republicans worry that President Obama could unilaterally delay border security measures in a manner similar to his decision last week to delay the Affordable Care Act's employer mandates. But any efforts to further restrict their path to citizenship could be a deal-breaker for Democrats, many of whom think the Senate bill is already too conservative and have decried such proposals as "poison pills." On Wednesday morning, before Obama's meeting with the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, the White House released a report playing up the Senate bill's economic benefits. Grijalva kept the details of the White House meeting under wraps at Pelosi's press conference. "We all had an understanding with the president that the consequences of much of the very honest and blunt discussion was going to stay private," he said. Rep. Filemon Vela (D-Texas), who resigned from the CHC last week in protest of its support for the Senate immigration bill despite the border security measures, was also at the press conference but did not attend the White House meeting. Asked if Vela's resignation was a sign of further splintering to come on the left, Grijalva said simply, "No.

#### Political Capital changes nothing, Republicans will kill the bill no matter what

**The Hill 6-28-13,**(House conservatives may kill any immigration bill)

http://thehill.com/video/house/308385-ros-lehtinen-senate-immigration-bill-not-going-to-move-in-the-house

***The Hill***, a subsidiary of News Communications Inc., is a newspaper published in Washington, D.C. since 1994.[2][3][4]¶ Its first editor was Martin Tolchin, a veteran correspondent in the Washington bureau of *The New York Times*.[4]¶ It is written for and about the U.S. Congress, with a special focus on business and lobbying, political campaigns and other events on Capitol Hill. The newspaper features investigative reporting, profiles of lawmakers and aides, features describing the sociology and politics of the Hill, book and restaurant reviews and a weekly column about the Capitol Hill neighborhoods

Rep. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (R-Fla.) said Friday that she knows the Senate immigration bill is "not going to move in the House" and expressed fears that conservative Republicans will block any House legislation from proceeding. ¶ But Ros-Lehtinen nevertheless is hopeful that Republicans can pass some sort of border security bill that would allow a comprehensive immigration reform deal to be struck in conference committee.¶ "I do support it but I understand that bill is not going to move in the house," Ros-Lehtinen told CNN. "We're hoping that any bill will pass in the House so we can go into conference with the Senate, and then out of that conference will be a balanced bill."¶ House Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) has said he will only proceed with immigration bills that have the backing of a majority of his Republican majority, dimming the prospects for the legislation that passed the Senate in a 68-32 vote on Thursday.¶ Ros-Lehtinen said she was most concerned that warring factions within the House would block any bill from proceeding, preventing a possible conference committee compromise.¶ "My fear is this -- that the more conservative members of our party will vote no because they worry about any bill getting into conference, even though they may agree with that border security bill, and many Democrats may vote no because they want to deal with the 11 million undocumented first," she said.¶ "We just need to get to conference and try to negotiate compromise."¶ The Miami Republican admitted that it would be a "very difficult" tightrope to walk, but said conservative Republicans felt the need to ensure border security protections after an immigration bill signed during Ronald Reagan's presidency failed to stop illegal immigration to the United States.¶ "We've got to make sure the American people trust and believe and we can prove to them that there will be border security," Ros-Lehtinen said.

#### Won’t Pass – There is no momentum for Immigration reform, King killed it

Tim **Alberta 7-14-13** (Tim Alberta is leadership reporter for the National Journal. He formerly served as senior editor of National Journal Hotline, where he edited the publication’s popular tip-sheets and directed its coverage of the 2012 Republican presidential race.¶ A native of Michigan, Alberta was an award-winning reporter on state government while studying journalism and political science at Michigan State University. He moved to D.C. in January 2008 to cover Congress while interning with the Wall Street Journal. Shortly thereafter, Alberta joined Politico, where he worked as an assistant editor and web producer while also reporting on the 2010 midterm elections.¶ Alberta joined the National Journal team in August 2010. He lives in Falls Church, Va.) How momentum for immigration reform collapsed in the house¶ http://www.nationaljournal.com/congress/how-momentum-for-comprehensive-immigration-reform-collapsed-in-the-house-20130714

What a difference one month makes.¶ It wasn't that long ago—June 5, in fact—that conservatives in the House of Representatives were pushing the panic button, convinced that the momentum behind comprehensive immigration reform was becoming irreversible. They had watched with horror as the Gang of Eight bill, which included a path to citizenship for illegal immigrants, sped through the Senate. And on this day, at a special immigration summit hosted by the Republican Study Committee, they saw members of their own chamber—some longtime opponents of "amnesty"—coming around to the case for comprehensive immigration reform, and agreeing with GOP senators that Republicans must act quickly to address what had become both a policy dilemma and political nightmare.¶ It looked awfully bleak for the likes of Iowa Rep. Steve King, who emerged from that meeting red in the face and wondering aloud whether his fellow conservatives had lost their nerve -- if not their minds. He marveled at how "so many otherwise smart people" in his chamber were being seduced by Florida Sen. Marco Rubio. He described that immigration summit, and the supposed ideological shift among his colleagues, as "surreal." To King, the writing was on the wall: The House was going to pass some form of comprehensive immigration reform, and probably sooner rather than later.¶ But by July 10, everything had changed. Emerging from a conference-wide immigration meeting, King and his newly vocal band of conservative comrades were floating. After convening for more than two hours to plot the path forward on immigration reform, members were still not entirely sure what the House approach would be. But this much they knew: The Senate bill was, as Speaker John Boehner said without equivocation, "dead on arrival." The House would act, the speaker vowed. But it would not follow the Senate. ¶ There would be no comprehensive package. There would be no rush to approve legislation this year. And, in all likelihood, there would be no path to citizenship.¶ How did the dynamic shift so quickly?¶ It began with an exasperated, wits-end King on June 6. One day removed from the RSC summit, King began visiting his colleagues—the same ones who were silent during that meeting—and asking for their signatures to force another gathering. This one would be longer and more thorough, he told them, involving the entire conference. Soon he had collected the 50 signatures needed to trigger what he and other lawmakers would later describe as a "family meeting."¶ On June 12, a week after King launched his petition drive, Boehner's leadership team scheduled a July 10 special conference meeting to discuss immigration. (Leadership aides insist Boehner had long been planning such a session.) ¶ With less than one month to organize the opposition, King went to work. He checked back with the conservative members who had signed his petition, asking them to attend an "anti-amnesty" rally the following Wednesday on the East Lawn of the Capitol. King wanted to bring his coalition out of the shadows, and perhaps even more, he wanted the grassroots opposition that was simmering beneath the political surface to be seen from the windows of the Capitol Building.¶ As King strategized behind the scenes, Boehner began feeling the heat in public. On June 17, Rep. Dana Rohrabacher, R-Calif., told a radio show that Boehner "should be removed as speaker" if he brought an immigration bill to the floor without the support of a majority of House Republicans, a violation of the so-called "Hastert Rule." At a conference meeting the next day, Boehner promised his members that he would do no such thing. He also emphasized that immigration proceedings would go through regular order, with House Judiciary Committee Chairman Bob Goodlatte, R-Va., working through a series of single-issue bills.¶ Speaking to reporters later that day, Boehner publicly repeated his promise, saying, "I don't see any way of bringing an immigration bill to the floor that doesn't have a majority support of Republicans."¶ Feeling a sudden surge of momentum, King prepared to capitalize on Boehner's pledge. The next afternoon, conservative activists swarmed around a makeshift stage on the Capitol lawn, listening as King and his chorus of conservative allies railed against "amnesty" for illegal immigrants and begged House Republicans to reject the Senate bill, which was on track to pass in the coming week. Energized by the swollen crowd of activists, King took the stage and cried: "I can feel it! I can feel we're going to defend the rule of law! We're going to defend the Constitution! We're going to defend our way of life!"¶ The momentum, King said, was shifting in front of Washington's eyes. The camps were becoming clearer, King told *National Journal* during the rally. "But," he added, "ours is getting bigger."¶ As the tension intensified outside the Capitol, lawmakers also felt the pressure up close. Twice that week, the Heritage Foundation's Robert Rector—who had co-authored the organization's controversial study on comprehensive immigration reform—headlined private policy forums for members of the House GOP. Sparring with the CATO Institute's Alex Nowrasteh, his ideological counterpart, Rector did at those meetings what he had done for months in private visits with lawmakers: Lobby them against any comprehensive bill.¶ The following Thursday, Boehner again told reporters he would not bring any immigration bill up for a vote unless it had majority support. But this time, the pledge included any House-Senate compromise that could be ironed out in a conference committee. The speaker had now made it unequivocal: Either immigration reform would pass in a manner pleasing to his House majority, or it would not pass at all. There would be no back-door deal with the Senate.¶ Hours later, the Senate passed its bill on a 68-32 vote, with 14 Republicans joining a unanimous Democratic caucus. The response from across the Capitol erased any doubt about the House's willingness to follow suit. Boehner released a statement saying, "The House is not going to take up and vote on whatever the Senate passes." The speaker reiterated that Goodlatte, an outspoken proponent of incremental legislation, would continue with regular order, and that the House would focus on "real border security." ¶ Rank-and-file members were not as passive. King called the Senate triumph "a meaningless political trophy." Minnesota Rep. Michele Bachmann said it amounted to "amnesty now, border security never." It wasn't just the hardliners, either. Alabama Rep. Martha Roby, not known as a firebrand, called the Senate bill a "monstrosity." ¶ The House Republican Conference, having opened itself to modulating on immigration following Mitt Romney's drubbing among Hispanics the previous November, had hardened its position once more. ¶ When the July 10 summit arrived, House Republicans were ready. Having recently returned from their districts, where they heard from constituents about immigration over the Fourth of July recess, lawmakers had specific expectations for the meeting.¶ In interviews with more than a dozen members prior to the immigration summit, there was remarkable consensus. On the policy side, they wanted leadership to focus on border security now and everything else later. And on the process side, they wanted a renewed commitment to a slow, incremental approach that unhurriedly tackled one issue at a time. If those expectations were met, members said, the meeting would go fine.¶ By five-thirty that afternoon, the transformation was complete. Emerging from the same room he had one month earlier, King looked like a changed man. As his conservative comrades met with reporters to share their satisfaction with the meeting—and declare victory for "the rule of law" in America—the Iowa lawmaker hung back, savoring the scene. King didn't need to be quoted. His smile said it all.

### Health Care Thumper/Link Uniqueness

#### Obama’s Credibility low now—Health Care

Fox News 7-14-13-(Fox News, “Republicans press new immigration tactic: Obama won't enforce border security,” 7-14-13, http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2013/07/14/house-republicans-press-new-immigration-tack-obama-wont-enforce-border-security/)

Congressional Republicans pressed ahead Sunday with their emerging stance on immigration reform, arguing President Obama delaying the implementation of his health care law raises major concerns about whether he’ll enforce border security measures in immigration laws.¶ “We cannot fix with laws things the president refuses to do,” Iowa Republican Rep. Steve King told “Fox News Sunday.”¶ Though well known as one the House’s most conservative members, King has emerged as perhaps the chamber’s most vocal opponent of the Senate’s immigration bill, which includes $40 billion toward additional security along the U.S.-Mexico border and a path to citizenship for at least some of the roughly 11 million illegal immigrants now living in the United States.¶ House Republicans appeared to emerge with the new strategy after a closed-door meeting Wednesday, which was preceded by the Obama administration saying earlier this month that it will delay the start of the so-called employer mandate part of the president’s signature health care law until after the 2014 elections.¶ “If the president can selectively enforce ObamaCare, what’s to say he cannot selectively enforce border security?” House Majority Leader Eric Cantor said ahead of the meeting.

## \*\*\* U.S.-EU Relations

### A/C—U.S.-EU Relations

#### Spying scandals impede EU relations

Johnson 13 – editor of the parliament magazine [Brian Johnson, “Latest Spying Revelations could have serious impacts on EU-US trade talks, warn MEPS” The Parliament, July 1, 2013, http://www.theparliament.com/latest-news/article/newsarticle/latest-spying-revelations-could-have-serious-impact-on-eu-us-trade-talks-warn-meps/#.UeMzZD7OvGA]

European parliament president Martin Schulz led the condemnation, following claims over the weekend by US Prism whistle blower Edward Snowden in the German weekly news magazine Der Spiegel that the NSA had routinely bugged EU officials and offices in Brussels, New York and Washington. "I am deeply worried and shocked about the allegations of US authorities spying on EU offices", said Schulz on Saturday, adding, "If the allegations prove to be true, it would be an extremely serious matter which will have a severe impact on EU-US relations. The revelations could stall the beginning of negotiations on a new free trade deal with Washington. Announced last month and heralded as a "game changer" for both the EU and US by commission president José Manuel Barroso, Verhofstadt said, "I cannot see how a crucial trade and investment partnership can be concluded as long as this spectre of spying hangs over us." Further reaction came from the chair of parliament's influential economic and monetary affairs committee, Sharon Bowles, who also warned that the revelations could have a serious impact on the planned trade talks. "The upcoming EU-US trade talks will certainly be under strain in the wake of this scandal. There will be an enormous elephant in the room which will be impossible to ignore," said Bowles. Dutch deputy Sophie In't Veld, a vice chair of parliament's civil liberties committee said, "The spying scandal puts Europe to the test. Now Europe has to show its citizens it is able and willing to protect the rights of European citizens.

#### Multitude of other issues undermine EU relations

Townsend 03 - justice and home affairs research fellow at the Centre for European Reform, [ Adam Townsend, “Transatlanic disputes must not undermine EU and US Counter-terrorism Co-operation”, Center for European Reform, June 27, 2003, http://www.cer.org.uk/sites/default/files/publications/attachments/pdf/2011/briefing\_at\_terrorism-3851.pdf

Not all is doom and gloom in the tattered transatlantic relationship. EU member-states and the US are cooperating effectively over terrorism. But the US needs to work more with the EU as a whole, rather than simply through individual European governments. Moreover, officials on both sides of the Atlantic are increasingly concerned that co-operation could be undermined by the poisonous political climate. However, intelligence professionals question how long their collaboration can remain healthy when¶ relations between their political bosses are so rocky. Officials fear that anti-Europe figures in the US administration will pressure the intelligence services to start withholding intelligence and shutting the French and Germans out of joint investigations. US intelligence officers also worry that their French¶ counterparts will become less helpful. Even if the US continues to work well with national security agencies, it may not find it easy to add an effective EU dimension to this transatlantic co-operation. The two sides disagree on a plethora of issues. US officials express frustration that the EU does not always seem to take the terrorist threat seriously. For example, they point to the EU’s failure to list the political wing of Hamas as a terrorist organization. “Basically, we see terrorism as an existential threat and [the EU] doesn’t,” said a senior Pentagon staffer. EU officials retort that they have long experience fighting terrorism, and, in the case of Hamas, they say the experience of the Northern Ireland peace process shows that political channels must be kept open¶ for dialogue. Differences between the two run deeper than just tactics. The attacks of September 11th have not diminished European distaste for the death penalty, which some US states still use. The two sides disagree over how governments should use their citizens’ personal information continue. Many Europeans (and Americans) are aghast at the US detention centres in Guantanamo Bay, where the US government is holding over 600 people – including three minors – without charge. Bush administration plans to try some prisoners in military tribunals with powers to impose the death penalty contribute to the EU’s concern that the US is no longer serious about upholding the rule of law.

#### Agricultural Issues prevent relations

Solmonsen 13—Senior Director of Congressional Relations at the American Farm Bureau Federation, [ David Solmonsen, “Discussion on US trade deal highlights opportunities”, Georgetown Universiy McDonough School of Business, April 7, 2013, http://cbpp.georgetown.edu/2013/04/07/discussion-on-useu-trade-deal-highlights-opportunities-challenges/

Dave Solmonsen followed Ms. Lee’s remarks by addressing agricultural concerns with the EU-US trade agreement.  Despite the long and extensively trade history in agricultural goods, there are several issues with a potential EU-US trade deal.  The first issue is differing food safety standards, such as the EU restriction on chemicals used in US pork exports.  Second, tariff rates between the two countries could be lowered.  Third, the EU biotech approval process is slow in comparison to the United States.  Last, the United States is largely against geographic indicators whereas the EU strongly supports them.  Mr. Solmonsen concluded his remarks by saying that the trade deal will certainly address tariff rates; however, to be effective, it must also address non-tariff barriers.

#### Issues in the MENA region complicate US – EU cooperation

Mix 13 Analyst in European Affairs (Derek E., “The United States and Europe: Current Issues“, *Congressional* *Research Service*, March 20., http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RS22163.pdf)

The United States and Europe continue to face challenges stemming from the dramatic political and social upheavals occurring across the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region over the past two years. The civil war in Syria may be the most acute and urgent case in the region, but the stakes involved with the on-going transitions in Egypt, Libya, and Tunisia are also of considerable importance.

The United States and its European partners share similar interests in ensuring that the changes underway in the region result in more open and democratically accountable governments, greater economic opportunities, and long-term stability and security. Common U.S. and European concerns in the region include countering terrorism, weapons proliferation, and transnational crime, curtailing Islamist extremism, ensuring a reliable flow of energy exports and commercial transit, and advancing regional peace. Europe’s geographic proximity to the MENA region also makes controlling migration a key priority for the EU and individual European countries, while The United States and Europe continue to face challenges stemming from the dramatic political and social upheavals occurring across the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region over the past two years. The civil war in Syria may be the most acute and urgent case in the region, but the stakes involved with the on-going transitions in Egypt, Libya, and Tunisia are also of considerable importance.

In light of the sweeping changes in the region, the United States and the EU have been seeking to re-align their policies to put greater emphasis than in the past on supporting democratic and economic reforms in the MENA region. Both the United States and Europe face inherent difficulties, however, in dealing with a changed political landscape in the MENA region in which new actors and unsettled conditions make for considerable uncertainty. As events unfold in the region, potential U.S.-European policy differences—on issues ranging from how best to encourage Egypt’s democratic progress to how to manage the role of Islamist parties or what to do about the on-going violence in Syria—could arise and complicate the prospects for closer U.S.-European cooperation. In addition, experts note that both the United States and its European allies are ultimately limited in what they can or should do to influence events in the region.

### US-EU Relations High

#### Counterterrorism measures promote closer US – EU cooperation

Mix 13 Analyst in European Affairs (Derek E., “The United States and Europe: Current Issues“, *Congressional* *Research Service*, March 20., http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RS22163.pdf)

U.S. and European officials from the cabinet level down maintain regular dialogues on issues related to homeland security and counterterrorism. In recent years, U.S. and EU police and judicial agencies have established cooperative relationships that include several information sharing arrangements. In 2010, new U.S.-EU treaties on extradition and mutual legal assistance entered into force. The United States and the EU have also reached agreements on container security and airline passenger data as part of their efforts to strengthen aviation, transport, and border security. In addition, the United States and the EU actively work together to track and counter the financing of terrorism, in forums such as the Financial Action Task Force and through information sharing deals such as the U.S.-EU “SWIFT agreement,” which allows U.S. authorities access to financial data held by a Belgium-based consortium of international banks as part of the U.S. Treasury Department’s Terrorist Finance Tracking Program (TFTP). Although overall counterterrorism cooperation is strong, areas of tension exist. European policymakers have had significant concerns over the adequacy of data privacy safeguards in a number of U.S.-EU information sharing arrangements. The EU considers data privacy a basic right, and the EU has strict regulations protecting personal data. During the past several years, objections raised in the European Parliament complicated and delayed the adoption of the most recent version of the SWIFT deal and the agreement on sharing airline passenger name record (PNR) data. In 2011, the United States and the EU began negotiations on a framework Data Privacy and Protection Agreement (DPPA). Some observers assert that such a framework agreement, building on a set of privacy and data protection principles endorsed by the two sides in 2009, could expand mutual recognition of one another’s data protection systems, help ease European concerns, and promote closer cooperation.

### US-EU Relations Resilient

#### Strong economic ties will maintain US-EU relations

**Cooper 13** (, William H. Specialist in International Trade and Finance. Congressional Research Service. “EU-US Economic Ties: Framework, Scope, and Magnitude” April 2, 2013. <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL30608.pdf>)

The United States and the European Union (EU) economic relationship is the largest in the world—and it is growing. The modern U.S.-European economic relationship has evolved since World War II, broadening as the six member European Community expanded into the present 27-member European Union. The ties have also become more complex and interdependent, covering a growing number and type of trade and financial activities.

In 2012, $1,500.5 billion flowed between the United States and the EU on the current account, the

most comprehensive measure of U.S. trade flows. The EU as a unit is the largest merchandise trading partner of the United States. In 2012, the EU accounted for $265.1 billion of total U.S. exports (or 17.1%) and for $380.8 billion of total U.S. imports (or 16.7%) for a U.S. trade deficit of $115.7 billion. The EU is also the largest U.S. trade partner when trade in services is added to trade in merchandise, accounting for $193.8 billion (or 30.7% of the total in U.S. services exports) and $149.7 billion (or 35.4% of total U.S. services imports) in 2012. In addition, in 2012, a net $150.0 billion flowed from U.S. residents to EU countries into direct investments, while a net $105.9 billion flowed from EU residents to direct investments in the United States.

Policy disputes arise between the United States and the EU, generating tensions which sometimes lead to bilateral trade disputes. Yet, in spite of these disputes, the U.S.-EU economic relationship remains dynamic. It is a relationship that is likely to grow in importance assuming the trends toward globalization and the enlargement of the EU continue, forcing more trade and investment

barriers to fall. Economists indicate that an expanded relationship would bring economic benefits to both sides in the form of wider choices of goods and services and greater investment opportunities.

#### Further cooperation will restore relations

**Učakar 13** (,Urška. Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations “The Future of US-EU Relations” June 19th, 2013. <http://www.defactual.com/335-2/>)

Relations between the European Union and the United States present a long-term strategic cooperation on political, economic, security and defense level. Even though the US tends to name France as its oldest alllie, Germany as its crucial trading partner and the United Kingdom as the country whom it has a ‘special relationship’ with, the truth is, that both the US and the EU are well aware of the importance of their bilateral cooperation. It is therefore not surprising that the G8 Summit in Lough Erne has brought about the beginning of negotiations on a new trade agreement between the two.

The EU – US relations commenced in 1953 and were formally set in 1990 with the Transatlantic Declaration. The latter was to formally establish relations between the European Community, its Member States and the United States. The Transatlantic Declaration set some common goals such as support for democracy, the rule of law, respect for human rights and liberties, peace and international security, market principles, and economic and political reforms. Some basic principles of this partnership are cooperation in the field of economy, education, science, culture and security and have been realized through regular consultations.

Only 5 years after, a New Transatlantic Agenda with the goal of responding to new challenges and building bridges across the Atlantic was set. Furthermore, parties were keen on contributing to the expansion of world trade and closer economic relations, as well as parliamentary links. Based on this agenda, several partnerships and cooperation forms were formally launched, e.g. the Transatlantic Economic Partnership, the Transatlantic Economic Council, and also other less formal multilaterally levelled modes of cooperation. It is not a coincidence that the EU and NATO strengthened their cooperation through the so-called Berlin plus agreement, and that the majority of the EU Member States and the US had several joint stances on numerous topics, such as crises in Libya, Iran, Iraq etc.

Besides the strong defense and security cooperation and despite the financial crisis, the EU and the US have the largest bilateral trade and investment relationship in the world. However, their economic power is quickly declining and their image is losing its power in the world. The EU is far too preoccupied with its internal issues and the US are currently dealing with several issues, such as the NSA crisis, transition in Afghanistan, affairs connected to the State Department, as well as some more long-term challenges, such as the health and immigration reform, nuclear talks and the war on terror. These issues are contributing to the deteriorating global image of both actors and their soft power is quickly declining.

So what is the solution for both parties? As the US and EU see it, further cooperation is essential. Besides regular bilateral meetings, one of the foundations for this cooperation is the EU Delegation to the USA in Washington, as well as the US Mission to the EU in Brussels. Considering the previously mentioned NSA affair and a growing euro-scepticism in the EU, one would expect that public diplomacy shall be used to restore the trust of citizens on both sides of the Atlantic and answer questions one might have concerning the current cooperation of the US and the Union on the most important aspects of their relations. Therefore, DeFactual has joined the first-ever chat with the US Ambassador to the EU Mr. William Kennard (@USAmbEU), organized by the Financial Times (@ftbrussels, @FT) and hosted by Mr. Peter Spiegel(@spiegelpeter).

#### US-EU economic base is strong enough to endure political pressure

**Andersson 13** (, Jan Joel. Senior Research Fellow at the Swedish Institute of International Affairs (UI.) “ The Transatlantic Relationship” European Global Strategy. March 20th, 2013 www.europeanglobalstrategy.eu/Files.aspx?f\_id=86961‎)

In fact, European support in Afghanistan has been of great importance to the United States. During several years, European troops have made up more than half of the NATO-led mission in Afghanistan. It is also European countries such as Denmark and Estonia that have suffered most casualties per capita in Afghanistan, not the United States.

The European allies have also participated in many missions under various flags in the Middle East and Africa. It was, for example, European pilots from France, Britain, Belgium, Denmark and Norway that dropped most of the bombs over Libya during the NATO-led air war against the Khadafy regime during the summer of 2011. European warships are also continuously patrolling the Gulf of Aden and the coast of Somalia in the international anti-piracy operations since several years back.

A third example is other military interventions and military training missions under European leadership in Somalia, Chad and Sudan. Finally, European allies Britain and France are also the only countries besides the United States that have the capability for semi-independent military power projection across oceans. The French intervention in early 2013 in Mali is a case in point where the French initiated an operation and deployed some 4500 troops more than 3500 km from Paris in Western Africa.

As demonstrated above security is an important cornerstone of the transatlantic relationship but the economic relationship between the U.S. and Europe remains the base. Despite a deep economic crisis affecting large parts of Europe and the United States, the strength of the economic bonds between Europe and the United States is often overlooked. The transatlantic economic relationship remains robust and is set to grow stronger.

The Transatlantic economy makes up about half of the world’s GDP and five trillion USD in commercial sales. Combined, the EU and the U.S. produce a quarter of all global exports and receive a third of all global imports. While the Transatlantic share of overall global trade has diminished as a result of fast growing economies in the East and South, absolute transatlantic trade remains impressive.

Recent focus on the rise of the BRICS in general and of China in particular tend to obscure the fact that the EU and the U.S. remain each other’s biggest economic partner. Not only is EU-U.S. merchandise trade growing but the EU and the U.S. are also the world’s two largest and most sophisticated service economies. In fact, the U.S. exports of goods are three times as large to the EU as to China. The EU, in turn exports twice as much goods to the U.S. as to China.

The strength of the transatlantic economic relationship becomes even clearer when looking at foreign direct investment. The U.S. continues to invest at high levels in Europe with a steady share of 56% of FDI going to Europe since year 2000. Europe in turn sends a staggering 71% of its total FDI to the U.S. Despite the rise of China these numbers have held steady.

With the announcement of President Obama in January 2013 to pursue a U.S.-EU free trade area, the transatlantic economic relationship is set to take a great leap forward that could significantly improve economic growth in both Europe and the United States.

## \*\*\* Trade Updates

### TTIP Bad

#### TTIP causes environmental degradation

Devany 13 (Tim, “Anti-globalization groups take aim at proposed U.S.-Europe trade deal”, *The Washington Times,* July 8., http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2013/jul/8/anti-globalization-groups-aim-us-euro-trade-deal/?page=all)

On Monday, negotiators discussed investment, government procurement, cross-border services, textiles, rules of origin, energy and raw materials, and legal issues. On Tuesday, they plan to discuss market access issues, as well as sanitary and phytosanitary measures.

Ms. Drake, whose organization has been more open to the trade deal than others because it could create jobs, said the AFL-CIO has concerns that the pact could suppress wages and degrade labor markets.

Environmental groups are even more skeptical.

“The Sierra Club is very concerned that our climate, our water, and our air could be put at risk by this sweeping trade agreement,” said Ilana Solomon, a representative of the environmental group, which organized Monday’s phone news conference.

Bill Waren, an analyst at Friends of the Earth, another environmental group, said the proposed trade deal could “roll back” decades of progress that the EU has made protecting human health and the environment from toxic chemicals.

“The stakes couldn’t be higher,” he said.

Food safety groups are also raising concerns that a U.S.-EU deal could ease regulations in Europe while locking the U.S. into a less-than-ideal system.

“We don’t want to be locked into lower standards,” said Karen Hansen-Kuhn, international program director at the Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy.

### TTP Bad—China Containment

#### US will TTP to contain China

Schott 13 – Senior Fellow of the Peterson Institute for International Economics and Member of the US Trade Representative’s Trade and Environmental Policy Committee and the Advisory Committee on International Economic Policy of the State Department [Jeffrey J. Schott, Understanding the Trans-Pacific Partnership, pg. 55-58, Copyright 2013, accessed 7/14/2013, available online at http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=D3dKRTlKJ10C&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=trans+pacific+partnership+excludes+china&ots=AYO0dXut9o&sig=netIaPElmFI1LpQbH4yzAdmPxi4#v=onepage&q=china&f=true]

By crafting a high-standard, 21st century trade accord that is far more comprehensive and legally binding than the trade arrangements forged among Asian countries, some observers have concluded that TPP participants actually intend to exclude China from their integration arrangement. They contend that the bar would be set too high in terms of transparency of domestic policies and the rigor of disciplines on government interventions in the market-place. Others take this argument further and claim that the United States is trying to keep China out of the TPP and is trying to “contain China” in order to retard its economic and political influence in the region. ¶ Charges that the United States seeks to “contain” or “surround” China by securing a comprehensive trade accord with China’s neighbors seem to ring true to those accustomed to hearing US officials berate unfair Chinese trade practices. US trade officials clearly prefer to talk about US trade enforcement actions against China – and will emphasize trade litigation even more now that the new Interagency Trade Enforcement Center is up and running – rather than including China in “free trade” talks in the Asia-Pacific region.

### Canada Will Follow US Lead on Trade

#### The US and Canada have integrated economies due to their successful trade operations

Manzella 12 September 5, 2012, John Manzella, a world-recognized author and speaker on global trends, international business, China, and today's economic realities, is editor-in-chief of The Manzella Report and president of Manzella Trade Communications, a strategic communications and public affairs firm. (http://www.manzellareport.com/index.php/trade-finance/575-canada-the-number-one-export-destination)

The United States and Canada have achieved a level of international business and economic integration like no other two countries in the world. The U.S.-Canada Free Trade Agreement of 1989, which evolved into the 1994 North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), has helped make this a reality. And U.S. and Canadian transportation systems, including international bridges, railways, highways, waterways and airports, also are a major contributing factor. The result: each day the U.S. and Canada conduct $1.64 billion in merchandise trade across our 5,525 mile-long shared border, the U.S. Department of Commerce reports. And this level of trade, which is considerably higher than the next largest U.S. bilateral relationship, supports millions of North American jobs. Canada’s affluent, high-technology and market-oriented economy has created tremendous opportunities for American exporters, importers and investors. Like the United States, the Canadian government increasingly has allocated resources to border security and infrastructure. And U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP), in association with the Canada Border Services Agency, operates several programs designed to expedite the movement of people and goods north and south. For example, CBP maintains preclearance operations at eight Canadian airports, allowing air travelers expedited U.S. entry. Plus, over the years, thousands of U.S. and Canadian firms have invested millions of dollars to protect their supply chains and have participated in programs designed to prevent delays at the border. This is important since, every day, some 300,000 people cross our shared border to do business, shop and/or visit, the U.S. Department of State says. In turn, our international transportation infrastructure, combined with our integrated security cooperation efforts, have boosted levels of North American efficiencies and global competitiveness, make the U.S.-Canadian relationship increasingly important. And the results have changed the nature of manufacturing. Long gone are the days when trucks crossing our borders were filled with finished products destined for each other’s retail shelves. Now, trucks are filled with components and parts heading for assembly lines. In turn, the U.S. and Canada don’t just make goods for one another. Together we make attractive goods for the world. As a result of our highly integrated economies, the United States supplies approximately half of all Canadian merchandize imports. In turn, the U.S. buys about 75 percent of all Canadian exports, the Congressional Research Service reports. And the number of companies involved is tremendous.

#### The US’s bilateral economic relations with Canada

BUREAU OF WESTERN HEMISPHERE AFFAIRS 12 June 29, 2012 US Department of State, BUREAU OF WESTERN HEMISPHERE AFFAIRS (http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/2089.htm)

The United States and Canada share the world's largest and most comprehensive trading relationship, which supports millions of jobs in each country. Canada is the single largest foreign supplier of energy to the United States. Recognition of the commercial viability of Canada's oil sands has made it the world's third largest holder of oil reserves after Saudi Arabia and Venezuela and is the only non-OPEC member in the top five. Canada and the United States operate an integrated electricity grid that meets jointly developed reliability standards, and they provide all of each other's electricity imports. Canadian uranium helps fuel U.S. nuclear power plants. The North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) among the United States, Canada, and Mexico aims to reduce trade barriers and establish agreed upon trade rules. It has resolved long-standing bilateral irritants and liberalized rules in several areas, including agriculture, services, energy, financial services, investment, and government procurement. The Regulatory Cooperation Council seeks to further stimulate trade by increasing regulatory transparency and cooperation between the United States and Canada and eliminating unnecessary regulatory differences and duplicative actions that hinder cross-border trade and investment. Canada and the United States have one of the world's largest investment relationships. The United States is Canada's largest foreign investor, and Canada is the fifth-largest foreign investor in the United States. U.S. investment is primarily in Canada's mining and smelting industries, petroleum, chemicals, the manufacture of machinery and transportation equipment, and finance. Canadian investment in the United States is concentrated in finance and insurance, manufacturing, banking, information and retail trade, and other services. Bilateral trade disputes are managed through bilateral consultative forums or referral to NAFTA or World Trade Organization (WTO) dispute resolution procedures. Canada has challenged U.S. trade remedy law in NAFTA and WTO dispute settlement mechanisms. The two countries negotiated the application to Canadian goods of "Buy American" provisions for state and local procurement under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. The United States has encouraged Canada to strengthen its intellectual property laws and enforcement. Canada passed an important copyright law on June 28, 2012.

## \*\*\* US-LA Relations

### AT: Snowden Alt Cause to US-LA Relations

#### Latin American Countries fear angering the US, not the other way around

Scholchet 13 CNN Newsdesk for Latin America (“Is Snowden Worth the Risk? Latin America weighs the pros and cons” CNN 13 July 2013 Catherine E. Scholchet http://www.cnn.com/2013/07/11/world/americas/latin-america-snowden-asylum/index.html)

It's still unclear where Snowden will go, what's the holdup?

Sure, we've heard fiery speeches offering asylum from leftist leaders who are eager to criticize the United States. But supporting Snowden's cause and wanting to make Uncle Sam look bad aren't the only parts of the equation, with so many trade and diplomatic relations hanging in the balance, said Michael Shifter, president of the Inter-American Dialogue think tank in Washington. "They want to make a point," he said, "but I think they're concerned about suffering the consequences, which I think would be serious. The United States has made that pretty clear."

#### Obama is making sure cooperation is not jeopardized after Snowden affair

Talev and Goldman 13 Writers at Bloomberg Magazine (“Obama says US pursuit of Snowden won’t jeopardize ties” 27 June 2013 Margaret Talev and Julianna Goldman http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-06-27/obama-says-no-to-dealmaking-in-pursuit-of-snowden.html)

President Barack Obama said he won’t engage in “wheeling and dealing” or jeopardize cooperation on a broad range of issues with China or Russia in the U.S. pursuit of leaker Edward Snowden. At a news conference yesterday in Dakar, Senegal, the U.S. president said he hasn’t spoken with Chinese President Xi Jinping or Russian President Vladimir Putin as the U.S. seeks Snowden’s extradition. “I shouldn’t have to,” Obama said.

#### Snowden issue won’t affect US Brazilian relations- Brazil key to the rest of Latin America

Associated Press 13 (“Leading Brazil Congressmen says Disclosures of US Spying will not affect relations” 10 July 2013 Associated Press http://articles.washingtonpost.com/2013-07-10/politics/40494116\_1\_president-dilma-rousseff-brazil-u-s-good-relations)

BRASILIA, Brazil — Disclosures alleging that the United States has collected data on billions of telephone and email conversations in Latin America’s biggest country will not affect Brazil-U.S. relations, the head of Brazil’s joint congressional committee on intelligence said Wednesday. Congressman Nelson Pellegrino told foreign correspondents in Brasilia that despite Brazil’s strong repudiation of the U.S. information gathering activities in Brazil “the good relations we have with the United States will not be interrupted.” We have sent Washington a clear message that we are interested in maintaining good relations, but that we will not accept these kinds of practices,” he said. “We cannot accept that a country spies another, on its citizens, its companies and its authorities.” He said President Dilma Rousseff’s state visit to Washington October was still on and that it would not be affected by the recent disclosures.

#### **Latin American countries demand apology- not much more**

Jackson 13 Writer for USA Today (“South Americans Demand Apology for plane incident” 5 July 2013 David Jackson http://www.usatoday.com/story/theoval/2013/07/05/obama-south-america-bolivia-evo-morales-edward-snowden/2491063/

President Obama's counterparts in South America are demanding apologies over this week's Bolivian plane incident. South America's leftist leaders are rallying behind Bolivian President Evo Morales after his plane was re-routed because of suspicions that National Security Agency leaker Edward Snowden was aboard. The presidents demanded apologies from France, Italy, Portugal and Spain over the blocking of air space for Morales' plane, and many said the United State was behind the whole incident.

### US Mexico Relations Resilient

#### U.S. and Mexico have enough security

**The Economist 6/22/13 –** The Economist, a highly regarded publication that focuses on World Politics and Economics (“Secure Enough” 6/22/13, can be found online here: http://www.economist.com/news/united-states/21579828-spending-billions-more-fences-and-drones-will-do-more-harm-good-secure-enough)

The Border Patrol, which is charged with nabbing illegal crossers between official entry points, defines its effectiveness by the number of people it catches (or those that turn back) as a proportion of those it detects. By this formula the Border Patrol in Tucson sector, which includes Mr Chilton’s ranch as well as the area around an official crossing at Nogales, is 87% effective. But estimates for the true overall figure range widely; some put it as low as 30%. For such a hot topic, the available data are, as a report from the Council on Foreign Relations puts it, “distressingly sparse”.

The numbers are clearer on the input side. When Congress last tackled immigration reform, in 2007, there were 15,000 Border Patrol agents; today there are 21,000. Ten Predator drones patrol the skies, tower-mounted cameras dot the deserts and ground sensors monitor land movements. Mitch Merriam, deputy commander of the Arizona Joint Field Command, says he had enough agents until sequestration cuts forced the patrol to get “pretty darn creative”. According to the Migration Policy Institute, a think-tank, border enforcement costs $18 billion a year, more than all other federal criminal-law-enforcement agencies combined.

To bolster its argument that the border is secure, Barack Obama’s administration points to the drop in apprehensions at or near it (see map). These bottomed out in 2011, and as the once-porous Tucson sector has tightened there are signs that the action may be moving east, to Texas. Apprehension numbers are a poor proxy for border security, but few dispute that, compared with the free-for-all of the late 1990s and early 2000s, today’s border is calm Why might this be? Economics probably matters more than enforcement. America’s downturn cost many illegal migrants their jobs, just as opportunities were blossoming back home in Mexico. In the past two years Mexico’s economy has grown at a healthy 3.9% annually, creating jobs (albeit at much lower pay than in America).

In the longer term, demography is also likely to slow the flow of migrants. The number of 15-24-year-olds in Mexico and El Salvador will start declining between 2015 and 2020. Since illegal crossers tend to be young men, this will surely ease the pressure on the border. And over the next 40 years fertility rates in both countries are forecast to drop below America’s.

Walls and drones do make a difference. Gordon Hanson, an economist at the University of California, San Diego, credits tighter security for one-third of the drop in migration between the late 1990s and 2010. Spending yet more money could reduce crossings further, he says—although he believes that America is already inflicting economic self-harm by spending so much to keep workers out.

#### High U.S.-Mexico security means good relations

**Schaefer 13 -** Agnes Gereben Schaefer, senior political scientist at the RAND Corporation, professor at the Pardee RAND Graduate School, has a background in international relations, comparative politics, defense strategy, homeland security, and environmental policy, (“If U.S.-Mexico Get Security Right, Other Good Policy Will Follow” 5/29/13 can be found online here: http://www.rand.org/blog/2013/05/if-us-mexico-get-security-right-other-good-policy.html)

During their joint news conference, Obama and Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto touted their work on economic cooperation and commercial integration. Likewise, Obama's speech to the Mexican people and a joint statement from the two presidents stressed economic ties and shared opportunities while only briefly mentioning such difficult security issues as drugs, guns and crime. Headlines suggested that the economy will become the driving force behind future U.S.-Mexico relations.

Let's not get carried away. While security isn't the only topic confronting Washington and Mexico City, it's still likely to consume the lion's share of attention in this crucial relationship. After all, between Peña Nieto's inauguration in December 2012 and the end of April 2013, 5,296 people were killed in Mexico in drug-related violence — about 35 every day. That level of violence alone would keep security issues as a high priority for the United States and Mexico.

Moreover, drug trafficking in Mexico continues to affect the U.S. Mexico is the largest supplier of heroin, marijuana and methamphetamines to the U.S., and Mexico is the shipment point for 95 percent of the cocaine brought into the U.S.

So over the past six years, the U.S. has embarked on a strategic partnership with Mexico that has focused on drug-related violence. This partnership has meant closer U.S.-Mexican cooperation on several fronts, including an unprecedented transfer of U.S. equipment, U.S. training of Mexican security forces and U.S. access to Mexican security agencies.

But while security will remain central to the U.S.-Mexico relationship, the two sides may well change how they handle it. The new Peña Nieto administration is re-evaluating Mexico's recent close cooperation on security. The new Mexican leader's overall security strategy is evolving, but he has embarked on some important reforms to defense institutions. Peña Nieto has called for a more centralized approach to security issues that would eliminate inefficiencies and redundancies across government agencies. He is also pushing to develop a new National Intelligence Agency — similar to the U.S. Office of the Director of National Intelligence set up after the 9/11 Commission to quarterback the U.S. intelligence community — that would streamline Mexico's intelligence collection and analysis, which is now conducted by many disparate agencies.

Economic cooperation is of course also exceedingly important. The United States is still Mexico's largest trading partner. In 2011, U.S. trade with Mexico totaled $500 billion, and Mexico was the United States' second-largest goods export market in 2012. But let's not assume that economic issues will displace security issues at the top of the U.S-Mexico agenda.

Because security issues are not going away, the two sides need to tackle them as best they can. The Obama and Peña Nieto administrations should build on the unprecedented levels of cooperation developed over the past six years — and if they get security right, they will be far better-positioned to broaden the relationship to focus on other issues such as economics, energy and the environment. If the two sides continue to invest together in security today, they may find themselves with far more opportunities for broader cooperation tomorrow.

#### U.S.-Mexico Relations Have Factors to remain resilient

**Villarreal 12 –** M. Angeles Villarreal, Analyst in International Trade and Finance

Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division in Congress, (“U.S.-Mexico Economic Relations: Trends, Issues, and Implications” 8/9/12, can be found online here: http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL32934.pdf)

The bilateral economic relationship with Mexico is of key interest to the United States because of Mexico’s proximity, the high volume of trade with Mexico, and the strong cultural and economic ties between the two countries. Mexico is one of the United States’ key trading partners, ranking second among U.S. export markets and third in total U.S. trade (imports plus exports). Under the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), the United States and Mexico have developed significant economic ties. Trade between the two countries more than tripled since the agreement was implemented in 1994. Through NAFTA, the United States, Mexico, and Canada form the world’s largest free trade area, with about one-third of the world’s total gross domestic product (GDP). Mexico has a population of 114 million people, making it the most populous Spanish speaking country in the world and the third-most populous country in the Western Hemisphere (after the United States and Brazil). The United States and Mexico share many common interests related to trade, investment, and regulatory cooperation. The two countries share a 2,000 mile border and have extensive interconnections through the Gulf of Mexico. There are also links through migration, tourism, environmental issues, health concerns, and family and cultural relationships. During the remainder of the 112th Congress, policymakers will likely maintain an active interest in Mexico on issues related to cross-border trade between the two countries, Mexico’s participation in the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) agreement negotiations, economic conditions in Mexico, migration, and border issues. Congress may also take an interest in the economic policies of President-elect Enrique Peña Nieto of Mexico, who was elected in July 2012. Mexican President-elect Enrique Peña Nieto is expected to enter into office for a six-year term on December 1, 2012. During his campaign, he advocated a 10-point economic plan that includes, among other measures, implementing recently passed legislation to counter monopolistic practices, passing fiscal reform, opening up the oil sector to private investment, making farmers more productive, and doubling infrastructure investments. Peña Nieto also endorses an active international trade policy aimed at increasing Mexico's trade with Asia, South America, and other markets. His government is likely to take an active role in the negotiations for a TPP.

## \*\*\* Economy Updates

### Econ Decline Bad—Defense Spending

#### Double dip recession risks defense budget cuts that jeopardize US Hegemony

Ethan J. Diven, Major in the US army 2012 [Major Ethan J. Diven “Preventing a Hollow Army: 20th Century Lessons for the 21st Century” Fort Leavenworth, Kansas 2012, http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a563122.pdf]

A significant increase in the way war is funded today is the establishment of overseas contingency operations (OCO) funds that are used to support wartime operations. **The impact of the Budget Control Act of 2011 on national defense demands a re-evaluation of strategic security risk**. **The act requires a** mandatory **$1 trillion spending reduction for the Department of Defense** to be executed 2013-2021 which analysts contend amounts to **a 20 percent decline in the defense budget from levels identified in** the **2012** Future Years Defense Program (FYDP). **These require immediate reassessment of force size and structure, procurement timelines, personnel policies, risk assessments and strategic commitments.** Defense planners expected budget reductions in the realm of 6-8 percent and these expectations led the Secretary of Defense, Leon Panetta, to plan to reduce $450 billion worth of defense spending over the next decade from the FYDP but did not plan for anything beyond $450 billion (Troutman 2012, 30-31). Demonstrating his frustration with the volatile fiscal environment and the potential budget cuts Secretary of Defense, Leon Panetta, testified before the House Armed Service Committee in February, “If you take another $500 billion out of this defense budget, the strategy I just presented to you, I’d have to throw it out the window,” (Brannen 2012, 6.) **Some defense analysts propose that defense spending generated the current fiscal crisis** within the United States **and** responsible **defense cuts are part of the solution**. **The national budget should influence the capabilities and requirements of our national policy without sacrificing security** as we focus on internal issues of the economy, infrastructure, and global politics. The proposed 9 percent reduction to the Army’s budget for fiscal year 2013 is much smaller than the 48 percent decrease during the period of 1968-1976 and may be considered light cuts to the Army’s budget. **However the impacts of sequestration can only be projected to depict the ultimate reduction to the Army’s budget for 2013 and beyond. Sequestration requires an additional $500 billion in reductions through 2021 on top of the $487 billion over the next 10 years** (Burton and Eastman 2012, slide 6). **The impacts on the defense budget and the Army could double from nine percent to eighteen percent as the Army’s budget makes up 25.6 percent of the d**epartment **o**f **d**efense**’s** **2013 budget** and expects to maintain the same amount in the future (Burton and Eastman 2012,slides 6, 8 and 11). (see figure 10)

### Econ Decline Doesn’t Cause War

#### Falling nations will improve their domestic policies instead of engage in war

Page 1 (Robert A. Page, Specialize in international security affairs, MIT, “Technological Sources of War and Peace:   
Why Structural Change Ended the Cold War Peacefully”, http://web.mit.edu/ssp/seminars/wed\_archives01spring/pape.htm)

The cause of the long term, economic decline has a tremendous impact on how a state will respond: cooperation and peace or competition and war? When faced with economic decline, states can pursue domestic reform and/or external expansion. Backward states falling behind will respond differently than advanced states losing a lead. More specifically, backward states falling behind usually opt for domestic reform instead of external expansion. In order to acquire breathing space to make necessary economic and social changes, they will adopt accommodating foreign policies and make territorial concessions. Backward states falling behind realize that only shifts in the balance of technology can reverse their decline, so marginal gains or losses of territory or resources are less important to their security concerns. Backward states falling behind usually do not realize the extent of their technological inferiority until their power has declined so far as to make preventive war extremely unattractive. Conversely, advanced states losing a technological lead often pursue resources aggressively and wage preventive war. As technology spreads throughout the international system, the technological gap narrows and resources gain in importance. That is, the balance of power becomes increasingly sensitive to marginal gains and losses of territory, which intensifies the competition for resources. States losing the lead realize that only material gains can change their relative decline until new technological innovations can be developed.

#### Economic decline doesn’t lead to insecure economies

McCoy 10 (Alfred W. McCoy, Professor of History at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, “The Decline and Fall of the American Empire”, The Nation, http://www.thenation.com/article/156851/decline-and-fall-american-empire#axzz2Z43tXsEe)

Significantly, in 2008, the US National Intelligence Council admitted for the first time that America's global power was indeed on a declining trajectory. In one of its periodic futuristic reports, Global Trends 2025, the Council cited “the transfer of global wealth and economic power now under way, roughly from West to East" and "without precedent in modern history,” as the primary factor in the decline of the “United States' relative strength—even in the military realm.” Like many in Washington, however, the Council’s analysts anticipated a very long, very soft landing for American global preeminence, and harbored the hope that somehow the US would long “retain unique military capabilities… to project military power globally” for decades to come.

#### Economic decline does not lead to war

Page 1 (Robert A. Page, Specialize in international security affairs, MIT, “Technological Sources of War and Peace:   
Why Structural Change Ended the Cold War Peacefully”, http://web.mit.edu/ssp/seminars/wed\_archives01spring/pape.htm)

Preventive war theory predicts that major powers in relative decline will engage in more aggressive foreign policy behavior. In the case of the Soviet Union, relative economic decline led to the opposite result (i.e., a more cooperative foreign policy). Why? This theory of structural, technological change and international conflict and cooperation helps explain why the Cold War ended peacefully. Recently available evidence from Soviet memoirs, interviews, and primary documents reveal that Soviet leaders were primarily concerned with economic decline relative to the United States and other Western countries. As early as 1982, Gorbachev wrote that the Soviet Union's backwardness was the result of missing the scientific and technological revolution. The Soviet Union was falling behind technologically in relation to the West, so the Soviet leaders attempted to gain some breathing space for domestic reform and increased access to foreign techniques by adopting a more cooperative foreign policy. In short, the Soviet case supports the logic of backwardness and foreign policy. First, the Soviet Union had become technologically backward relative to the West by the 1980s. Second, this technological gap created military consequences that threatened Soviet security in the long term. Third, Soviet leaders realized that catching up to the West technologically would require substantial domestic reform, and, hence, a conciliatory foreign policy.

## \*\*\* WTO Updates

### WTO Good—Growth

#### WTO helps economic growth.

Kelly 5-20-13 Kenny is a fellow at the Center for Global Development and the New America Foundation. http://www.businessweek.com/articles/2013-05-20/a-stronger-world-trade-organization-is-good-for-america

Over the past few weeks, much has been made about the transatlantic trade pact President Obama proposed in his State of the Union address, as well as the announcement that Japan will join the Trans-Pacific Partnership, which the U.S. hopes to wrap up this year. Largely overlooked, however, was another development in the area of trade: the leadership contest for the post of the World Trade Organization’s director general. The winning candidate, Brazil’s Roberto Carvalho de Azevêdo, managed to secure the closed-door consensus that passes for a selection procedure with milquetoast statements designed to offend no one. The lack of excitement about Azevêdo’s appointment reflects the extent to which the WTO has been marginalized in favor of trade regionalism. That’s a real problem for the U.S.: Regional approaches can’t handle a lot of the country’s most significant trade issues. The World Trade Organization, meanwhile, remains vital to national and global economic prospects. The two most important long-term trends in U.S. trade are the integration of American factories and retailers into global production networks and the declining U.S. share of global trade volume. Both factors suggest America needs a strong WTO much more than it needs a series of bilateral and regional deals. The rise of global production networks means that products no longer originate in a single place. Instead, manufacturing now involves multiple countries. And networked production is becoming the norm worldwide. According to the U.S. International Trade Commission, the proportion of U.S. manufacturers’ inputs that were imported increased fourfold from 1980 to 2006. And the proportion of the value of U.S. exported goods accounted for by imported parts doubled from 1977 to 2002. Global trade in “intermediate goods” each year is larger than that in finished manufactured products sold to consumers and industries combined. Take the Boeing 787, finally assembled in Everett, Wash. Parts of the plane, including the flight-deck controls, escape slides, and rear fuselage, are made in the U.S. Other bits—the landing gear and passenger doors—are made in Europe. The wing tips and toilets are made in countries in Asia. The components of those parts, in turn, come from a range of other countries. Production of this world-traveling aircraft is pretty much a global endeavor. Jason Dedrick of Syracuse University and his colleagues pointed out that a few years ago, each iPod sold at $299 retail. It appears as a $144 trade deficit with China in the trade statisitcs, but China’s input is actually only worth about $5 of labor. Much of the remaining $139 of imported value is accounted for by parts imported by China from all over the world—including the U.S. Apple’s gross margins amount to about $80 on each iPod; U.S. retailers and distributors account for about $75. For Apple (AAPL) and Boeing (BA) to make money requires friction-free trade not just between the U.S. and China, but around the world. That involves a global agenda far beyond the traditional fixation on trade tariffs. Analysis by the OECD suggests that reducing transaction costs of trade by just 1 percent would increase global income by more than $40 billion. And World Bank researchers note that countries with more efficient logistics systems are far more integrated into international production networks. The WTO has begun to tackle a host of nontariff barriers to trade that prevent goods and services from being provided to consumers more efficiently and with greater choice. These include trade in services—such as logistics, banking, and telecommunications—as well as policies relating to the movement of the people who deliver those services. The U.S. needs global trade to work better at a time when America’s economic dominance is declining. The U.S. controlled nearly 16 percent of world trade as recently as 2000. Economist Arvind Subramanian predicts that will drop to around 7 percent by 2030 (China will control around 15 percent—as much as the U.S. and Europe combined). The best way to lock in a trading regime that will be fair to the U.S. is to use the power of the WTO. The organization has shown itself capable of standing up to today’s biggest trade bully: Washington. Economic minnows Antigua and Costa Rica have both successfully challenged U.S. trade practices using the WTO. At the same time, WTO decisions have also helped the U.S.—not least, a WTO ruling forced China to drop export taxes on a number of raw materials, including bauxite and zinc, in 2012. If the U.S. wants to benefit from a stronger, fairer, truly global trading regime, it needs to reach out beyond Europe and the Far East to producers from Africa to Asia and Latin America. Because of global production networks, it needs agreements that promote friction-free movement of goods all around the world. And only one trade institution has that reach. The WTO now has 158 members who account for more than 95 percent of world trade. Add in 32 applicant countries, and that brings the total to 99.95 percent. For all of the frustrations of the past 10 years, the Obama Administration should be putting its muscle behind reviving the moribund Doha WTO round—or launching a new one. Regional and bilateral agreements are simply a distraction.

#### WTO establishes global economic order because it reduces trade barriers.

Shrybman 97- Steven Shrybman is a partner in the law firm of Sack, Goldblatt and Mitchell and practices international trade and public interest law in Ottawa, Canada. http://www.sierraclub.ca/national/programs/sustainable-economy/trade-environment/env-guide-wto.html

The WTO and the Global Economy- The establishment of the WTO, represents a watershed in the process of establishing a truly global economic order and it is likely to exert a more profound influence over the course of human affairs than has any other institution in history. There are three reasons that justify such an assessment. The first has to do with the ever increasing importance of international trade to a global economy. Transnational corporations now control more than one third of worlds' productive assets, and the organization of their production and distribution systems has little to do with national or even regional boundaries. Decisions about locating factories, sourcing materials, processing information or raising capital are made on a global basis, and a particular product may include components from several countries{3}. This explains why nearly 40% of all international trade takes within the same corporate family. Another measure of the growing dimensions of globally economic integration, is the growth in international trade itself which according the most recent figures published by the WTO increased by a staggering 9 1/2 per cent in 1994. An Economic Constitution for the Planet- When the Canada-US Free Trade Agreement was concluded, President Reagan described it as the "economic constitution of North America", a characterization that was recently echoed by the Director General of the WTO, Renato Ruggiero, referring to the WTO. In many ways their assessments are appropriate because as traditional constitutions guide the domestic affairs of the members of national communities, so does the WTO set out comprehensive rules to guide activities of the members of the global community. Further, trade agreements operate at a super-jurisdictional level and effectively supersede the sovereign authority of nation states - very much as national constitutional instruments constrain the exercise of legislative authority. Finally, like constitutions, trade agreements set out the fundamental rights of their constituents. Unfortunately, under the WTO only corporations are the beneficiaries of these entrenched rights, and efforts to include social, labour or environmental rights - have been decidedly rejected. The second, concerns the way in which the reach of trade rules has extended into every field of economic endeavour. Historically trade agreements were concerned with the trade of goods eg. manufactured goods and natural resource products, across international borders. With the establishment of the WTO, the purview of trade agreements now includes investment measures, intellectual property rights, domestic regulatory initiatives, and services - in fact it would be difficult to identify an issue of social, economic or environmental significance that does not have some relationship to trade.

#### The WTO helps developing countries grow and adapt to trading with the world.

GOV. UK 13 https://www.gov.uk/the-world-trade-organisation-and-trading-with-developing-countries

The WTO has reached several agreements to reduce and eliminate barriers to global trade, including: the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT - goods), the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS), the Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), dispute resolution between member governments, specific product/service and exporter/importer agreements. The WTO also allows developing countries and ‘least developed countries’ (LDCs) to adapt more slowly to free trade. There are 50 LDCs as defined by the UN - 32 of which are WTO members. These include self-defined developing countries, and two of the world’s largest economies - China and India. These developing countries have successfully agreed certain changes in WTO agreements, including: a programme of Technical Assistance and Capacity Building - for which the UK has pledged £45 million, a change in the TRIPS rules on patented medicines to allow developing countries to use cheaper medicines under certain circumstances. There are also other changes being considered by the WTO that would benefit developing countries, such as: special measures for LDCs and small economies, changes to the relationship between trade, debt and finance, the possibility of technology transfers, the relationship between patents and development. There are also some issues which have not been resolved due to disagreements between developed and developing countries. These issues include: agricultural commodities and subsistence farming; trade, debt and finance; the lack of safeguard mechanisms for developing countries during an economic crisis. WTO agreements and their changes have created a vast range of new business opportunities. Rules preventing special help for small business in public procurement - including development aid contracts - have been effectively removed in the EU and other developed countries, allowing many opportunities in these markets.

### WTO Good—Environment

#### WTO helps the environment- makes it sustainable for the future.

Tamiotti et al 9- Ludivine Tamiotti (Tamiotti conducts research on technical barriers to trade and trade and environment issues and holds advanced law degrees from the Universities of Aix-en-Provence, Geneva and New York.), Robert Teh (Teh worked as a lecturer in San Francisco State University and the University of the Philippines. He has been involved in the negotiation and implementation of free trade agreements in the Asia-Pacific region. He obtained his PhD in economics from Stanford University.), Vesile Kulaçoğlu (Kulaçoğlu has a Masters degree in International Affairs from Columbia University and an Economics degree from the University of Geneva.), Anne Olhoff (*Anne* heads the Climate Resilient Development Programme at UNEP Risø Centre (URC)), Benjamin Simmons (Benjamin Simmons is Head of the Trade, Policy and Planning Unit in UNEP’s Economics and Trade Branch, located in Geneva, Switzerland.), Hussein Abaza (Hussein Abaza is the Chief of the Economics and Trade Branch of UNEP's Division of Technology, Industry, and Economics.) [“Trade and Climate Change: A Report by the United Nations Environment Programme and the World Trade Organization”]

In the Marrakesh Agreement establishing the WTO, members highlighted a clear link between sustainable development and trade opening – in order to ensure that market opening goes hand in hand with environmental and social objectives. In the ongoing Doha Round of negotiations, members went further in their pledge to pursue a sustainable development path by launching the first-ever multilateral trade and environment negotiations. One issue addressed in the Doha Round is the relationship between the WTO and multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs), such as the UNFCCC. In this area of negotiations, WTO members have focused on opportunities for further strengthening cooperation between the WTO and MEA secretariats, as well as promoting coherence and mutual supportiveness between the international trade and environment regimes. While, to date, there have been no WTO legal disputes directly involving MEAs, a successful outcome to the Doha negotiations will nevertheless contribute to reinforcing the relationship between the trade and environmental regimes. The negotiators have drawn from experiences in the negotiation and implementation of MEAs at the national level, and are seeking ways to improve national coordination and cooperation between trade and environment policies. Also in the context of the Doha Round, ministers have singled out environmental goods and services for liberalization. The negotiations call for “the reduction, or as appropriate, elimination of tariff and non-tariff barriers to environmental goods and services”. The objective is to improve access to more efficient, diverse and less expensive environmental goods and services on the global market, including goods and services that contribute to climate change mitigation and adaptation. Climate-friendly technologies can be employed to mitigate and adapt to climate change in diverse sectors. Many of these technologies involve products currently being discussed in the Doha negotiations, such as wind and hydropower turbines, solar water heaters, photovoltaic cells, tanks for the production of biogas, and landfill liners for methane collection. In this context, the WTO environmental goods and services negotiations have a role to play in improving access to climate-friendly goods and technologies. There are two key rationales for reducing tariffs and other trade-distorting measures in climate-friendly goods and technologies. First, reducing or eliminating import tariffs and non-tariff barriers in these types of products should reduce their price and therefore facilitate their deployment. The access to lower-cost and more energy-efficient technologies may be particularly important for industries that must comply with climate change mitigation policies (see Part IV). Second, liberalization of trade in climate-friendly goods could provide incentives and domestic expertise for producers to expand the production and export of these goods. Trade in climate-friendly goods has seen a considerable increase in the past few years, including exports from a number of developing countries.

### WTO Impact Defense

#### Trade interests will cause protectionism based off of non-tariff barriers.

MAHE ’97 – Louis-Pascal Mahe. Professor Emeritus at Agrocampus (Ecole d’Agronomie) Rennes. From 1989through 1997, he was a Professor and Chair of the Economics department at Ecole d’Agronomie de Rennes. He has been an expert work for the European Commission, OECD, FAO, the World Bank

The Uruguay Round Agricultural Agreement will discipline traditional agricultural policies, particularly in the long run. It is argued that the same trade interests and lobby pressures will trigger a new protectionism based on non-tariff barriers, under the cover of objectives related to health, quality, environment and ethics. Economic theory provides some guidelines for distinguishing between the measures necessary to alleviate market failures and those which are protectionist abuses of consumer or environmental protection objectives. The WTO has implemented an efficient system of checks to limit this tendency, as can be seen from the Agreements related to these issues and recent panel decisions. However, WTO activities seem to be limited by the role of objectivity and science in the case of global commons and ethics. Moreover, the WTO is the outcome of a voluntary treaty and tends to focus more on barriers to trade and less on global welfare losses related to world commons and to ethics.

#### WTO is bound to spark new protectionism in the future.

MAHE ’97 - Louis-Pascal Mahe. Professor Emeritus at Agrocampus (Ecole d’Agronomie) Rennes. From 1989through 1997, he was a Professor and Chair of the Economics department at Ecole d’Agronomie de Rennes. He has been an expert work for the European Commission, OECD, FAO, the World Bank

The regulatory role of the WTO in these areas is bound to become more extensive. It is therefore of interest to our profession to assess the relevance and the efficiency of the new international system by considering the economic content behind the principles of international co-ordination included in the Agreements, to compare the regulation methods applied to different areas of potential NTBs and to relate the role of the WTO to other international bodies and conventions (such as the Codex Alimentarius or the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species). As countries clearly have different concerns about regulations due to comparative advantages or trade interests (e.g., importers versus exporters) and diverging priorities due to their level of income and development, it is worth analyzing the strategies of pressure groups and countries regarding the new protectionism

#### WTO had a lot to do with the recent global economic crisis which sparked protectionism in some areas.

Evenett ’11 – Simon Evenett. Simon J. Evenett is Professor of International Trade and Economic Development at the University of St. Gallen, Switzerland, and Co-Director of the CEPR Programme in International Trade and Regional Economics. Evenett taught previously at Oxford and Rutgers University, and served twice as a World Bank official. He was a non-resident Senior Fellow of the Brookings Institution in Washington. He obtained his Ph.D. in Economics from Yale University.

This paper challenges the contention that WTO rules had much impact on state behaviour during the recent global economic crisis. Evidence on the variety of discrimination implemented by governments, characteristics of the recent systemic crisis, as well as on certain, often overlooked features of WTO obligations are used to support a conclusion that the WTO rules altered at most the composition of crisis-era protectionism. As to the quantum of protectionism, it is unclear how WTO rules could have prevented many governments from adopting tariff increases on the scale of the Smoot Hawley tariff. Pessimistic implications are drawn concerning the future restraining role that multilateral trade obligations could ever play during systemic economic crises. Realistically, the fate of the open world trading system must rely on other incentives to refrain from protectionism.

## \*\*\*US-China Updates

### US China Relations High

#### US-China good as well as stable

**Lieberthal and Jisi 12** [Addressing U.S.-China distrust; Kenneth Lieberthal and Wang Jisi, researchers at the John L. Thornton China Center at Brookings; John L. Thornton China Center Monograph Series Number 4; http://yahuwshua.org/en/Resource-584/0330\_china\_lieberthal.pdf; March 2012]

The issue of mutual distrust of long-term intentions—¶ termed here “strategic distrust”—has become a central ¶ concern in US-China relations. Vice President Xi Jinping recognized this reality in giving this issue first place in ¶ his review of key problems in U.S.-China relations during ¶ his major policy address in Washington, DC on February 15, ¶ 2012.¶ Both Beijing and Washington seek to build a constructive ¶ partnership for the long run. U.S.-China relations are, moreover, mature. The two sides understand well each others’ position on all major issues and deal with each other extensively. ¶ The highest level leaders meet relatively frequently, and there ¶ are more than sixty regular government-to-government dialogues between agencies in the two governments each year.¶

#### US and China will cooperate

**Kissinger 2012** [The Future of U.S.-Chinese Relations: Conflict is a Choice, Not a Necessity; Henry Kissinger, Member of the Council on Foreign Relations, former Secretary of State; March/April 2012; http://www.mauldineconomics.com/images/uploads/overmyshoulder/The\_Future\_of\_US-Chinese\_Relations\_\_Foreign\_Affairs.pdf]

On January 19, 2011, U.S. President Barack Obama and Chinese President Hu Jintao issued a joint statement at¶ the end of Hu’s visit to Washington. It proclaimed their shared commitment to a “positive, cooperative, and¶ comprehensive U.S.-China relationship.” Each party reassured the other regarding his principal concern,¶ announcing, “The United States reiterated that it welcomes a strong, prosperous, and successful China that plays¶ a greater role in world affairs. China welcomes the United States as an Asia-Pacific nation that contributes to¶ peace, stability and prosperity in the region.”¶ Since then, the two governments have set about implementing the stated objectives. Top American and Chinese¶ officials have exchanged visits and institutionalized their exchanges on major strategic and economic issues.¶ Military-to-military contacts have been restarted, opening an important channel of communication. And at the¶ unofficial level, so-called track-two groups have explored possible evolutions of the U.S.-Chinese relationship.

#### Obama is trying to create good relations

**Green 11** [Good news and bad news about U.S.-China relations; Michael Green, senior advisor at the Center for Strategic and International Studies; January 13, 2011; http://shadow.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2011/01/13/good\_news\_and\_bad\_news\_about\_us\_china\_relations]

The Obama administration came into office intending to continue the broad Bush policy of engaging China based on strong alliance relationships in Asia, particularly with Japan. The Obama team hoped to build on that basic approach by establishing a more enduring formula for mutual strategic reassurance with Beijing. To set the right tone early on, the White House delayed sensitive arms sales to Taiwan and a meeting with the Dalai Lama in advance of the president's first trip to China in November 2009 and then sought language in a joint statement in Beijing that would signal U.S. understanding of China's "core interests" with respect to Tibet, Taiwan, and other issues. Set against the backdrop of the financial crisis and increasing confidence in China, these gestures backfired and the administration soon found itself responding to a series of assertive Chinese moves at the Copenhagen climate summit, in the South China Sea, on the Korean peninsula, and in the Sino-Japanese territorial dispute over the Senkaku or Diaoyutai Islands. To its credit, the Obama administration adjusted and spent much of 2010 reminding Beijing of the depths of U.S. strategic power and influence in Asia, as countries from India to Vietnam and Japan sought closer security ties with Washington to re-establish a stable strategic equilibrium vis-à-vis Beijing. The top national security team -- Donilon, Gates, and Clinton -- have now replaced the administration's earlier dreamy visions of transformational U.S.-China cooperation on global issues with a much more hardheaded appreciation of the underlying power realities of dealing with Beijing.

### US China Relations Low

#### US-China relations low now

Zheng 13 Political Pundit (Henry Zheng. “ US-China Relations: Why Obama’s ‘Asia Pivot’ Strategy Could Lead to Disaster.’ *Policy Mic.* 1-13.) http://www.policymic.com/articles/20675/us-china-relations-why-obama-s-asia-pivot-strategy-could-start-a-nuclear-war

The back-and-forth defense escalation bespeaks the suspicious nature of security agencies in general that could contribute to the deterioration of bilateral relations. With things as they are now, tensions are quickly rising on both sides because they are both approaching each other with a zero-sum mentality. Even with their almost inextricable economic and trade interdependence, the politics of Chinese containment and American repulsion could become a military conflict before long. As shown by the Chinese-Japanese dispute over the Diaoyu/Senkaku Islands, Chinese citizens are willing to boycott foreign goods and services in a surge of patriotic fervor. Therefore, even economic interdependence may not deter war if the strategic interests of both the U.S. and China are compromised. The two leaders must engage in an open discussion which addresses these problems honestly, and come up with practical solutions that move beyond their ideological and cultural differences. If not done soon, we will all suffer

#### Mistrust blocks good US-China relations.

Lawrence and Lum 11. Analyst in Asian Affairs, Specialist in Asian Affairs. (Susan V. Lawrence and Thomas Lum. *US-China Relations: Policy Issues.* Print. 1/12/11).

The US-China relationship remains dogged, however, by long-standing mutual mistrust. That mistrust stems in part form the two countries’ very different political systems. Many in the United States are uncomfortable with China’s authoritarian system of government and see continued Communist Party rule in a post-Cold-War world as anachronism. Many Communist elite in China are suspicious that the United States seeks to constrain China’s rise, and in long term, foist multi-party democracy on China and push the Communist Party in power.

The two countries’ economic levels have led to mistrust, too. Some in the United States believe that China has achieved its economic successes by playing by a different, and not always fair, set of rules. Such critics point to China’s alleged strong reliance on exports for growth and the PRC’s government’s policy of keeping the China’s currency artificially weak, in part to make Chinese exports more attractive to importing nations. Other points of contention include the PRC government’s direct and indirect subsidies and other forms of support for its state-owned corporations, and its inability or unwillingness to prevent violations of foreign intellectual property by Chinese entities. For their part, PRC officials have sometimes criticized the United States for its high levels of consumption, low savings rate, and long-term debt. Chinese officials have also criticized the United States’ allegedly loose monetary policy.

### Alt Cause—Snowden

#### Snowden damaged US China Relations

Blood 13 (Michael R. Blood. “Hilary Clinton: China Damaged U.S. Relationship by Allowing Edward Snowden to Flee.” *Huff Post Politics.* 6/25/13).

LOS ANGELES -- Hillary Rodham Clinton said Monday that China damaged its relationship with the U.S. by allowing National Security Agency leaker Edward Snowden to flee from Hong Kong, despite a U.S. request to arrest him for extradition.

"That kind of action is not only detrimental to the U.S.-China relationship but it sets a bad precedent that could unravel the intricate international agreements about how countries respect the laws – and particularly the extradition treaties," the former secretary of state and possible 2016 presidential contender told an audience in Los Angeles.

Clinton's remarks echoed criticism from White House officials that Hong Kong's refusal to detain Snowden had "unquestionably" hurt relations between the two countries. Hong Kong has a high degree of autonomy from the rest of China, although experts believe Beijing probably orchestrated Snowden's exit in an effort to remove an irritant in relations with the U.S.

### Yes U.S. China War

#### Historically, expanding power has led to an increased chance of conflict-makes U.S. – China war a strong possibility

Friedberg 5—Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton University [Aaron L. Friedberg, “The Future of U.S.-China Relations: Is Conflict Inevitable?” International Security, Volume 30, No. 2, Pg. 18-22, Summer 2005 <http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/pdf/10.1162/016228805775124589>]

Realist pessimists note that, throughout history, rising powers have tended to be troublemakers, at least insofar as their more established counterparts in the international system are concerned. This is the case, in the realists’ view, regardless of regime type; it was as true of a rising, democratic United States as it was of a rising, autocratic Germany. As Samuel Huntington has pointed out, “The external expansion of the UK and France, Germany and Japan, the Soviet Union and the United States coincided with phases of intense industrialization and economic development.”31¶ There appear to be a number of reasons for this pattern. As a state’s capabilities grow, its leaders tend to define their interests more expansively and to¶ seek a greater degree of influence over what is going on around them. Rising powers seek not only to secure their frontiers but to reach out beyond them, taking steps to ensure access to markets, materials, and transportation routes; to protect their citizens far from home, defend their foreign friends and allies, and promulgate their values; and, in general, to have what they consider to be their legitimate say in the affairs of their region and of the wider world. This¶ correlation between growing power and expanding interests has been succinctly summarized by Robert Gilpin: “A more wealthy and more powerful¶ state... will select a larger bundle of security and welfare goals than a less¶ wealthy and less powerful state.”32¶ As they seek to assert themselves, rising powers are often drawn to challenge territorial boundaries, international institutional arrangements, and hierarchies of prestige that were put in place when they were relatively weak. Their leaders and people often feel that they were unfairly left out when the pie was divided up, and may even believe that, because of their prior weakness, they were robbed of what was rightfully theirs. Like Germany at the turn¶ of the twentieth century, rising powers tend to want their “place in the sun,”¶ and this often brings them into conºict with more established great powers,¶ which are typically the architects and principal beneªciaries of the existing international system.33¶ The collision between the expanding interests of a rising power and those of its more established counterparts can be dealt with in a number of ways, but the resulting disputes are seldom resolved peacefully. Recognizing the growing threat to its position, a dominant power (or coalition of status quo powers) may attempt to use force preventively to destroy a rising state before it can achieve its full potential. Less bellicose, established powers have also at times¶ sought to appease emerging states, looking for ways to satisfy their demands¶ and ambitions without conºict and to engage them and incorporate them¶ peacefully into an existing international order. However sincere and well intentioned these efforts may be, they have usually failed. Sometimes the reason¶ is clearly the character of the demands of the rising state. As was true of Adolf Hitler’s Germany, for example, a rising power may have ambitions that are so extensive as to be impossible for the status quo powers to satisfy without effectively committing suicide. Even when the demands being made of them are less extensive, the status quo powers may be too reluctant to make reasonable concessions, thereby fueling the frustrations and resentments of the rising power, or too eager to do so, feeding its ambitions and leading to escalating demands. Successful policies of engagement/appeasement are certainly possible in theory, but in practice they have proven to be difªcult to implement.34¶ Looking at the raw facts of its expanding economy and growing military capabilities, most realist pessimists would be content to conclude that China is a¶ rising power and that, as such, it is unlikely to behave differently than have¶ others of its type throughout history. Thus Huntington, after describing the¶ correlation in past cases between rapid internal growth and external expansion, predicts that China too will “undoubtedly be moving into such a phase in the coming decades.”35 Similarly, according to John Mearsheimer, so long as China’s power continues to grow, “China, like all previous potential hegemons, [will] be strongly inclined to become a real hegemon.”36 Some analysts go a step further, arguing that China is especially likely to behave assertively, even at the risk of coming into conflict with others. Recent Chinese history, the “century of humiliation” that began with the Opium Wars of the 1840s and ended only with the final expulsion of foreign powers from the mainland after World War II, appears to have left China’s leaders and its people acutely sensitive to perceived slights to national honor and prestige and especially alert to threats around their periphery.37 As a result of the painful experiences of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, contemporary Chinese strategists may be even more eager than they might otherwise be to establish a sphere of inºuence or zone of control that would prevent such threats from reemerging in the future.38¶ Reaching even further back into the past, other observers point to the fact¶ that, before its decline and domination by outside powers, China was for¶ many centuries the preponderant force in Asia and the hub of a Sinocentric¶ Asian international system. As they adapt to the reality of their growing power and look for models to guide their behavior under increasingly favorable conditions, the leadership in Beijing could hearken back to this earlier era of glory and seek to reestablish China as East Asia’s preponderant power.39¶ Some U.S. government agencies have concluded that China’s current leaders aim to “maximize [China’s] influence within East Asia relative to the U.S.” or, more bluntly, to become “the preeminent power in Asia.”40 If this is true, and assuming that the United States continues to adhere to its century-old policy of opposing the dominance of either half of Eurasia by a hostile power or coalition, the stage will be set for an intense and possibly protracted strategic competition between the two Pacific giants.41

#### Further securitization in both China and U.S. likely to lead to conflict, missile defense systems prove

**Friedberg 05-Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton University** [Aaron L. Friedberg, “The Future of U.S.-China Relations: Is Conflict Inevitable?”, International Security, Volume 30, No. 2, Pg. 22-24, Summer 2005 <http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/pdf/10.1162/016228805775124589>]

Even if one does not accept the view that the PRC’s goal is to displace the United States as East Asia’s preponderant power, it is still possible to reach fairly pessimistic conclusions about the likely future character of the U.S.- China relationship by invoking the mechanism of the security dilemma.42 In other words, even if the larger political goals of both sides are, in some sense, purely defensive, the measures that each takes to secure its position and achieve its objectives may still arouse alarm and stimulate countermeasures on the other side. Such processes appear to be at work in several aspects of contemporary U.S.-China relations**.¶** As regards Taiwan, China’s goal may be only to prevent that island from sliding toward independence**.** The PRC’s leaders may be perfectly willing to¶ live with the status quo indeªnitely, but they may believe that they have to issue periodic threats to prevent Taiwan from breaking free. The U.S. objective¶ may be only to prevent forceful reunification. But China’s threats and ongoing military buildup may increase fears that Beijing will eventually feel capable of achieving its objectives through the use of force. To maintain deterrence, Washington may then feel compelled to increase military assistance to Taipei and to take other measures designed to make it appear more likely that the United States would intervene if Taiwan were attacked. But these steps will almost certainly make the PRC more fearful of a Taiwanese bolt for independence, which will cause Beijing to further intensify its military efforts and heighten its rhetoric, and so on.43 China’s aim in deploying large numbers of theater ballistic missiles may be¶ primarily to deter Taiwan from declaring independence. But those deployments inevitably appear threatening not only to Taiwan but also to Japan, the¶ United States, and others in the region. Conversely, the U.S. aim in moving toward deployment of some kind of theater missile defense (TMD) system may be to provide a measure of protection to U.S. friends and allies and to its bases and forces in the Western Pacific. But the possibility of such a deployment is obviously deeply threatening to the Chinese, who see it as undermining their ability to prevent unfavorable regional developments, especially if a U.S.- orchestrated TMD system is extended to include Taiwan. Beijing’s concerns¶ about TMD will be further heightened by the deployment of a U.S. national¶ missile defense system, which the Chinese could see as reducing their ability¶ to deter an attack on their own territory. The Chinese response to these developments is likely to include steps to augment both their theater- and intercontinental-range strike forces, which will tend to heighten U.S. anxieties about their intentions.44 U.S. government ofªcials see regional alliances as defensive bulwarks of stability and bend over backward to disclaim any intention of encircling or containing China. Not surprisingly, however, Chinese strategists tend to see U.S. behavior in a less benign light. Since the end of the Cold War, the United States¶ has been busy trying to strengthen and solidify its ties to its traditional regional allies (including Japan, South Korea, and Australia) in large part out of¶ concern over the growth of Chinese power. Especially since the latter part of¶ the 1990s, the United States has also been working to expand its network¶ of alliances and quasi alliances in Southeast, South, and Central Asia. The¶ September 11 terrorist attacks have only intensifed this trend. Whatever U.S. spokespeople may say, Chinese observers are likely to view much of this activity as directed at China and as hostile to its interests. Should China seek to oppose U.S. actions, however, by criticizing the persistence of American alliances, or by attempting to bolster its own relationship with Russia or with the Central Asian republics, its actions will be seen by many in the United States as evidence of hostile, expansionist tendencies.45

#### Competitions for primacy in Asia will lead to U.S.-China conflict

Christensen 6-William P. Boswell Professor of World Politics of Peace and War and Director of the China and the World Program at Princeton University [Thomas J. Christensen, “Fostering Stability or Creating a Monster? The Rise of China and U.S. Policy toward East Asia”, International Security, Volume 31, No. 1, Pg. 81-126, Summer 2006 <http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/pdf/10.1162/isec.2006.31.1.81>]

The second view of international politics portrays international relations, especially between existing and rising great powers, as largely a zero-sum struggle for leadership. Advocates of this view draw easy analogies between contemporary U.S.-China relations and the historical examples of relations among rising challengers and incumbent leading great powers, which have often been tense, highly competitive, and conflict prone.44 From this perspective, even if conflict is avoidable in the near term, eventual Sino-American competition for primacy in the East Asia region (or, perhaps, around the globe) will likely lead the two states into a cold war, if not a shooting war. In such a competitive¶ worldview, one great power actor’s gains are by definition the other actor’s¶ loss. Although the United States maintains a healthy overall lead in the competition for influence in Asia, China has closed the gap faster than most¶ analysts could have expected in the early 1990s.45 One basic point underscores the sometimes stark differences between the zerosum and positive-sum perspectives. Since the early 1990s, almost all of the¶ changes in the region that reduced the dangers of mistrust and spirals of tension from a positive-sum point of view also increased China’s relative economic and political role in the region. From a zero-sum perspective, those¶ changes should be seen as unwelcome in Washington because they reduce the¶ relative power of the United States and its regional allies. From a zerosum perspective, relatively high economic growth rates provide China with growing regional power in comparison to the United States. China’s rise has been even more impressive compared with its neighbors, including U.S. allies such as Japan, the Philippines, South Korea, and Thailand. Of course, China’s economic power helps it afford a fast-paced military modernization program, which began in earnest in the late 1990s. China’s official military budget more than doubled from 1999 to 2005; and in addition to increasing ballistic missile deployments across from Taiwan, China is developing/importing from Russia various weapons systems, such as submarines and cruise missiles, which are of concern to the U.S. Pacific Command and to the security establishments of regional friends and allies of the United States. But China’s growing economic presence arguably plays a separate and equally important strategic role. In an article written in 2000, Aaron Friedberg explores a decidedly zero-sum perspective on the challenge posed to the United States by a rising China. He¶ writes, “As time passes, China will probably become even less susceptible to American economic pressure than it is today. Chinese exports to the United States may be large, but even now they are greatly overshadowed by China’s exports to its Asian neighbors. And as important as the U.S. is as a source of¶ capital, it now comes in among the ªve largest providers of direct foreign investment to China; the other four [Hong Kong, Japan, Singapore, and South¶ Korea] are all Asian players.”46 Of course, this is what one would have expected if the region was to break out of its thin intraregional interdependence¶ and the heavy reliance on outside markets that Friedberg and others considered potentially destabilizing from a positive-sum perspective in the early¶ 1990s.¶ Even in bilateral relationships in which China’s diplomatic relations are¶ rather poor, economic leverage still looms large. Since the start of this decade,¶ political relations between China and Japan and across the Taiwan Strait have¶ been frosty, but economic relations are deep and growing quickly. As noted¶ above, both Sino-Japanese and Chinese–South Korean economic cooperation¶ has skyrocketed. China is also Taiwan’s leading overseas investment target¶ and its largest trade partner, with Taiwan enjoying a mammoth trade surplus¶ with the mainland.47 Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan will not likely be eager¶ to simply accommodate mainland China on core security issues, but the economic relationships they have with the PRC will almost certainly affect their¶ choices moving forward. From the zero-sum perspective, Japan’s and South Korea’s high degree of reliance on the Chinese economy makes analysts nervous about whether either country can be considered a reliable U.S. ally, particularly in conºicts that might directly affect U.S. strategic interests, but not their own. Although to date the U.S.-Japan alliance does not seem severely hampered by this phenomenon, the problem is arguably already severe in U.S.–South Korean alliance relations during a period of restructuring of U.S. forces on the peninsula. The government of President Roh Moo-Hyun would¶ clearly like to ensure that Washington will not use its reconªgured bases in¶ South Korea to ªght a war with China over Taiwan.48 Similarly, many actors in the region, including Singapore, Thailand, and Vietnam, seem to want to hedge their bets in the face of a potential U.S.-China military showdown, rather than simply lean toward the United States. They do not want to be¶ forced to choose the United States over China.49

#### US-China conflicts rising over the South China Sea

Zheng 13 Political Pundit (Henry Zheng. “ US-China Relations: Why Obama’s ‘Asia Pivot’ Strategy Could Lead to Disaster.’ *Policy Mic.* 1-13.) http://www.policymic.com/articles/20675/us-china-relations-why-obama-s-asia-pivot-strategy-could-start-a-nuclear-war

In an interesting policy move that has been dubbed the "Asia Pivot," the Obama administration has shifted its priorities to the Pacific region. Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta indicated that by 2020, 60% of U.S. naval ships will be in the Pacific, and 40% percent in the Atlantic, "compared with the current 50-50 split." Critics of the pivot say that it is verbal bravado and a mere "repackaging of policies begun in previous administrations, although still enough to unnecessarily antagonize the Chinese."

This American response is due in part to the surprising advancements made by the Chinese military, such as the successful developments of its aircraft carrier, advanced jet fighters, and more cost-effective drones. China-U.S. relations expert Wu Xinbo advises the U.S. not to just focus on China's rising capabilities, but also to "pay attention to how China will use its military power." It is not surprising that China wants to catch up militarily, as it is a dominant economic power that has the means to do so. However, the Chinese Communist Party and the People's Liberation Army may not necessarily want to undermine U.S. global military preeminence, but rather wish to assert their country's sovereignty in regional disputes involving territories in the East and South China seas. The Chinese might threaten U.S. dominance in these regions insofar as they see American forces as encroachments that they must guard against. Conversely, Washington sees itself as an important player in the Pacific, with certain obligations and diplomatic interests to which it must attend. Notable strategic maneuvers stemming from this perception include the stationing of 250 U.S. Marines in Australia, and military drills with Japan.

### Alt Cause—SCS War

#### Cut Seismic Cable Increases Tension in South China Sea

Perlez 2012 (Jane Perlez- chief diplomatic correspondent in the Beijing bureau of The New York Time, December 04, 2012, “Dispute Flares Over Energy in South China Sea” NYT, http://www.nytimes.com/2012/12/05/world/asia/china-vietnam-and-india-fight-over-energy-exploration-in-south-china-sea.html?\_r=0)

BEIJING — China and two of its neighbors, Vietnam and India, were locked in a new dispute on Tuesday over energy exploration in the South China Sea, a signal that Beijing plans to continue its hard line in the increasingly contentious waterway.

Vietnam accused a Chinese fishing boat of cutting a seismic cable attached to one of its vessels exploring for oil and gas near the Gulf of Tonkin, an act apparently intended to inhibit Vietnam from pursuing energy deposits.

Vietnam said Tuesday that in retaliation, it would send out new patrols, which would include the marine police, to guard against increasing encroachment by Chinese fishing boats in the South China Sea. India, which operates several joint ventures with Vietnam’s national energy company, Petro Vietnam, said it would consider sending navy vessels to protect its interests in the South China Sea.

The latest episode followed an announcement by Hainan Province in southern China last week that Chinese vessels would board and search ships in contested areas of the waterway, which includes vital shipping lanes through which more than a third of global trade moves.

The new tensions among China, Vietnam and India illustrate in stark terms the competition in the South China Sea for what are believed to be sizable deposits of oil and gas.

Some energy experts in China see the sea as an important new energy frontier close to home that could make China less dependent on its huge oil imports from the Middle East.

On Monday, China’s National Energy Administration named the South China Sea as the main offshore site for natural gas production. Within two years, China aims to produce 150 billion cubic meters of natural gas from fields in the sea, a significant increase from the 20 billion cubic meters produced so far, the agency said.

Earlier this year, China’s third-largest energy company, the state-owned China National Offshore Oil Corporation, began drilling with a rig in deep water in nondisputed waters off the southern coast of China.

The escalation in the South China Sea comes less than a month after Xi Jinping took office as China’s leader. Mr. Xi appears to have taken a particular interest in the South China Sea and the serious dispute between China and Japan over the islands known as Diaoyu in China and as Senkaku in Japan. Whether any of China’s most recent actions in the South China Sea were associated with Mr. Xi was not clear.

But Mr. Xi does lead a small group of policy makers clustered in the Maritime Rights Office, which serves to coordinate agencies within China, according to Zhu Feng, a professor of international relations at Peking University, and other Chinese experts. The unit is part of the office of the Foreign Affairs Leading Small Group, Mr. Zhu said. The leading small group, now headed by Mr. Xi, is widely believed to be China’s central policy-making group.

#### China and India Tensions Increase Over South China Sea

Ranade 2012 (Jayadeva Ranade- a former Additional Secretary, Cabinet Secretariat, Government of India is a security and intelligence expert. He is a seasoned China analyst with over 25 years experience in the field. He earned a Diploma of Advanced Proficiency in Chinese after a two-year study programme in Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi and completed an Intensive Introductory Course in Mandarin and a Diploma in Mandarin from the University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, “China Perceives India as a Factor in South China Sea Disputes” June 25, 2012, DNA, http://www.dnaindia.com/analysis/1706326/column-china-perceives-india-as-a-factor-in-south-china-sea-dispute)

As four Indian Navy ships, including the indigenously-built stealth frigate ‘Shivalik’ (F-47), left the Philippines en route to South Korea, a Chinese Navy frigate said: “Welcome to the South China Sea, Foxtrot-47,” and stayed alongside the Indian ships for a few hours.

Other developments nonetheless clearly indicate that tensions are unlikely to dissipate as China strives to ‘recover’ sovereignty over these islands. Pressure on India will increase. At a recent seminar in Beijing, Chinese strategists outlined Beijing’s ambitions in the region. They said: ‘China must gradually and gently force the United States to accept China’s status in Asia and its strategic status as a military power in the world’.

Separately, General Ma Xiaotian, Deputy Chief of General Staff of China’s People’s Liberation Army (PLA), told Hong Kong’s Phoenix TV, that China has the ability to defend its waters, but is not yet prepared to use military force. Military force, he said, will be the last resort and only after bilateral talks, diplomacy and civilian law enforcement measures fail. Most recently, on June 21, China again pushed the envelope and established the Three Sands City prefecture to administer the Paracels, Spratly and Scarborough Reef

#### Chinese Ready to Fight for South China Seas over India-Vietnam Relations

Pant 6/20 (Dr. Harsh Pant- Professor at King’s College London works on contemporary Indian foreign and security policy issues, June 20, 2013, “The South China Sea: A New Area in Chinese-Indian Rivalry”, The Nation, http://www.nationmultimedia.com/opinion/The-South-China-Sea-A-new-area-in-Chinese-Indian-r-30208644.html)

While the world focuses on rising tension between China and the Philippines and other claimants in the South China Sea, Beijing and Delhi are also engaged in a quiet struggle in the contested waters. By putting up for international bidding the same oil block that India had obtained from Vietnam for exploration, China has thrown down a gauntlet. By deciding to stay put in the assigned block, India has indicated it's ready to take up the Chinese challenge. At stake is Chinese opposition to India's claim to be a regional power.

The conflict between India and China over the South China Sea has been building for more than a year. India signed an agreement with Vietnam in October 2011 to expand and promote oil exploration in the South China Sea and has now reconfirmed its decision to carry on despite the Chinese challenge to the legality of Indian presence.  
By accepting the Vietnamese invitation to explore oil and gas in Blocks 127 and 128, India's state-owned oil company ONGC Videsh Ltd (OVL) not only expressed New Delhi's desire to deepen its friendship with Vietnam, but ignored China's warning to stay away. After asking countries "outside the region" to stay away from the South China Sea, China issued a demarche to India in November 2011, underlining that Beijing's permission should be sought for exploration in Blocks 127 and 128 and, without it, OVL's activities would be considered illegal. Vietnam, meanwhile, had underlined the 1982 UN Convention on the Law of the Sea to claim its sovereign rights over the two blocks being explored.  
China has been objecting to Indian exploration projects in the region, claiming that the territory comes under its sovereignty. Whereas India continues to maintain that its exploration projects in the region are purely commercial, China has viewed such activities as an issue of sovereign rights.  
India's moves unsettled China, which views India's growing engagement in East Asia with suspicion. India's decision to explore hydrocarbons with Vietnam followed a July 2011 incident during which an unidentified Chinese warship demanded that a Indian Airavat, an amphibious assault vessel, identify itself and explain its presence in the South China Sea after leaving Vietnamese waters. Completing a scheduled port call in Vietnam, the Indian warship was in international waters.  
After an initial show of defiance, India had second thoughts. In May last year, India's junior oil minister RPN Singh told the parliament that OVL had decided to return Block 128 to Vietnam as exploration there wasn't commercially viable. Hanoi publicly suggested that New Delhi's decision was a response to pressure from China. In July 2012, after Vietnam gave OVL more incentives in terms of a longer period to prove commercial viability, India decided to continue the joint exploration. Vietnam decided to extend the OVL contract for hydrocarbon exploration in Block 128, reiterating that it valued India's presence in the South China Sea for regional strategic balance.  
In June 2012, state-owned China National Offshore Oil Company, (CNOOC), opened nine blocks for exploration in waters also claimed by Vietnam. Oil block 128, which Vietnam argues is inside its 200-nautical mile exclusive economic zone granted under the UN Law of the Sea, is part of the nine blocks offered for global bidding by CNOOC.  
By putting up for global bidding a Vietnamese petroleum block under exploration by an Indian oil company, China has forced India into a corner. That India would not be cowed by Chinese manoeuvres came during the ASEAN Regional Forum in Phnom Penh in July last year. There, India made a strong case for supporting not only freedom of navigation but also access to resources in accordance with principles of international law. New Delhi, which so often likes to avoid taking sides, must assume it can no longer afford the luxury of inaction if it wants to preserve credibility as a significant actor in East and Southeast Asia.  
Like other major powers, India is concerned about China's challenge to free access to the South China Sea. The South China Sea passage is too vital for trade and international security to be controlled by a single country.  
Meanwhile, China has been doing its best to roil the waters in the South China Sea. Concerns have been rising about China's claim to ownership of much of the South China Sea and the Chinese Navy's assertive behaviour in the region. China has decided to establish a military garrison on Woody Island in the Paracels in an attempt to assert claims over the region. China's Defence Ministry has openly warned that "combat ready" Chinese naval and air patrols are ready to "protect our maritime rights and interests" in the South China Sea.  
In a bold display of power and with the help of its friend Cambodia, China prevented ASEAN from even issuing a joint statement for the first time in the organisation's 45-year history. China succeeded in playing divide-and-rule politics, thereby ensuring that the dispute remains a bilateral matter between Beijing and individual rival claimants.  
When China suggests that it wants to extend its territorial waters - which usually extend 12 nautical miles from shore - to include the entire exclusive economic zone, extending 200 nautical miles, it is challenging the fundamental principle of free navigation. All maritime powers, including India, have a national interest in freedom of navigation, open access to Asia's maritime commons and respect for international law in the South China Sea. China has collided with Japan, South Korea, Vietnam and the Philippines in recent months over issues related to exploitation of the East China Sea and South China Sea for mineral resources and oil.  
India's interest in access to Vietnam's energy resources puts it in direct conflict with China's claims over the territory. In an ultimate analysis, this issue is not merely about commerce and energy. It is about strategic rivalry between two rising powers in Asia. If China can expand its presence in the Indian Ocean region, as New Delhi anticipates, India can also do the same in the South China Sea. As China's power grows, it will test India's resolve for maintaining a substantive presence in the South China Sea.

#### China-Philippine Relations Threaten Creation of CoC

Heydarian 7/10 (Richard Javad Heydarian is a foreign affairs analyst focusing on the South China Sea and international security issues. He is a lecturer at Ateneo De Manila University's (ADMU) Department of Political Science, July 10,2013, “Conflicting Currents in South China Sea” Asia Times Online, http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Southeast\_Asia/SEA-01-100713.html)

After securing the disputed Scarborough Shoal after a standoff with Philippine forces last year, China has in recent weeks moved to consolidate control over the hydrocarbon-rich Reed Bank off the western Filipino island of Palawan.   
The Philippines has desperately sought external support, mainly from the US and Japan, to retain its tenuous control over the Second Thomas Shoal, a critical gateway to the disputed Reed Bank. As the Philippines moves to reinforce its forces in the Second Thomas Shoal's area, China warned of a possible "counterstrike" in state media on June 29.   
In response the next day, Philippine Foreign Secretary Albert Del Rosario accused China of "militarizing" the South China Sea, while Philippine Defense Secretary Voltaire Gazmin called for the establishment of Japanese military installations to reinforce America's revolving military presence in the Philippines.   
The renewed tensions and pitched rhetoric have raised the stakes for a binding CoC. For proponents of a minimalist CoC, the priority is to engage in a series of negotiations aimed at a binding set of agreements that will govern the conduct of parties and the resolution of disputes involving more than two claimants. 

### No U.S. China War

#### US-China war not possible, two reasons

Keck 7-12-13 (Zachary Keck is Assistant Editor of The Diplomat. He has previously served as a Deputy Editor for E-IR and as an Editorial Assistant for The Diplomat. Zach has published in various outlets such as Foreign Policy, The National Interest, The Atlantic, Foreign Affairs, and World Politics Review. <http://thediplomat.com/flashpoints-blog/2013/07/12/why-china-and-the-us-probably-wont-go-to-war/> Why China and the US (Probably) Won’t Go to War)

As I noted earlier in the week, the diplomatic summits between China and the U.S. over the past month has renewed conversation on whether Beijing and Washington, as rising and established power, can defy history by not going to war. Xinhua was the latest to weigh in on this question ahead of the Strategic and Economic Dialogue this week, in an article titled, “China, U.S. Can Avoid ‘Thucydides Trap.’” Like many others, Xinhua’s argument that a U.S.-China war can be avoided is based largely on their strong economic relationship. This logic is deeply flawed both historically and logically. Strong economic partners have gone to war in the past, most notably in WWI, when Britain and Germany fought on opposite sides despite being each other’s largest trading partners. More generally, the notion of a “capitalist peace” is problematic at best. Close trading ties can raise the cost of war for each side, but any great power conflict is so costly already that the addition of a temporarily loss of trade with one’s leading partner is a small consideration at best. And while trade can create powerful stakeholders in each society who oppose war, just as often trading ties can be an important source of friction. Indeed, the fact that Japan relied on the U.S. and British colonies for its oil supplies was actually the reason it opted for war against them. Even today, China’s allegedly unfair trade policies have created resentment among large political constituencies in the United States. But while trade cannot be relied upon to keep the peace, a U.S.-China war is virtually unthinkable because of two other factors: nuclear weapons and geography. The fact that both the U.S. and China have nuclear weapons is the most obvious reasons why they won’t clash, even if they remain fiercely competitive. This is because war is the continuation of politics by other means, and nuclear weapons make war extremely bad politics. Put differently, war is fought in pursuit of policy ends, which cannot be achieved through a total war between nuclear-armed states. This is not only because of nuclear weapons destructive power. As Thomas Schelling outlined brilliantly, nuclear weapons have not actually increased humans destructive capabilities. In fact, there is evidence to suggest that wars between nomads usually ended with the victors slaughtering all of the individuals on the losing side, because of the economics of holding slaves in nomadic “societies.” What makes nuclear weapons different, then, is not just their destructive power but also the certainty and immediacy of it. While extremely ambitious or desperate leaders can delude themselves into believing they can prevail in a conventional conflict with a stronger adversary because of any number of factors—superior will, superior doctrine, the weather etc.— none of this matters in nuclear war. With nuclear weapons, countries don’t have to prevail on the battlefield or defeat an opposing army to destroy an entire country, and since there are no adequate defenses for a large-scale nuclear attack, every leader can be absolute certain that most of their country can be destroyed in short-order in the event of a total conflict. Since no policy goal is worth this level of sacrifice, the only possible way for an all-out conflict to ensue is for a miscalculation of some sort to occur. Most of these can and should be dealt by Chinese and the U.S. leaders holding regularly senior level dialogues like the ones of the past month, in which frank and direct talk about redlines are discussed. These can and should be supplemented with clear and open communication channels, which can be especially useful when unexpected crises arise, like an exchange of fire between low-level naval officers in the increasingly crowded waters in the region. While this possibility is real and frightening, it’s hard to imagine a plausible scenario where it leads to a nuclear exchange between China and the United States. After all, at each stage of the crisis leaders know that if it is not properly contained, a nuclear war could ensue, and the complete destruction of a leader’s country is a more frightening possibility than losing credibility among hawkish elements of society. In any case, measured means of retaliation would be available to the party wronged, and behind-the-scenes diplomacy could help facilitate the process of finding mutually acceptable retaliatory measures. Geography is the less appreciated factor that will mitigate the chances of a U.S.-China war, but it could be nearly as important as nuclear weapons. Indeed, geography has a history of allowing countries to avoid the Thucydides Trap, and works against a U.S.-China war in a couple of ways. First, both the United States and China are immensely large countries—according to the Central Intelligence Agency, the U.S. and China are the third and fourth largest countries in the world by area, at 9,826,675 and 9,596,961 square km respectively. They also have difficult topographical features and complex populations. As such, they are virtually unconquerable by another power. This is an important point and differentiates the current strategic environment from historical cases where power transitions led to war. For example, in Europe where many of the historical cases derive from, each state genuinely had to worry that the other side could increase their power capabilities to such a degree that they could credibly threaten the other side’s national survival. Neither China nor the U.S. has to realistically entertain such fears, and this will lessen their insecurity and therefore the security dilemma they operate within. Besides being immensely large countries, China and the U.S. are also separated by the Pacific Ocean, which will also weaken their sense of insecurity and threat perception towards one another. In many of the violent power transitions of the past, starting with Sparta and Athens but also including the European ones, the rival states were located in close proximity to one another. By contrast, when great power conflict has been avoided, the states have often had considerable distance between them, as was the case for the U.S. and British power transition and the peaceful end to the Cold War. The reason is simple and similar to the one above: the difficulty of projecting power across large distances—particularly bodies of waters— reduces each side’s concern that the other will threaten its national survival and most important strategic interests. True, the U.S. operates extensively in China’s backyard, and maintains numerous alliances and partnerships with Beijing’s neighbors. This undeniably heightens the risk of conflict. At the same time, the British were active throughout the Western Hemisphere, most notably in Canada, and the Americans maintained a robust alliance system in Western Europe throughout the Cold War. Even with the U.S. presence in Asia, then, the fact that the Chinese and American homelands are separated by the largest body of water in the world is enormously important in reducing their conflict potential, if history is any guide at least. Thus, while every effort should be made to avoid a U.S.-China war, it is nearly unthinkable one will occur.
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#### Neoliberalist polices have detrimental effects on workers.

Abramovitz and Zelnick (Dr. Mimi Abramovitz is a co-founder of WRI, Professor of Social Policy at the Silverman School of Social Work at Hunter College, City University of New York and author of several books. Jennifer Zelnick is the policy Officer at KHANA (Khmer HIV/AIDS NGO Alliance), Luce Scholar at The Henry Luce Foundation. She was the tutor at Haverford College Writing Center, Co-Chair at Quaker Bouncers, Student at Haverford College, and Anthropology Research Assistant at Haverfor. She went to school at the University of Chicago, Haverford College, Newark Academy http://www.hunter.cuny.edu/socwork/faculty/Abramovitz-Zelnick%20Double%20Jeop.IJSH.pdf)

The impact of welfare reform on human service workers was explored through in-depth interviews with senior staff at 107 NYC nonprofit agencies representing a wide range of service areas and located in all five boroughs of the city (40). These disparate agencies turned out to be surprisingly uniform in terms of the problems created by welfare reform. Although the job of human service workers has never been easy, it became much harder after 1996. Welfare reform simul- taneously fueled economic crises and emotional distress among clients and under- mined the working conditions that made it possible for human service workers to meet clients’ needs. More than 90 percent of the agencies surveyed indicated that welfare reform affected how workers carried out their jobs (49). Having to run uphill in an attempt to fix the problems created by welfare reform significantly increased stress and burnout for many human service workers. Increased Demand As welfare reform denied more and more clients access toneeded benefits, they turned to nonprofit agencies for help. The demand for help with workfare issues rose at 81 percent of the agencies in the study, for help with eligibility rules at 76 percent, and for help with Medicaid problems at 72 percent. Agencies also reported increased requests for help with food stamps, citizenship, and child care. Client requests for help with specific services also increased at many of the agencies. The demand for help with job training services increased at 77 percent of the agencies, for child care at 79 percent, for access to food pantries at 69 percent, and for access to housing at 68 percent. The need for assistance accessing Legal Aid, immigration advice, and English as a second language programs also mounted. Finally, following welfare reform, workers also had to spend more time helping clients understand the new welfare rules. Workers spent more time helping clients with workfare at 75 percent of the agencies, case closings at 72 percent, job search at 66 percent, fair hearings at 66 percent, and sanctions at 60 percent. The director of an HIV/AIDS program concluded that since welfare reform, “we deal [more] with the day to day aspects of negotiating the system.” A social worker at a battered women’s shelter explained: “We sometimes take the role of the system that is no longer there. We have become the safety net, which is not the way it is supposed to be.” Increased Work Intensity / Speed-up. In addition to increased demand, the intensity of work also mounted following welfare reform, as was evident in various routine agency operations. Eighty-six percent of the agencies reported increaseddocumentation and paperwork, 76 percent reported more contacts with the welfare office, 70 percent engaged in more outreach, 49 percent experienced increased caseloads, and 44 percent had more staff overtime. “It’s just gotten more difficult. That’s the bottom line,” said the program director at a program for immigrants. The speed-up resulting from the increased use of performance-based contracts, numerical caps for client visits, shorter lengths of stay in programs, billable hours, and other neoliberal productivity measures compounded the growing work intensity. The director of a foster care agency explained: “These days you just have to produce more.” According to a supervisor at a school mental health program: “We are doing more to meet the same goals.” “We have to do [everything] quicker now,” stated the unit supervisor at an employment program for substance abusers. The executive director of a domestic violence program declared: “Everything is on a clock!” Demand Shift / Picking Up the Slack. Before welfare reform, workers could assume that government programs provided a minimal level of subsistence that buffered families against crises and freed workers to address other client needs. Following welfare reform, workers spent the majority of their time helping clients with welfare rules and penalties and managing crises that surfaced when welfare’s harsh new requirements tipped the financial and emotional balance of many already vulnerable families. According to a social worker at a foster care prevention program, “We are spending more and more time just to make sure that they have their basic needs. So it is not counseling, it is not parenting, it is not all the other things you want to give them.” The division director of a battered women’s shelter declared that “welfare reform has forced us to deal with concrete issues at the expense of psychological and intra-psychic issues. The emotional issues get put aside because the concrete stuff is so overwhelming.” Substance-abuse program workers reported that since welfare reform, job placement has trumped vocational rehabilitation, drug treatment, and supportive service. Less Control on the Job. The welfare overhaul also deprived human service workers of a sense of control over their job. Workers from a wide range of agencies reported the decline of five basic conditions needed to carry out their regular responsibilities: a) predictable presence of clients, b) enough time to think and plan, c) access to timely information, d) adequate government resources, and e) professional autonomy. The loss of autonomy ranked especially high. Speaking for many, a social worker at a program for ex-offenders stated: “Sometimes I feel that the welfare department is the one dictating and no matter what, I have to follow.” Workers also suffered a lack of cooperation from the welfare department, whose case managers they described as more “inaccessible,” “uninformed,” and “rude” since welfare reform. Some human service workers attributed this behavior to job stress in the welfare office, but added that the lack of help left them unable to do their job. More Ethical Dilemmas. The neoliberal welfare environment created many ethical issues for social workers. Welfare’s new, harsher rules for clients forced workers to choose between following government rules and honoring profes- sional commitments (55). Welfare reform exacerbated the long-standing tension between the professional commitment to protect client confidentiality and the welfare department’s reporting requirements. If reported to the welfare agency, the receipt of a small amount of additional income, a positive urine test, or other infringements of the rules typically cost clients their government benefits. One program director noted: “We are stuck. We try to build trust so people [are willing] to tell us what’s really going on. But then we are in a position to use that information against them.” Professional ethics stress client self-determination, yet practitioners often had to push clients to enter a work program or a parenting class, whether or not it was in their best interest. A supervisor at a school-based mental health clinic stated that this “raised ethical issues because you are really talking about someone’s autonomy as an adult, making choices in their lives.” Staff concerns about ethical issues had increased at 49.5 percent of the agencies. The director at a program for the homeless stated: “We are ethically challenged,” and another worker concluded that they were “on an ethical edge.” Human service professionals are also mandated to improve social conditions and promote social justice. Agency workers became “highly creative” in managing their ethical conflicts, sometimes going against the rules to help people survive. One worker explained: “We don’t lie; we just creatively manage to try to get our folks what they need.” At the same time, fear of reprisals or loss of funding from NYC officials left workers and administrators hesitant to publicly acknowledge their misgivings about welfare reform. They felt “gun shy” about speaking to the press and otherwise “tempered their vocal opposition” to the program. Feeling Less Effective. Workers also began to feel less effective. While many people enter the human services with a strong desire to help, at 61 percent of the agencies, workers felt less able to help their clients than before welfare reform. A mental health agency supervisor declared: “We are dealing with a social service system that is supposed to work one way—to help clients—but it actually hinders them.” According to the associate director of a teen pregnancy program, “The problems have become so intense that sometimes you walk away at the end of the day wondering if you did anything.” A literacy agency program director mused that “sometimes I guess the workers feel like they are just putting Band-Aids on things.” Lack of Government Support. Workers also interpreted the loss of government funding and the new punitive regulations as a measure of government’s lack of interest in their work and abandonment of their clients. The executive director of apreventive service agency explained that her workers “think that the system is against them, that they are trying their best to help families with no support.” Elsewhere, some workers believed that political leaders “have declared war on the poor in so many different ways.” Burned Out and Stressed. It is widely known that when frontline workers bear the brunt of increased demands, speed-up, reduced job control, ethical dilemmas, and feelings of ineffectiveness, they can become emotionally and physically depleted, uncertain of their values, and unsure of the relevance of their organization (56–60). Although this study did not set out to investigate workplace stress, increased stress emerged as a major finding. The changes wrought by neoliberal welfare reform left many NYC nonprofit human service workers feeling dissatisfied, demoralized, and burned out. Job satisfaction decreased at more than40 percent of the agencies, and morale decreased at almost 62 percent. The changes left some workers feeling, “Oh well, this is just a job.

#### Neoliberalism results in multiple impacts including the harming of the environment economy and human rights.

Diana M. Liverman and Silvina Vilas (Environmental Change Institute, Oxford University Center for the Environment, Oxford OX1 3QY, United Kingdom “Neoliberalism and the Environment in Latin America” http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/pdf/10.1146/annurev.energy.29.102403.140729)

Neoliberal reforms in Latin America have been blamed for numerous adverse social and environmental impacts such as declining wages, an increase in poverty, greater inequalities, a decline in states services, and environmental impacts such as deforestation and water and air pollution. The environmental problems stem from greater pressures to extract primary resources (e.g. m ining, logging, fishing) and the relocation of pollution intensive industries to Latin America (Perreault & Martin 2005; Klak 2008). As Green (2003: 171) puts it, “Although the rich have had a vintage two decades [1980s -1990s], most of the region’s people are poorer and more insecure: their homes, communities, schools, and hospitals are collapsing around them, and their cities, towns and villages are increasingly polluted.” Structural adjustment programs in the 1980s and 1990s that sought to reduce labor costs and, “get the prices right,” led many Latin American countries to reform labor laws. Consequently, wages declined, the power of trade unions was reduced, unemployment rates rose, and many people were forced to seek jobs in the informal sector (Green 2003; Babb 2005; Laurell 2000; Weeks 2000). Labor sector reforms have had a disproportionate impact on women who have been increasingly integrated into the work force but are also still expected to maintain their domestic work (Radcliffe 2006; Lind 20 2 002). For example, Julie Cupples (2005: 314) documents how neoliberal restructuring in Nicaragua has increased the work burden for low-income women and forced them to take on a “double shift of paid and domestic work.” Those working in the public sector have also been particularly affected by government spending cuts that have led to massive layoffs (Gwynne & Kay 2000). In addition to detrimental labor reforms, market - oriented economic reforms meant to promote export - led growth and expand the private se ctor‟s involvement in the economy has led to an increasingly large gap between the rich and poor within countries (Huber & Solt 2004; Laurell 2000; G reen 1996). Boron (quoted in Harris 2000: 148 - 149) explains, “Neoliberal policies have augmented the share of the very rich in the national income ... [and] tend to magnify the strength of the dominate classes.” Also, the privatization of state owned enterprises (meant to promote “efficiency”) has led to price increases of many services such as electricity and water which particularly hurts the poor (Perreault 2005). While the rich are consolidating their wealth, there is evidence that neoliberal reforms have actually increased poverty rates in Latin America . Structural adjustment programs that require govern ment spending cuts on public services such as health care, education, and welfare programs as well as the removal of subsidies on food, transport, and energy has led to an increase in the number of people living below the poverty line (Gwynne & Kay 2000; G reen 2003; Laurell 2000). In an analysis of poverty in Latin America, Kay (2006: 456) observed that,“[structural] adjustmentpolicies exacerbated poverty as government expenditure on social welfare andsubsidies for basic foods and other essential commodities were cut back quite drastically.” It is becoming increasingly clear that economic growth will not automatically alleviate poverty but that a more egalitarian access to assets is critical for reducing poverty (Ibid). In addition to the adverse social impacts of neoliberal reforms in Latin America there is ample evidence that points to adverse environmental impacts of neoliberal reforms. Trade liberalization has led to the deregulation of trade and investment and pressured governments to maintain weak environmental regulations (Babb 2005). Both Sawyer (2004) and Gerlach (2003) have documented how neoliberal reforms in Ecuador have pressured the government to expand oil drilling operations in the Amazon with devastating environmental implications (not to mention the impacts on the indigenous peoples living in the region). Furthermore, neoliberal policies regarding the environment that seek to enclose environmental commons tend to exclude traditional users while providing the opportunity for capital ac cumulation for private companies (Perreault & Martin 2005). For example, Perreault (2005) documents how Bolivia tried to privatize water rights in 2002 and exclude traditional resource users (although attempts to do so failed due to widespread opposition) . Promoting export - led growth (especially when the exports are primary products) can also put extraordinary pressure on a country‟s n atural resources. Schurman (1996) documents how neoliberal reforms in Chile encouraged an expansion of the shellfish indu stry which eventually led to its collapse when the fish were overharvested. In sum, neoliberal reforms such as trade liberalization, privatization, and government spending cuts have had numerous detrimental social and environmental impacts throughout Latin American. While the social and environmental impacts of Neoliberalism have been severe, Green (2003) does point to one success of neoliberalism in Latin America: the ability to get inflation under control. The following section Summarizes how and when neoliberal reforms were implemented in Ecuador and reviewssome of the specific impacts and challenges they have created for Ecuadorians