**No risk of Korean war**

**Edwards 10** (Michael, Reporter – ABC News, “Full-scale War on Korean Peninsula 'Unlikely'”, ABC News, 11-25, http://www.abc.net.au/news/stories/2010/11/24/3075727.htm)

**Experts say full-scale war on the Korean Peninsula is unlikely**. But they do say that it remains an alarming possibility. An expert on North Korea, Professor Peter Hayes from RMIT University, says yesterday's attack is evidence there is a new sense of confidence in Pyongyang. "I think the reason, at least in part, is that [North Korea] feels it has a both compellent and deterrent capacity," he said. "A compellent capacity in the sense that it can undertake conventional and nuclear operations to force South Korea to change its policies of hostility towards North Korea, which have come about in the last few years under the current president in South Korea, and deterrent in respect to the United States. "In other words it can put a lid on any escalation that might come about because of its use of conventional force, because it is simply too dangerous to escalate for everyone, because you might end up in a nuclear war and now they have nuclear weapons which they didn't have." Professor **Hayes** says North Korea's unveiling of its uranium enrichment plant has changed the dynamic on the Korean peninsula. He **says** war could happen, but **South Korea is likely to resist a full-scale military response** for the time being. "I actually think that **they can absorb a lot of provocation because the risk of war**," he said. "**Given that Seoul, which represents roughly 80 per cent of their economy, is within striking distance of** artillery and rockets **from North Korea means that we would have to see a lot more violence** at this point **before the South will be willing to actually conduct military operations against the North."** Professor **Hayes does expect** North Korea's main ally **China to intervene.**

**NOT REVERSE CAUSAL – SKFTA MIGHT BOOST FREE TRADE BUT ITS ABSENCE WON’T RESULT IN TOTAL COLLAPSE.**

**South Korea isn’t key**

**Carpenter and Bandow 4** (Ted Galen, Vice President for Defense and Foreign Policy Studies – Cato Institute, and Doug, Senior Fellow – Cato Institute, The Korean Conundrum: America's Troubled Relations with North and South Korea, p. 126)

**America's** cultural and **economic ties with South Korea are valuable, but not critical.** For instance, **two-way trade** in 2003 **exceeded $60 billion** (it peaked at almost $67 billion in 2000), real money but **small change for Amer­ica's $10 trillion economy**.26 Moreover, notes Stephen W. Bosworth, dean of the Fletcher School at Tufts University, "**The relative weights of the U**nited **S**tates **and South Korea in the increasingly global economic interests of the other are shrinking in relative terms."**27

**Decline doesn’t cause war**

Morris **Miller**, Professor of Administration @ the University of Ottawa, **‘2K**

(Interdisciplinary Science Review, v 25 n4 2000 p ingenta connect)

The question may be reformulated. Do wars spring from a popular reaction to a sudden economic crisis that exacerbates poverty and growing disparities in wealth and incomes? Perhaps one could argue, as some scholars do, that it is some dramatic event or sequence of such events leading to the exacerbation of poverty that, in turn, leads to this deplorable denouement. This exogenous factor might act as a catalyst for a violent reaction on the part of the people or on the part of the political leadership who would then possibly be tempted to seek a diversion by finding or, if need be, fabricating an enemy and setting in train the process leading to war. According to a study under- taken by Minxin Pei and Ariel Adesnik of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, there would not appear to be any merit in this hypothesis. After studying ninety-three episodes of economic crisis in twenty-two countries in Latin America and Asia in the years since the Second World War they concluded that:19 Much of the conventional wisdom about the political impact of economic crises may be wrong ... The severity of economic crisis – as measured in terms of inflation and negative growth – bore no relationship to the collapse of regimes ... (or, in democratic states, rarely) to an outbreak of violence ... In the cases of dictatorships and semi-democracies, the ruling elites responded to crises by increasing repression (thereby using one form of violence to abort another).

### TAA is still blocking passage

AP, 6/28 (Associated Press, 6/28/11, “Breakthrough on Trade Could Clear Way for Vote”, http://www.boston.com/business/articles/2011/06/28/breakthrough\_on\_trade\_could\_clear\_way\_for\_vote/

WASHINGTON—The Obama administration and lawmakers on Capitol Hill have taken steps toward breaking a stalemate that could clear the way for Congress to vote on three key free trade agreements, according to congressional officials and business representatives briefed on the plan. But obstacles remain to action on the trade deals pending since the George W. Bush administration. The proposal would allow for a renewal of retraining assistance for American workers who lose their jobs because of foreign competition. The Trade Adjustment Assistance Program, or TAA, would be included in legislation on a coveted trade deal with South Korea. The White House had threatened to hold up passage of the South Korea pact, along with trade agreements with Colombia and Panama, unless the retraining assistance was renewed.

### Won’t pass- trade unions

Korea Times 6/29/11 (“EU free trade pact sparks debate on KORUS FTA”, <http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/nation/2011/06/116_89863.html//sb>)

“We believe in free trade and this is one of the reasons why Britain is like Korea. We both believe in free trade. We think this will be a genuine change in trade relations between Europe and Korea,” Kerr noted. Han Seung-soo, former prime minister and chairman of the board at the Global Green Growth Institute, said protectionist U.S. trade unions are a major stumbling block to the ratification of the free trade pact. Han added that U.S. businesses were worried about losing ground in the Korean market

# 1AR DC

### Debt ceiling is highly controversial and costs Obama capital

Young 6/28/11 (Ricardo, “The end of the endless money”, <http://english.ruvr.ru/2011/06/28/52501375.html//sb>)

When we are talking about a very controversial subject that certainly got the House, the Senate and the White House all tied up, we are talking about the debt ceiling. And our guest this morning is Bill Baker, the founder of The Conservative Economist website and the author of Endless Money: The Moral Hazards of Socialism. First of all, let’s give a little refresher course on what the debt ceiling is, why it’s so important and what you think should be done. The debt ceiling is what Congress limits the Treasury, its pocket book, if you will, so it can’t spend anything over what it can’t raise in the capital markets. We’ve bumped up against it because we have a budget deficit, meaning the government has spending programmes that are vastly in excess of the tax revenues that we are receiving. That’s where we are right now. Now President Barack Obama is said to be meeting with Mitch McConnell. **He’s entered these debt ceiling talk**s. Do you think there will be any difference since Eric Cantor, Majority Leader in the House of Representatives, walked out of the debt talks on Friday? Given the fact that the presence evolved, do you think any progress will be made? My conclusion is that we are going to kick the can down the road again. I know it sounds like we are coming up to the abyss and are about to make some sort of momentous decision. I’d love to see that, but I just don’t see the political will on it from either side.

### House Dems feel unloved – need more Obama pol cap and focus

The Hill, 6-28

[Mike Lillis, “House Democrats feel jilted by the president in budget, debt talks”, <http://thehill.com/homenews/house/168713-house-democrats-feel-jilted-by-the-president>, NKN]

House Democrats feel like jilted lovers. They’re looking down Pennsylvania Avenue for some sign of affection from President Obama in the White House. But all they feel they’re getting in return is the back of his hand. “How is it that the House Democrats played such an important role [in the majority], and all of a sudden [the White House says], ‘Forget it, we’ll work with the Senate and the Republican leadership?’ ” asked Rep. Henry Cuellar (D-Texas), vice chairman of the Democrats’ Steering and Policy Committee. House Democrats’ frustration with Obama is boiling in the intense heat of negotiations to reach a budget deal and raise the nation’s $14.3 trillion debt ceiling. Capitol Hill Democrats have been steaming for months, since being sidelined during talks to extend the George W. Bush-era tax rates and fund the government this year. Many say the White House takes their support for granted but ignores them when it comes to making policy.

### MORE EV DEMS ARE ANGRY.

The Hill, 6-28

[Mike Lillis, “House Democrats feel jilted by the president in budget, debt talks”, <http://thehill.com/homenews/house/168713-house-democrats-feel-jilted-by-the-president>, NKN]

A fellow Democrat, speaking on the condition of anonymity, said Capitol Hill Democrats called months ago for oil to be released from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to lower gasoline prices, but the president waited until last week to do it. The lawmaker called the White House “obtuse” and added, “I’m disappointed in their politics.” The frustration “seems to be growing” with “senior members of the caucus … shaking their heads,” the lawmaker said. Partly to temper mounting discontent, Obama called House Democrats to the White House on June 2, a day after meeting with House Republicans, to hear their concerns about the debt negotiations. It was a tense encounter, according to several accounts. One Democrat who was there said Rep. Henry Waxman (D-Calif.) bluntly asked Obama whether he was willing to fight for Democratic priorities amid GOP calls for trillions of dollars in spending cuts.

#  AT: Biden In Charge

### Obama has taken back the debt limit talks from Biden—they are at an impasse

SFC, 6/24 (“Obama Steps Into Budget Talks Seeking to Break Impasse”, 6/24/11, San Francisco Chronicle Business Report, <http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/g/a/2011/06/24/bloomberg1376-LNAX7R6S972D01-5IUIH3V1F7QDH28V0AR58VJUNF.DTL>

Obama summoned Senate leaders Democrat Harry Reid and Republican Mitch McConnell to the White House for separate meetings on June 27 aimed at breaking the impasse that scuttled a seven-week negotiating effort led by Vice President Joe Biden.

### Obama’s fully involved in debt ceiling negotiations- no delegation

ABC News 6/29/11 (“The Presidential Planner: Obama Holds Press Conference Amid Ongoing Debt Negotiations”, http://blogs.abcnews.com/politicalpunch/2011/06/the-presidential-planner-obama-holds-press-conference-amid-ongoing-debt-negotiations.html//sb)

Today President Obama will face the press for the 14th time in his presidency in a solo mid-morning news conference. With just weeks to go until the August 2 deadline to raise the debt ceiling, the president is expected to face questions about the ongoing deficit negotiations, in particular whether he will accept a deal with Republicans that doesn’t include a tax increase on the wealthy. The press, which hasn’t faced off with the president since March, will also likely press him on why he believes the War Powers Act shouldn’t apply to his intervention in Libya. The press conference comes just one week after Obama outlined his withdrawal strategy from Afghanistan and just one day after [a deadly Taliban attack in Kabul](http://abcnews.go.com/Blotter/kabuls-intercontinental-hotel-attack-suicide-bombers/story?id=13949876), making his drawdown a prime topic as well. Looking ahead to 2012, transparency could be an issue as well. The president has come under fire recently for engaging in [legal, but “unseemly” efforts](http://blogs.abcnews.com/politicalpunch/2011/06/president-obama-joins-ranks-of-predecessors-in-unseemly-but-perfectly-legal-white-house-campaign-act.html) to reach out to big donors, specifically during a DNC-sponsored meeting in the White House. Watch the president's 11:30 a.m. (ET) press conference livestream here on [abcnews.com](http://abcnews.go.com/). In addition to meeting the press, **the president will also continue negotiations over the debt ceiling** this afternoon when he meets with Senate Democratic Leadership in the Oval Office. Also on the agenda: a private meeting with Treasury Secretary Geithner.

### Debt ceiling will cost Obama capital now

Fox News 6/29/11 (“Obama to Hold Press Conference Amid Budget Talks”, http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2011/06/29/obama-to-hold-press-conference-amid-budget-talks/?test=latestnews//sb)

That meeting follows efforts by the president to salvage budget talks that fell apart late last week when GOP negotiators bowed out. The talks surely will be front and center at Wednesday's press conference. Obama is trying to find middle ground between the two parties on a plan to cut spending so he can muster a majority in Congress to approve an increase in the $14.3 trillion debt ceiling by early August. So far, a compromise is elusive. The biggest sticking point has been the issue of tax hikes, which Republicans resolutely oppose. House Speaker John Boehner, speaking on Fox News Tuesday night, reiterated that he opposes any tax increase as part of a deal. "There are no votes in the Congress ... to raise taxes on anyone, so tax increases are off the table," Boehner said. The speaker also predicted that the Obama administration will soon issue warnings that Americans might not get their Social Security checks or that doctors might not get Medicare payments if the debt ceiling issue is not resolved in the coming weeks. "It is predictable. It is going to come. What we've got to do is continue to press our case with the American people that cutting spending now and dealing with our long-term debt will help create a better environment for job creators in our country," Boehner said.

# 1AR Libya

### BIPART OPPOSITION TO LIBYA SAPS CAPITAL.

Chaddock, 6/23 (Gail Russell Chaddock, The Christian Science Monitor, “On Libya, Obama upsets Congressional Republicans and Democrats”, 6/23/11, http://www.alaskadispatch.com/article/libya-obama-upsets-congressional-republicans-and-democrats

The wars in Iraq and Afghanistan have cost US taxpayers more than $1.3 trillion over 10 years, but it took the 93-day engagement in Libya, which has yet to top $1 billion, to rouse Congress to challenge the White House over the president's powers to wage war. The anger at President Obama’s failure to make a case to Congress for the mission in Libya crosses party lines, including even those who support a US military role there. The Republican caucus, focused for the past six months on cutting spending, is particularly divided about Libya. Some libertarians, including GOP freshmen, are siding with antiwar Democrats in an attempt to cut off war funding. Others see that move as a betrayal of the GOP’s tradition of support for national security. But all share a conviction that the president needs to take Congress’s constitutional role in times of war more seriously. “Libya has been handled extremely poorly by the president,” says Rep. Rob Bishop (R) of Utah. “If we cut the funding, it’s because this administration is so inexperienced.”

### House is seeking to defund Libya – rebuking Obama

The Hill, 6-24

[Pete Kasperowicz, “Full Libya defunding discussed as next step in House”, <http://thehill.com/blogs/floor-action/house/168321-full-libya-defunding-discussed-as-next-step-in-house>, NKN]

Members of the House on Friday were already discussing a more serious step to cut off all funding for military operations in Libya, even as they debated two Libya bills that some criticized as too weak. Rep. Dennis Kucinich (D-Ohio) said on the floor that when the House returns in July, he and Rep. Justin Amash (R-Mich.) will propose an amendment to the Defense Department Appropriations Act that cuts off all funding for Libya operations. Kucinich said he would vote for H.R. 2278, which prohibits spending in Libya except for search and rescue, intelligence, aerial refueling and operational planning. Kucinich said this bill is "not perfect," but "it does make clear that the United States will not take over the war as European support continues to diminish." Rep. Ron Paul (R-Texas) went further by saying that in authorizing these exceptions, H.R. 2278 actually authorizes the Obama administration to continue doing what it is already doing in Libya. Kucinich's full defunding amendment won the support of a Republican member of the House — Rep. Rob Woodall (R-Ga.), who was managing some of the debate on Friday. "We could go one step further that says no funds shall be used, period," Woodall said. "And when we return to this body, Mr. Speaker, I believe my colleague Mr. Kucinich and my colleague Mr. Amash are going to make that amendment available to us, and I will be voting yes when that amendment comes down the pipe. "But for today, for today we have an opportunity to take a step in that direction," he said. "We have an opportunity to make our voice heard."

# 4) Polcap not key – Dickinson / new card

## 1AR Polcap not key:

### Extend Dickinson - theory of polcap is flawed - Congress votes on bills based off their constituents, ideologies and details of a bill

### Prefer recency - its in the context of the obama administration – their card is from \_\_\_\_\_

* Prefer quals and aff methodology– our evidence cites a consensus of experts– the neg misconstrues political capital in their ev
* Evaluate the polcap key debate as a yes or no question

**All studies flow aff**

**Beckmann and Kumar 11 (**Matt, Associate Professor of Political Science at UC Irvine, received his B.A. from UCLA and his Ph.D. from the University of Michigan. and Vimal, professor of political science at UC Irvine, How presidents push, when presidents win: A model of positive presidential power in US lawmaking, Journal of Theoretical Politics 2011 23: 3)

For political scientists, however, the resources allocated to formulating and implementing the White House’s lobbying offensive appear puzzling, if not altogether misguided. Far from highlighting each president’s capacity to marshal legislative proposals through Congress, the prevailing wisdom now stresses contextual factors as predetermining his agenda’s fate on Capitol Hill. From the particular ‘political time’ in which they happen to take ofﬁce (Skowronek, 1993) to the state of the budget (Brady and Volden, 1998; Peterson, 1990), the partisan composition of Congress (Bond and Fleisher, 1990; Edwards, 1989) (see also Gilmour (1995), Groseclose and McCarty (2001), and Sinclair (2006)) to the preferences of speciﬁc ‘pivotal’ voters (Brady and Volden, 1998; Krehbie, l998), **current research** suggests a president’s congressional fortunes are basically **beyond his control**. The implication is straightforward, as Bond and Fleisher indicate: …presidential success is determined in large measure by the results of the last election. If the last election brings individuals to Congress whose local interests and preferences coincide with the president’s, then he will enjoy greater success. If, on the other hand, most members of Congress have preferences different from the president’s, then he will suffer more defeats, and no amount of bargaining and persuasion can do much to improve his success. (Bond and Fleisher, 1990: 13
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