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**\*\*\*1NC\*\*\***

**KORUS Good- 1NC**

KORUS will pass – bipartisan support and Obama push

Reuters 7-26 – Doug Palmer, “Kirk hopes for September approval of trade deals”, 2011, http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/07/27/us-usa-trade-kirk-idUSTRE76P5CE20110727

Trade Representative Ron Kirk said on Tuesday he was optimistic a deal could be struck with Republicans clearing the way for Congress to pass free trade pacts with South Korea, Colombia and Panama after lawmakers return in September from a month-long recess. President Barack Obama had hoped to win approval of the three agreements before the August break but Republicans balked at a White House plan to include an extension of the Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) program for displaced U.S. workers in the implementing legislation for the South Korea pact. "We believe we have a framework for an agreement that will allow us very quickly when Congress reconvenes in September to approve and have a vote on Trade Adjustment Assistance and allow us to move forward with passage of the free trade agreements at the same time," Kirk said in a speech. Kirk said the Obama administration had been working with congressional leaders in both parties to find a path forward on TAA and the trade pacts, telling reporters after the speech there were still a few more details to nail down. "What's still needed is a final commitment by congressional leaders to a process that will move all three agreements and TAA," a second USTR official said. Republicans have demanded a separate vote on TAA, which provides retraining and income assistance for workers who lost jobs due to trade. While some party members support the program, many others elected last year on promises to cut government spending question its cost and effectiveness. Senate Republican Leader Mitch McConnell welcomed the administration's willingness to separate TAA from the South Korea pact as "an important step" and urged Obama to submit the trade deals to Congress before lawmakers leave town. "Now that we all seem to agree the FTAs (free trade agreements) will be free from extraneous spending programs, I renew my call for the administration to immediately send up these job-creating agreements. Even if Congress can't act on all three before the recess, it will send a positive signal to the world that the U.S. is committed to the cause of global trade," McConnell said in a statement. Democrats argue the nearly 50-year-old TAA program is a vital part of the U.S. social safety net and fear it could be killed if not shielded by the South Korea pact. An administration official emphasized that including TAA in the implementing legislation for one of the trade deals "was still a likely outcome" if a procedural agreement is not reached to protect the program from Republican attacks. The White House has insisted on renewal of TAA in conjunction with the trade pacts, but did agree on a package of reforms to scale back the program from levels approved in the 2009 economic stimulus bill. Congress would have to move quickly to approve all three trade deals in September. If the White House insists Congress approve TAA before submitting the trade deals, that could slow down the process, depending on how long that debate lasts. McConnell repeated a promise to work with Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid "to find a fair and workable path for floor consideration of Trade Adjustment Assistance." McConnell also has pressed for a separate vote on "Trade Promotion Authority," which would give the White House authority to negotiate new trade deals it could present to Congress for straight yes-or-no votes. "We're still working with the leadership to come up with the kind of specifics of how we'd sequence that," Kirk said. But the proposed framework "would allow us to get a vote on TAA," provide McConnell a chance to make his case for Trade Promotion Authority and "give us a chance to move" the free trade agreements, he added.

**<Insert link>**

Political capital is crucial to securing passage of KORUS

Kim, 7-6 – Sukhan, senior partner at the law firm of Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP in Washington, D.C., KOREA JOONGANG DAILY, “[Viewpoint] Endgame for Korus”, 2011, <http://joongangdaily.joins.com/article/view.asp?aid=2938477>

Four years after striking an initial deal with Korea, and after a number of significant revisions to that deal, President Barack Obama has finally announced a plan for Congressional consideration of the Korea-U.S. FTA (Korus), and he hopes for ratification prior to the Congressional recess in August. Under his plan, the Senate, controlled by Obama’s Democratic Party, will soon begin consideration of the legislation, with subsequent review by the Republican-controlled House. Prospects for the passage of Korus have never been so good, and there are grounds for optimism. Obama’s plan for Korus’ ratification, however, is a high-stakes political gamble in an enormously complicated political environment. After trying for months to forge a bipartisan consensus on the ratification, Obama has changed course and opted to try to push Korus through Congress in tandem with other controversial trade legislation. To succeed in this gamble, Obama must overcome a number of immediate challenges under great time pressure. The principle challenge is the renewal of Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA), a program that provides benefits to U.S. industrial workers laid off due to competition from imports. The renewal of the TAA is a must for Democrats, and Obama is attempting to link its renewal with the Korus bill. This linkage will complicate Congressional consideration of Korus, as many Republicans are opposed to the TAA, particularly in the current climate of fiscal austerity. Indeed, Senate Republicans boycotted a hearing organized by Senate Finance Committee Chairman Max Baucus to discuss an initial draft of the combined TAA-Korus bill. Key Republicans in both chambers, including House Speaker John Boehner, are now seeking any means to separate the TAA renewal from Korus in the hope that they can vote down the former while passing the latter. The White House, however, has declared it will not present Korus legislation to Congress without the TAA renewal. A second challenge is the linkage of Korus to pending FTAs with Colombia and Panama. Under Obama’s plan, and as a concession to the demands of Congressional Republicans, ratification of the three FTAs will move through Congress at the same time. However, many Democrats, including Sander Levin, the top Democrat on the House Committee on Ways & Means, which oversees trade matters, oppose the Colombia FTA because of concerns about Colombia’s treatment of trade union leaders. Levin’s opposition to the Colombia deal should not derail, but may well complicate, consideration of Korus in the House. Additional challenges relate to the so-called fast-track rules governing the submission of the trade deals to Congress. These rules provide, first, for informal reviews of draft legislation by both houses of Congress and permit members of Congress to propose amendments. While the president does not need to accept the amendments in the final version of the bill presented to Congress for passage, amendments proposed during the informal process signal Congressional concerns. The many amendments proposed for Korus, or at least those made public to date, indicate a high level of controversy and are previews of the heated debates to be expected in Congress about the legislation. They will also be used by opponents of the president’s strategy as drags on the process. Furthermore, Republicans insist that the pairing of the TAA renewal with the Korus legislation is inconsistent with fast-track rules. Timing is also a key concern for the White House. The November 2012 presidential election is coming fast, and the democratic base - already wary of trade deals and disappointed with Obama’s inability to revive the U.S. economy - may hold passage of three trade deals against him. The political cost to Obama of attempting to pass new trade deals will increase rapidly after the summer recess and at some point become unbearable. Hence, the Obama administration is now waging an all-out effort to secure passage under the expedited fast-track process before then. There is little that Korea can do to influence the outcome of the U.S. ratification process at this point. The Obama administration has decided it has obtained the best deal with Korea that it can get, and has launched a high-stakes domestic process to get the deal passed. Obama is personally invested in the success of this process, and we can expect that he will do his utmost to secure passage quickly. Indeed, Obama has repeatedly lauded Korus as a vital part of America’s exports promotion - and job growth from exports - strategy. The weeks ahead will show whether he can succeed in his audacious gamble.

Impact --- the deal is key to relations with South Korea --- key to deter North Korean belligerence

Gerwin 10 (Edward F., Senior Fellow for Trade and Global Economic Policy – Third Way, “5 Reasons America Needs Korea Free Trade Deal”, Wall Street Journal, 12-16, http://blogs.wsj.com/economics/2010/12/16/guest-contribution-5-reasons-america-needs-korea-free-trade-deal/)

5. China is Not a Fan. The Korea FTA would solidify America’s strategic relationship with South Korea, a key ally. It would bolster stepped-up U.S. efforts to respond to an increasingly assertive China and a belligerent North Korea by building strong trade, diplomatic and security relationships with South Korea and other Pacific allies. The Agreement would also help America compete and win in Korea’s $1.3 trillion economy. In recent years, China has muscled aside the United States, and is Korea’s #1 supplier. The FTA’s advantages would help U.S. companies and workers win back business from China and others in this vital Asian market. So, while Fords and fillets are certainly important, the Korea FTA also includes other “beefy” benefits for American trade.

And, Korean crisis escalates to great power conflict

Stares and Wit 9 (Paul, Senior Fellow for Conflict Prevention – Council on Foreign Relations and, Joel, Adjunct Senior Research Fellow – Weatherhead East Asia Institute at Columbia University, “Preparing for Sudden Change in North Korea”, January, http://www.cfr.org/content/publications/attachments/North\_Korea\_CSR42.pdf)

These various scenarios would present the United States and the neighboring states with challenges and dilemmas that, depending on how events were to unfold, could grow in size and complexity. Important and vital interests are at stake for all concerned. North Korea is hardly a normal country located in a strategic backwater of the world. As a nuclear weapons state and exporter of ballistic missile systems, it has long been a serious proliferation concern to Washington. With one of the world’s largest armies in possession of huge numbers of long-range artillery and missiles, it can also wreak havoc on America’s most important Asian allies––South Korea and Japan––both of which are home to large numbers of American citizens and host to major U.S. garrisons committed to their defense. Moreover, North Korea abuts two great powers—China and Russia––that have important interests at stake in the future of the peninsula. That they would become actively engaged in any future crisis involving North Korea is virtually guaranteed. Although all the interested powers share a basic interest in maintaining peace and stability in northeast Asia, a major crisis from within North Korea could lead to significant tensions and––as in the past–– even conflict between them. A contested or prolonged leadership struggle in Pyongyang would inevitably raise questions in Washington about whether the United States should try to sway the outcome.5 Some will almost certainly argue that only by promoting regime change will the threat now posed by North Korea as a global proliferator, as a regional menace to America’s allies, and as a massive human rights violator, finally disappear. Such views could gain some currency in Seoul and even Tokyo, though it seems unlikely. Beijing, however, would certainly look on any attempt to promote a pro-American regime in Pyongyang as interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign state and a challenge to China’s national interests. This and other potential sources of friction could intensify should the situation in North Korea deteriorate. The impact of a severe power struggle in Pyongyang on the availability of food and other basic services could cause tens and possibly hundreds of thousands of refugees to flee North Korea. The pressure on neighboring countries to intervene with humanitarian assistance and use their military to stem the flow of refugees would likely grow in these circumstances. Suspicions that the situation could be exploited by others for political advantage would add to the pressure to act sooner rather than later in a crisis. China would be the most likely destination for refugees because of its relatively open and porous border; its People’s Liberation Army (PLA) has reportedly developed contingency plans to intervene in North Korea for possible humanitarian, peacekeeping, and “environmental control” missions.6 Besides increasing the risk of dangerous military interactions and unintended escalation in sensitive borders areas, China’s actions would likely cause considerable consternation in South Korea about its ultimate intentions toward the peninsula. China no doubt harbors similar fears about potential South Korean and American intervention in the North.

**\*\*\*Uniqueness\*\*\***

**2NC Uniqueness Wall- YES KORUS**

1. KORUS will pass- there’s bipartisan support in Congress and Obama’s pushing it- that’s Reuters

2. KORUS will pass- GOP willing to compromise and business coalitions are driving momentum

Roll Call 7-25 – David M. Drucker and Kate Ackley, “Supporters See Path to Pass Trade Pacts Soon”, 2011, http://www.rollcall.com/issues/57\_12/supporters\_see\_path\_pass\_trade\_pacts\_soon-207624-1.html?pos=olobh

Supporters of pending free-trade agreements with Colombia, Panama and South Korea are holding out hope that Congress might pass the measures before adjourning for the August recess, even as Capitol Hill remains fixated on the looming Aug. 2 deadline when the government bumps against its debt limit. Sens. Roy Blunt (Mo.) and Rob Portman (Ohio) told reporters Friday that they have satisfied President Barack Obama’s demand for assurance that the Senate would approve federal assistance for workers whose jobs disappear as a result of the trade deals. The two Republicans produced a letter with the names of a dozen GOP Senators who have committed to voting with the Democrats to kill any filibuster of such legislation. Passage of the free-trade agreements has been stymied by a disagreement between Obama and Congressional Republicans over the appropriation of money to assist displaced workers, called Trade Adjustment Assistance. But the White House confirmed that discussions with GOP leaders in the House and Senate continue and suggested that passage of the free-trade agreements before the August recess was still possible. “The announcement by a number of Senate Republicans supporting passage of trade adjustment assistance is a welcome development in our discussions with Congress. “What’s needed now is a commitment on specifics from the leadership of both Houses for a viable process for the passage of the three [free-trade agreements] and TAA,” an administration official told Roll Call in an email Friday afternoon. The Obama administration previously requested that TAA be attached to one of the free-trade deals to ensure its approval, a procedure Senate Democrats have referred to as historically routine and noncontroversial. But Senate Republicans argue the move would be unusual and set a bad precedent for future trade agreements, encouraging lawmakers to lard up such deals with extraneous amendments that would impede their approval. Some Republicans also have opposed TAA on the grounds that it is too costly, particularly given Washington’s ongoing fiscal crisis. But Blunt and Portman believe they have engineered a compromise acceptable to all sides with their plan to clear TAA as a stand-alone bill while guaranteeing enough votes to overcome any GOP filibuster that might be lodged against it. The Senators said they had yet to hear back from the administration about their proposal. “Instead of putting it together with the trade agreement, the idea was to say, ‘OK, this is the new requirement, the hurdle that we need to reach. We will separate it out and ensure that there is a pathway forward,’” Portman said. “That’s what we were asked to do. We have done that. As Sen. Blunt has indicated, we have done that and more.” One possible outstanding concern on the part of the White House is that the Senate’s TAA legislation might be amended in such a way that it could sink the bill. Blunt and Portman did not dispute that possibility, but they noted that just because an amendment vote is held, it does not mean such legislation would achieve the votes needed to win attachment to the underlying TAA bill. Blunt, citing comments made on the floor Thursday by Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) regarding his commitment to moving the Colombia, Panama and South Korea deals through the Senate as quickly as possible, expressed confidence that this concern could be adequately addressed. McConnell had said he would like there to be an amendment process, but he indicated he would not expect any amendment to pass if “the administration can generate the votes it needs.” “My sense on where Sen. McConnell is, is that the outcome here is increasingly certain,” Blunt said. “Surely there’s a way that [Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D-Nev.)], Sen. McConnell and the White House can accommodate a process that produces a result the White House wants.” The Republicans who have joined Blunt and Portman on TAA include Sens. John Boozman (Ark.), Scott Brown (Mass.), Dan Coats (Ind.), Thad Cochran (Miss.), Susan Collins (Maine), John Hoeven (N.D.), Johnny Isakson (Ga.), Mike Johanns (Neb.), Lisa Murkowski (Alaska) and Roger Wicker (Miss.). Meanwhile, Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) and House Ways and Means Chairman Dave Camp (R-Mich.) have told the Obama administration their plan was to similarly move TAA as stand-alone legislation, unattached to any of the three free-trade bills. The business community, which praised the efforts of Blunt and Portman, has planned several lobbying activities this week — both far from the Beltway and inside the halls of Congress, although K Street sources said they do not expect the Obama administration to submit the free-trade pacts to Congress for approval until September. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce will continue a nationwide grass-roots lobbying tour today with Korean Ambassador Han Duk-soo with a stop in New Hampshire that includes a meeting with Rep. Charles Bass (R-N.H.) and a visit to the Pease International Tradeport. On Tuesday, the chamber delegation will head to Maine to meet with the state’s governor and state legislators and to tour a facility of retailer L.L.Bean. Back in D.C., the chamber-run Latin America Trade Coalition and the U.S.-Korea FTA Business Coalition are planning a large-scale, bipartisan lobbying spree. “We’re organizing a House-side door knock where we visit as many offices as possible,” said John Murphy, vice president of international affairs for the chamber. “We are reaching out to Members of Congress in the states,” Murphy added. “It’s useful to get the business community there fired up and engaged so that they’re weighing in with their Members of Congress. “While a deal hasn’t been reached on a clear path forward, it’s clear they’re making progress,” Murphy continued. “We’re heartened that it appears there have been regular talks all week long.”

3. KORUS will pass- bipartisan support has been reached

WSJ 7/20 (Tom Barkley, 7/20/11, " US Trade Representative Hopes for Deal Soon ", http://blogs.wsj.com/economics/2011/07/20/u-s-trade-representative-hopes-for-deal-soon/)

U.S. Trade Representative Ron Kirk said Wednesday he hopes to be able to reach a deal with Republicans in Congress on passing free-trade agreements along with funding for a job retraining program. “I believe we are closer to our end goal,” Kirk said in a speech to the Coalition of Service Industries, expressing confidence that Congress will pass trade agreements with South Korea, Colombia and Panama. He put the odds of passage at over 90%. But Kirk reiterated that funding for workers displaced by trade must be passed in concert with the trade agreements. While a bipartisan deal has been reached with Republicans on a scaled-down version of Trade-Adjustment Assistance, the administration has been holding off on submitting the trade deals for an up-or-down vote until it has assurance that the job retraining program will be passed as well. Kirk says he hopes to “very quickly announce a process on how we will be able to move that forward, but we are going to pass these agreements.” However, people familiar with the discussions say submission of the trade pacts might slip until September. The administration and congressional leaders had hoped to pass the trade agreements by the August recess, since approval is expected to grow more difficult as campaigning for next year's elections starts to pick up in the fall. Business groups have also grown increasingly concerned about delays in the trade talks, which have been overshadowed by the dispute over raising the debt ceiling. White House Chief of Staff Bill Daley said Tuesday he isn't sure whether they will be passed by the August recess, though he said they'd be submitted “very soon.” Meanwhile, Kirk also urged China to follow through on its plans to accelerate reforms in its services sector and “introduce greater competition” in sectors ranging from financial services to telecommunications. Kirk cited a specific example of China's restrictions in the auto insurance sector, saying the government prevents foreign companies from selling mandatory third-party liability auto insurance. Allowing foreign competition would benefit consumer and improve the quality of insurance, he said.

4. KORUS will pass- votes are there

Bloomberg 7/21 (Eric Martin, 7/21/11, " Portman Says Republicans Will Vote on Worker-Aid ", http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2011-07-21/senate-s-portman-says-republicans-will-ensure-worker-aid-vote.html)

Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell, R-Ky., left, and Sen. Rob Portman, R-Ohio, conduct a news conference on free trade agreements with Colombia and Panama. U.S. Senator Rob Portman said Republicans will guarantee a vote on aid for workers displaced by foreign competition, offering a path to renew the program should the Obama administration separate it from trade accords. Portman, an Ohio Republican, said he, Senator Roy Blunt of Missouri and 10 other Republicans would vote to end debate on Trade Adjustment Assistance if presented as a standalone bill. The administration plans to send Congress the aid program as part of free-trade agreements, which are covered by fast-track authority. The support, with backing from Democrats, would help get the 60 votes needed to break a potential filibuster and allow a vote to renew the aid program, Portman said. “We need 7 Republican votes to find 60,” Portman said last night at the Washington International Trade Association’s dinner in Washington, referring to the 51 Democrats and 2 independents who often vote with the party. “We were asked to find 7, we’ve found 12.” Approval of trade deals with South Korea, Colombia and Panama, reached under President George W. Bush, stalled last month after Republicans opposed considering worker aid and trade deals in the same legislation. White House Chief of Staff William Daley said last week the administration was preparing to send a trade bill with worker aid attached because Republicans “have yet to present a credible alternative to getting this legislation passed in a timely fashion.” Trade accords are considered under rules intended to ban amendments, limit debate and ensure an up-or-down vote. The worker-aid program wouldn’t qualify for Senate fast-track consideration if separated from the trade deals. A cloture vote on the aid program may lead to Senate passage, Doug Goudie, director for international trade policy at the National Association of Manufacturers in Washington, said today in an interview. “It has solid support on the Democratic side and I believe some Republicans that would support it as well,” Goudie said. President Barack Obama plans to delay sending the accords to Congress until lawmakers return from an August recess as the dispute with Republicans remains unresolved, people familiar with the decision said yesterday. The administration is in “active discussions” with congressional leaders to advance worker aid and trade deals as soon as possible, said Carol Guthrie, a spokeswoman for the U.S. Trade Representative’s office. “The announcement by a number of Senate Republicans supporting passage of Trade Adjustment Assistance is a welcome development,” she said. “What’s needed now is a commitment from leadership in both chambers on the specifics of how they will move the three trade agreements and TAA.” House Speaker John Boehner, an Ohio Republican, has said that worker aid should be separated from the free-trade agreements. Boehner said this month he hasn’t ruled out holding separate votes on the aid and trade pacts, then combining them before sending a bill to the Senate.

**YES KORUS AT: Debt Ceiling**

Compromise on debt ceiling will be reached

Washington Times, 7-25- “Clinton says U.S. will solve its debt crisis”, 2011, http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2011/jul/25/clinton-says-us-will-solve-its-debt-crisis/

Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton moved Monday to reassure Asian financial markets that the United States will solve its debt crisis, as she sought China’s help in pressing North Korea to resume nuclear disarmament talks and easing tensions in the South China Sea. After delivering a speech in Hong Kong where she maintained that the U.S. economy is sound despite its current woes and the debt deadlock, Mrs. Clinton drove to China’s southern mainland city of Shenzhen for four hours of talks with Chinese State Councilor Dai Bingguo, Beijing’s top foreign policy official. World financial markets are warily watching developments in Washington toward avoiding an unprecedented debt default on Aug. 2. China, the largest foreign holder of U.S. debt, is particularly concerned. Asian stocks were down early Monday because of nervousness about the situation. “The political wrangling in Washington is intense right now,” Mrs. Clinton said. “But these kinds of debates have been a constant in our political life throughout the history of our republic. Sometimes they are messy … but this is how an open and democratic society ultimately comes together to reach the right solution. “So I am confident that Congress will do the right thing and secure a deal on the debt ceiling and work with President Obama to take steps necessary to improve our long-term fiscal outlook.”

Compromise on debt ceiling will come by August 2

VOA News, 7-25- “Clinton Confident Congress and President Will Reach Debt Deal”, 2011, http://www.voanews.com/english/news/asia/Clinton-Reassures-Asian-Investors-126103278.html

U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton has reassured China and other Asian nations that American lawmakers will reach a deal to avoid a credit default. There was hope that U.S. lawmakers and President Barack Obama would reach an agreement before markets opened in Asia on Monday. But talks have stalled once again. In a speech Monday to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce in Hong Kong, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton predicted that lawmakers and the president would reach a debt deal before the August 2 deadline. "As I have travelled around the region, a lot of people have asked me about how the United States is going to resolve our debt ceiling challenge," she said. "Well, let me assure you, we understand the stakes. We know how important this is for us, and how important it is for you. The political wrangling in Washington is intense right now but these debates have been a constant in our political life throughout the history of our republic." High-ranking U.S. officials say that China has repeatedly raised concerns about the debt issue. In public, Chinese officials have voiced their concern about the long-term direction of the U.S. economy and urged America to protect the interests of investors. Asian markets traded lower on Monday and the breakdown of talks in Washington over the weekend sent the value of the U.S. dollar down and the price of gold to record highs. Clinton said she was confident the United States would make it through its current situation. She said the U.S. has made it through crises in the past and is what she called an opportunity society. She also held up America as a model for Asia - despite the challenges it is facing.

Despite debt ceiling gridlock, compromise will be reached

USA Today, 7-26- Kathy Chu, “Clinton tells Hong Kong chamber US is in Asia ‘to stay”’, 2011, http://www.facebook.com/blink182?ref=ts&sk=app\_178091127385#!/

Despite Congressional gridlock over the U.S. debt ceiling, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton told business leaders here Monday that she believes a last-minute deal will be struck to avert a default and ensure that America remains a driver of Asia's growth. "I am confident that Congress will do the right thing and secure a deal on the debt ceiling," Clinton said in prepared remarks to the American Chamber of Commerce in Hong Kong at the end of a nearly two-week trip through Europe and Asia.

Compromise coming- Clinton and economic analysts

The West Australian, 7-26 – “Clinton says ‘confident’ of deal on US debt crisis”, 2011, http://au.news.yahoo.com/thewest/a/-/world/9912097/clinton-says-confident-of-deal-on-us-debt-crisis/

US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said Monday she was confident lawmakers would reach a deal to avert a debt default, as she addressed business leaders in Hong Kong. "The political wrangling in Washington is intense right now," she said towards the end of an Asian tour, while the White House and top lawmakers scrambled to avert a disastrous default on the country's debt. "I am confident that Congress will do the right thing and secure a deal on the debt ceiling and work with President (Barack) Obama to take steps to improve our long-term fiscal outlook," the top US diplomat said. Democrats and Republicans have been sparring over a measure to raise the $14.3 trillion US debt ceiling, allowing Washington to pay its bills past an August 2 deadline, while cutting $2.7 trillion in spending over 10 years. Obama has warned of economic "Armageddon" if talks fail, sparking a debt default -- though analysts said they believed an agreement would be reached.

Compromise on Debt Ceiling coming

Washington Post, 7/27 (Ej Dionne, Jr, 7/27/11, " Democrats winning on the debt ceiling, losing on jobs ", http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/post-partisan/post/democrats-winning-on-the-debt-ceiling-losing-on-jobs/2011/07/27/gIQApy3WcI\_blog.html)

The Post's able blogger Greg Sargent has been pushing the idea of a “Beltway Deficit Feedback Loop.” The idea is that the Washington conversation makes everybody in the nation's capital believe more fiercely by the day that the deficit is the most important problem facing the country, when out in the real world, Americans are worried primarily about jobs and growth. There's a new poll out that lends further support to this view. The latest Pew Research Center poll released on Tuesday – the survey was carried out between July 20 and July 24 – asked respondents which economic issue worried them most. The results: 39 percent said the job situation, 29 percent said the deficit, 15 percent said rising prices and 11 percent said problems in the financial and housing markets. Pew's report noted that even among Republicans, 34 percent cited jobs while 37 percent cited the deficit. But the poll pointed to another aspect of the deficit obsession that is insidious from the point of view of those who favor Keynesian or progressive economics. The new survey repeated a question posed last March in which respondents were asked whether they thought cuts in federal spending would help the job situation, hurt it or not have much effect. In March, only 18 percent said cuts would help the job situation while 34 percent said they would hurt. But in the July survey, 26 percent said cuts would help the job situation, up eight points, while 27 said they would hurt, down seven points. (The proportion saying the cuts wouldn't make much difference was virtually unchanged: 41 percent said this in March, 39 percent said it in July.) Overall, President Obama and the Democrats are winning the debt-ceiling debate as such. As Pew reported, 68 percent of Americans “say that lawmakers who share their views on this issue should compromise, even it means striking a deal they disagree with. Just 23% say lawmakers who share their views should stand by their principles, even if that leads to default.” That's a margin of nearly 3 to 1. Pew noted that compromise was favored by 81 percent of Democrats, 69 percent of independents – a key number for Obama's political advisers — and 53 percent of Republicans. The only group that favored risking default consisted of Republicans and Republican-leaning independents who said they agree with the Tea Party: 53 percent of them preferred lawmakers to stand by their principles even if it meant pushing the government into default. Just 24 percent of the non-Tea-Party Republicans and Republican leaners took this view. But the Tea Party still seems to be running the show in the House of Representatives at the moment. The bad news for progressives lies in those numbers about spending cuts and jobs. Because the president and many Democrats have been complicit in making the deficit the centerpiece of the Washington conversation, they have left unanswered the Republican claim that cutting spending would help create jobs. That's a view rejected even by economists who favor long-term deficit reduction. Yet Republicans and conservatives have clearly moved opinion toward the idea that spending cuts equal more jobs. It's a case of political malpractice by progressive politicians, and another cost of that Beltway Deficit Feedback Loop. Republicans not in thrall to the Tea Party understand the dangers posed by those big pro-compromise numbers. I have a feeling that Senate Republican leader Mitch McConnell may try to force a resolution to this fight even if many on the right wing of the House object. But those who favor progressive economics have a lot of work to do. And the president still has a lot of work to do on jobs.

Obama’s not spending capital

Detroit News 7-29 – Frank Beckmann, “National debt ceiling debate recalls Lansing struggles”, 2011, http://www.detnews.com/article/20110729/OPINION03/107290330/1008/opinion01/National-debt-ceiling-debate-recalls-Lansing-struggles, \*

Obama likes to complain about the unfairness of cutting entitlement programs while failing to explain how it's fair to confiscate even more earnings from those who already carry the heaviest tax burden. The Republican-led House has laid out a proposal for addressing our debt limit and the Democratic-led Senate has done the same. Despite the President's continued rhetoric, his administration has eschewed a leadership role by failing to produce its own specific plan for reducing the national debt that he has increased by nearly 40 percent in less than three years in office.

Obama’s not wasting capital on debt ceiling

The Hill, 7-30 – Pete Kasperowicz, “Bachmann says Obama unengaged, offering no plan”, 2011, http://thehill.com/blogs/floor-action/house/174517-bachmann-says-obama-unengaged-offering-no-plan

Presidential candidate Michele Bachmann (R-Minn.) said on the House floor Saturday that President Obama has failed to put forward a plan for resolving the debt ceiling crisis, and called on Obama to engage in the process with just four days left before the deadline. "Throughout this debate over guaranteeing insane, never before seen in the history of this country levels of spending, President Obama has coolly stood on the sidelines, his arms crossed, very simply castigating Republicans for not giving him a $2.4 trillion blank check," she said. She said Obama's only plan was a budget proposal that would have led to another $1.5 trillion deficit. "Now is the time for the president to show leadership, and the only leadership that he's showing is one that's saying 'tsk, tsk, tsk,' trying to bring us to the brink, when in fact we're trying to be responsible and bring this to a successful conclusion," she said. "We call on the President of the United States to finally engage in the process." Bachmann spoke in debate just before a planned House vote on the Senate Democratic debt ceiling plan; the House was expected to reject that plan.

YES KORUS AT: TAA

KORUS will pass despite TAA fights

NAFB News Service, 7-25- “FTA Supporters See Passage on the Horizon”, 2011, http://www.hoosieragtoday.com/wire/news/00224\_ftahorizon\_222122.php

President Obama and Congressional Republicans have disagreed over Trade Adjustment Assistance but Missouri Senator Roy Blunt and Ohio Senator Rob Portman have produced a letter with names of Republican Senators committed to voting to kill a filibuster of that legislation. This is good news for supporters of the free trade agreements that have been stalled due to Obama's request that TAA be attached to one of the deals. Blunt and Portman believe they have created a compromise acceptable to both parties to clear TAA as a stand-alone bill and guarantee enough votes to kill a filibuster. The White House is still concerned the Senate's TAA legislation might be amended in a way that could kill the bill. House Speaker John Boehner and the House Ways and Means Chairman Dave Camp have told the Administration their plan is to proceed similarly to the Senate - with TAA on its own. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce Vice President of International Affairs John Murphy says they are organizing a House-side door knock to visit as many offices as possible. Murphy says a deal hasn’t been reached on a clear path forward - but it’s clear they are making progress. Colombia, Panama and South Korea FTA supporters - including those in agriculture - hope Congress will pass the agreements before summer recess.

Compromise on TAA coming now

Reuters 7-26- Doug Palmer, “Update 2: Kirk hopes for Sept approval of US trade deals”, 2011, http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/07/26/usa-trade-kirk-idUSN1E76P1DJ20110726,\*

U.S. Trade Representative Ron Kirk said on Tuesday he is optimistic Congress will pass free trade pacts with South Korea, Colombia and Panama shortly after lawmakers return in September from a month-long recess. President Barack Obama had hoped to win approval of the three agreements before the August break but Republicans balked at a White House plan to include an extension of the Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) program for displaced workers in the implementing legislation for the South Korea pact. "We believe we have a framework for an agreement that will allow us very quickly when Congress reconvenes in September to approve and have a vote on Trade Adjustment Assistance and allow us to move forward with passage of the free trade agreements at the same time," Kirk said in a speech. Kirk said the Obama administration had been working with congressional leaders in both parties to find a path forward on TAA and the trade pacts, telling reporters after the speech there were still a few more details to nail down. Republicans demanded a separate vote on TAA, which provides retraining and income assistance for workers who lost jobs due to trade. Many Democrats fear Republican foes of TAA will kill the program if it is not shielded by the South Korea pact. Democrats say TAA is a vital part of the U.S. social safety net but many Republicans question its effectiveness and cost. The White House has insisted on renewal of TAA in conjunction with the trade pacts, although it did agree on a package of reforms to scale back the program from levels approved in the 2009 economic stimulus bill. Senate Republican Leader Mitch McConnell said last week his party's lawmakers would not block a vote on TAA but that it would be up to the Obama administration to rally enough votes to protect the program from hostile amendments. McConnell also has pressed for a separate vote on Trade Promotion Authority, which would give the White House authority to negotiate new trade deals it could present to Congress for straight yes-or-no votes. "We're still working with the leadership to come up with the kind of specifics of how we'd sequence that," Kirk said. But the proposed framework "would allow us to get a vote on TAA," give McConnell a chance to make his case for Trade Promotion Authority and "give us a chance to move" the free trade agreements, he added. Kirk also said the chances of a successful conclusion of the long-running Doha round of world trade talks were "looking less and less likely." But he said the United States would work with other World Trade Organization members to chart a way forward for the talks. Earlier on Tuesday, WTO Director General Pascal Lamy recommended members abandon an effort to reach a mini-Doha deal aimed primarily at helping the world's poorest countries by the end of the year. Lamy said there was no consensus on what should be included in that package, which was intended to be a down payment toward a long-hoped-for bigger Doha round agreement covering areas such as agriculture, manufacturing and services.

YES KORUS- Top of the Docket

KORUS will pass- top of the docket after recess

Yonhap 7-26- Lee Chi-dong, “Kirk confident of September passage of FTAs”, 2011, http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/national/2011/07/27/78/0301000000AEN20110727000600315F.HTML

The top U.S. trade official predicted confidently Tuesday that Congress will pass free trade agreements (FTAs) with South Korea, Colombia and Panama in September. In a speech at a Bretton Woods Committee meeting, U.S. Trade Representative Ron Kirk said a "framework" for a deal on the controversial Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA) is already in place. President Barack Obama is pushing to renew the worker aid program. He included the TAA in an implementing bill on the FTA with South Korea. But congressional Republicans, opposed to the extension of the TAA, call for a separate approach. "We believe we have a framework for an agreement that will allow us very quickly when Congress convenes in September to approve and have a vote on Trade Adjustment Assistance and allow us to move forward with passage of the free trade agreements at the same time," he said, according to his office. Kirk did not elaborate. Obama initially sought to win ratification of the long-pending FTAs before Congress enters summer recess on Aug. 5. But he has been preoccupied with a partisan fight over federal debt limit. Kirk's comments marked the first formal confirmation by a top government official of a new strategy to seek the ratification of the FTAs when lawmakers return in September after a month-long break.

KORUS will pass- top of the docket in September

Arirang 7-27 – “US Trade Representatives Expresses ‘Optimism’ on Congressional Approval of KORUS FTA in Sept”, 2011, http://www.arirang.co.kr/News/News\_View.asp?nseq=118568&code=Ne4&category=3

US Trade Representative Ron Kirk is optimistic that Congress would pass free-trade pacts with South Korea, Colombia and Panama shortly after lawmakers return from a month-long congressional recess in September. During a speech to the Bretton Woods Committee on Tuesday Kirk said that he believed that the Obama administration had worked out a deal with congressional leaders to ensure passage of the three trade pacts and Trade Adjustment Assistance, a retraining program for American workers displaced by trade. This is the first time that a US senior official has specifically mentioned the September timeline for the FTAs.

YES KORUS- GOP

KORUS will pass- Republicans are warming up

Reuters 7/22 (David Lawder, John O'Callaghan, 7/22/11, " Republican senators won't block US retraining bill ", http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/07/22/usa-trade-deals-idUSN1E76L10020110722)

WASHINGTON, July 22 (Reuters) - Urging U.S. President Barack Obama to send three long-delayed free trade pacts to Congress for approval, 12 Republican senators pledged not to impede a vote on a separate worker retraining bill. The move is aimed at providing assurance to the Obama administration that an extension of the Trade Adjustment Assistance program will get a vote -- and pass -- in the Democratic-controlled Senate when trade deals with South Korea, Colombia and Panama are considered. Republicans in Congress oppose including the retraining provisions in legislation to approve the trade pacts but Obama, a Democrat, has refrained from sending stand-alone bills. "While not going forward with these agreements we're losing market share every day, which means American workers, American farmers, American service providers are losing opportunities." said Rob Portman, a Republican senator and former U.S. Trade Representative. The European Union has had its own free trade pact with South Korea since July 1 and is already seeing double-digit percentage rises in exports to the Asian industrial powerhouse, he said. The White House had hoped to pass all three trade deals before the August break but the disagreement with Republicans over the retraining program has complicated the effort. Many Republicans question the effectiveness of the program and its costs in a difficult budgetary environment. In a letter to Obama, the 12 Republican senators -- including Portman and Roy Blunt of Missouri -- said they would not join any effort to block consideration or a final vote on the bill. The pledge means Democrats could easily secure the 60 votes needed in the 100-seat Senate to fend off any procedural challenges. Passage of a separate extension of the retraining program may be more difficult in the Republican-controlled House of Representatives. An Obama administration official called the pledge a "welcome development" but repeated statements that more specifics were needed from House and Senate leaders to secure passage of the three trade agreements and the retraining bill. Trade Adjustment Assistance is a nearly 50-year-old retraining and income assistance program for workers who have lost jobs because of foreign competition. Many Republicans object to the White House plan to include an extension of the program in the implementing legislation for the South Korea trade agreement, instead of allowing lawmakers a separate vote. Democrats view the program as a vital part of the U.S. social safety net and fear the extension will be killed by Senate opponents if not shielded by the South Korean pact.

KORUS will pass- GOP momentum

Washington Post 7/22 (7/22/11, " Senate Republicans clear way for worker aid bill, removing obstacle to action ... ", http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/congress/senate-republicans-clear-way-for-worker-aid-bill-removing-obstacle-to-action-on-trade-bills/2011/07/22/gIQABhmtTI\_story.html)

WASHINGTON — A dozen Senate Republicans say they have cleared the way for legislation to help workers displaced by foreign competition, possibly removing the main obstacle to approval of free trade agreements with South Korea, Panama and Colombia. The Obama administration supports the trade deals, but says they must be linked to extension of expired sections of the Trade Adjustment Assistance program. The GOP senators, in a letter to President Barack Obama, said they can assure passage of the worker aid bill by joining Democrats in moving it past any filibuster hurdles. Their support, while welcomed by the administration, may be too late for Congress to act on the aid and trade bills this summer. Congress is scheduled to leave for its summer recess on Aug. 6, and is likely to be preoccupied until then in resolving the crisis over raising the government's debt limit to avoid a first-ever U.S. default. Administration officials said earlier this week that the Obama administration might delay sending final legislation on the three trade deals until September. Sens. Roy Blunt, R-Mo., and Rob Portman, R-Ohio, said Friday that their Republican group would provide more than enough votes to ensure Senate passage of a stand-alone, compromise version of the worker assistance bill. Blunt said he had been working with his House and Senate colleagues for five years to find a way to advance the three trade agreements. “Today we have that path forward,” he said. Sen. Max Baucus, D-Mont., who as chair of the Senate Finance Committee is in charge of trade issues, said in response that “there has never been a question that TAA would have to pass in tandem with the free trade agreements and we are open to any serious path that achieves that outcome.” He said the trade deals will “provide a major boost to our economy, but we need to make sure U.S. workers have all the resources to succeed in a global economy, and TAA is the way to do that.” The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, which like other business groups has been pressing Congress and the White House to act on the trade deals, praised the 12 Republicans for working to end the impasse. “With our economic recovery stalling, we need to move now on these job-creating trade agreements,” said the Chamber's president and CEO, Thomas J. Donohue. The Obama administration is behind the trade deals, which have been pending since the George W. Bush administration, but has said that Congress must at the same time act to extend expired sections of the four-decade-old program to assist workers hurt by foreign competition with financial and retraining aid. House and Senate Republicans critical of the expense of the assistance program have said that legislation to extend it must be separate from votes on the trade bills. Senate Republican leader Mitch McConnell, R-Ky., said Thursday he was committed to working with Majority Leader Harry Reid, D-Nev., “;to ensure a fair floor process for my members so they have an opportunity to try to amend a stand-alone Trade Adjustment Assistance bill separate from the three free trade agreements. That way, if the administration can generate the votes it needs, the TAA bill will pass on its merits.” McConnell acknowledged that he didn't expect this to happen before the August recess. In the House, Rep. Dave Camp, R-Mich., who chairs the Ways and Means Committee, which has jurisdiction over trade, said in a statement that he applauded the Senate Republicans for their approach to the worker aid bill and the trade deals. He repeated his promise to have his committee vote on both on the same day if the administration submits the trade agreements separately from the TAA bill.

KORUS will pass- GOP on board

Colombia Reports 7/22 (Travis Mannon, 7/22/11, " Republican senators won't block FTA retraining program ", <http://colombiareports.com/colombia-news/economy/17823-republican-senators-wont-block-fta-retraining-program.html>)

Twelve Republican U.S. senators say they will not block the Trade Adjustment Assistance program (TAA), the controversial bill holding up the ratification of the free trade agreements with Colombia, Panama and South Korea, various media reported Friday. The senators vowed that they will not attempt to block the final vote for the bill to reassure Obama that there will be no more delay from the Senate to pass the FTA. Republican Senator and former U.S. Trade Representative Rob Portman said, "While not going forward with these agreements we're losing market share every day, which means American workers, American farmers, American service providers are losing opportunities." President Obama initially tried to get the FTA passed before Congress' August recess but it looks as though he will have to wait until September. President Juan Manuel Santos tweeted Friday his appreciation of Obama's support for the FTA. "Thank you, President Barack Obama, for your words and for your support. We are confident that in September the FTA will actually move forward."

KORUS will pass- newfound Republican support jumpstarts the push for congressional approval

The Hill 7/22 (Vicki Needham, 7/22/11, " Senate Republicans vow to pass TAA; Democrats unconvinced ", http://thehill.com/blogs/on-the-money/1005-trade/173063-senate-republicans-vow-to-pass-taa-democrats-unconvinced)

Two Republican senators said Friday they have a way to break an impasse that would win congressional approval for three trade deals. Sens. Rob Portman (R-Ohio) and Roy Blunt (R-Mo.) released a letter to President Obama sent by them and 10 other Republicans promising support for a new workers-assistance program. They said their support for a bill authorizing assistance to workers hurt by increased imports, know as trade adjustment assistance (TAA), would clear its passage through the Senate. “This provides more than enough votes to ensure the reformed TAA bill can pass the Senate,” Portman, a former U.S. trade representative for President George W. Bush, told reporters. “In our view there’s no more excuses.” The Obama administration has declined to send trade deals with South Korea, Panama and Colombia to Congress after Republicans balked at the TAA bill. It remains unclear whether the move by the GOP senators would clear a path in the House. Blunt and Portman said Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) has the votes to move the TAA bill if Democrats in the lower chamber support it along with about 35 of his own members. Portman said the senators who signed the letter have committed to supporting procedural votes on TAA requiring 60 votes as well as a vote to approve the measure. They said the bill would reflect negotiations involving the White House, House Ways and Means Committee Chairman Dave Camp (R-Mich.) and Senate Finance Committee Chairman Max Baucus (D-Mont.). But the Obama administration and Democrats on Friday expressed concerns about the process, especially in the Senate. “The announcement by a number of Senate Republicans supporting passage of trade adjustment assistance is a welcome development in our discussions with Congress,” a senior administration official told The Hill. “What’s needed now is a commitment on specifics from the leadership of both chambers for a viable process for the passage of the three trade agreements and TAA. “We’re in active discussion with congressional leaders. We hope we can reach agreement as soon as possible.” Rep. Jim McDermott (D-Wash.), ranking member on the House Ways and Means subcommittee on Trade, said while he’s confident the votes to pass TAA exist in the House — Democrats have been pressing for a renewal of the 2009 program and back the recent changes — he’s concerned about the ability of the Senate to push through the measure, especially if it’s left open for amendment, as has been suggested. McDermott suggested that the administration wait until TAA clears both chambers before sending the three trade pacts up to Capitol Hill. “We sent hundreds of hundreds of bills in the last Congress and they all died in the Senate,” he said. “Why would we think that because Dave Camp sends it over they wouldn’t do the same thing or stall it to the point where it doesn’t pass?” Blunt said he would be willing to let Congress clear TAA before the administration sends up the trade agreements. But Portman stressed the need to send all four bills separately and at the same time. The Obama administration sent the trade deals to Congress last month and included TAA in the Korean pact, a move opposed by congressional Republicans. The White House has been adamant that the workers measure must move at the same time as the trade pacts. Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) said Thursday he’d consider taking up TAA if it’s done separately from the trade deals and can be amended. He has pushed for a renewal of Trade Promotion Authority (TPA), something the White House has said isn’t on the table right now. “I myself am personally committed to working with [Senate Majority Leader Harry] Reid [(D-Nev.)] to ensure a fair floor process for my members so they have an opportunity to try to amend a standalone Trade Adjustment Assistance bill separate from the three free-trade agreements,” McConnell said. The measure could stall if the House and Senate pass different versions. A conference to work out a final bill could hold up TAA through the fall, especially considering that most of September will be taken up by budget negotiations before the new fiscal year starts on Oct. 1. Portman acknowledged that waiting until the fall might make the trade deals harder to pass because of the schedule. McConnell said Thursday that he doesn’t “expect to finish any of this before August,” as debt-limit negotiations dominate the congressional schedule. “Still, I think the administration should submit [the trade deals] anyway as a show of good faith with our trading allies in Korea, Colombia and Panama,” he said. “Then we can work to pass them when we return.” Camp told The Hill on Friday that he’s “not ready to concede” that the TAA has to be held up through the fall. “We’re still talking to both the administration and members of the Senate,” Camp said. “It’s something I think we need to show progress on before September. That doesn’t mean they’ll be completed but I’d like to have us show some progress.” McDermott said he’d be surprised if the trade deals were done before October. The other lawmakers who signed the letter are Republican Sens. John Boozman (Ark.), Scott Brown (Mass.), Dan Coats (Ind.), Thad Cochran (Miss.), Susan Collins (Maine), John Hoeven (N.D.), Johnny Isakson (Ga.), Mike Johanns (Neb.), Lisa Murkowski (Alaska) and Roger Wicker (Miss.). Although she didn’t sign the letter, Sen. Olympia Snowe (R-Maine) pledged her support Friday, saying that “securing a reauthorization of Trade Adjustment Assistance is paramount as the Senate deliberates over our nation’s trade policies.” “I urge the president to separate the pending trade agreements and TAA, ensuring an up or down vote for this vital program,” she said.

YES KORUS- AT: Uniqueness Overwhelms

KORUS Passage isn’t guaranteed

WSJ 7-27- Elizabeth Williamson and Andrew Ackerman, “White House, Congress Creep Closer to Trade Deal”, 2011, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424053111904800304576472322651590958.html?mod=googlenews\_wsj

The White House and Congress are inching toward compromise on a deal that could allow a vote on trade agreements with South Korea, Colombia and Panama in September, but the fractious state of Congress still threatens progress. Congressional Republicans and Obama administration trade officials say they are working on a highly orchestrated plan for renewing the controversial Trade Adjustment Assistance program after Congress returns from its month-long August recess. That could pave the way for a vote on the three trade agreements in the fall. But aides to Senate Democrats and the administration caution that a final deal isn't agreed yet. The TAA program, as it is called, provides training and extended unemployment benefits for workers laid off as a result of trade-related shifts in production. The program, which costs about $1 billion annually, has existed for 50 years with bipartisan support. But this year it was targeted by Republican budget hawks, and President Barack Obama refused to send the three trade agreements to Congress for approval until GOP leaders strike a deal on renewing the program. House Ways & Means Committee Chairman Dave Camp (R., Mich.) for the first time Wednesday outlined a sequence for congressional passage of three trade pacts along with separate legislation renewing the TAA. Republican leaders in both chambers have insisted that the TAA be voted upon separately, so lawmakers can debate its merits. Democrats, led by Senate Finance Committee Chairman Sen. Max Baucus (D., Mont.), want a scaled-back version of the TAA program to be considered as part of the South Korea trade bill, in order to lure more votes for both. In remarks at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Camp said there was general agreement among congressional leaders that the Senate would first pass the TAA, after which the White House would submit the trade agreements for ratification. The House would vote on the TAA legislation and the trade bills at the same time. Mr. Camp said that was the outline on which he, Mr. Baucus, Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D., Nev.) and House Speaker John Boehner (R., Ohio) agree. Mr. Camp said talks with the White House over the outline were ongoing, but had entered a hiatus this week amid fighting over raising the nation's federal debt ceiling. A Democratic Senate leadership aide and an administration trade official said Thursday that the discussions on sequencing had so far fallen short of a deal. "There is no agreement. There have certainly been productive conversations … but so far, there is not an agreement on a path forward," the Senate aide said in an email. U.S. Trade Representative Ron Kirk said Tuesday that he believed a "framework" had emerged to allow the retraining program and trade pacts to be passed, most likely separately, after the recess. An administration official said Wednesday that "the Senate has proposed including Trade Adjustment Assistance on the Korea implementing bill, and that remains a possibility while we are in discussions on other possible approaches. While talks have been promising, we understand that congressional leadership is still discussing the specific sequencing and timing."

Passage isn’t guaranteed

Klingner 5-16 (Bruce, Senior Research Fellow for Northeast Asia – Heritage Foundation, “KORUS won't help North Korea,” The Hill, 2011, http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/foreign-policy/161429-korus-wont-help-north-korea)

After years of delay, the South Korea-U.S. free trade agreement (KORUS) is rushing toward bipartisan Congressional approval. The Obama administration will formally submit it to Congress this month, and many previously fierce opponents have now jumped onboard as advocates. But die-hard trade protectionists are still using red herrings and scare tactics to stoke opposition. The latest salvo includes allegations that North Korean goods would freely enter the U.S. market via the Kaesong industrial zone, a business venture 10 miles north of the demilitarized zone.

YES KORUS- South Korea Will Ratify

South Korea is on board for a FTA with the US

Korea Joongang Daily, 7-21 – “Gov’t: Pass US FTA by next month”, 2011, http://joongangdaily.joins.com/article/view.asp?aid=2939154

The government wants the National Assembly to approve a free trade pact with the United States by next month, despite the possibility that the U.S. Congress will fail to approve it this summer, Seoul’s senior trade official said yesterday. The government and the ruling Grand National Party have been seeking to pass the long-pending accord through the Assembly during an extra session in August with the United States moving to get Congress to approve the deal by early next month. Congress is due to enter recess on Aug. 6, and the Obama administration, eager to expand exports and create jobs, has informally set the date as the deadline for passing long-overdue free trade bills, including the free trade agreement with Korea. But Obama has been preoccupied with drawn-out debt ceiling talks with congressional Republicans. “There are no changes in our stance that the free trade pact should be passed through the Assembly,” Lee Si-hyung, deputy trade minister, told reporters. Lee said Washington has yet to inform Seoul of any further details about the ratification of the pact. The Korea-U.S. free trade agreement, known as Korus FTA, was signed over four years ago in 2007, but the government’s ratification bill has been blocked partly because of strong objections from the main opposition Democratic Party and the country’s farming industry. The deal was supplemented late last year with minor modifications mostly concerning the automotive industry.

Will pass in South Korea – translation errors were fixed

Korea Herald 6-3 (“Lawmakers rebuke government over N. Korea disclosure,” http://www.koreaherald.com/national/Detail.jsp?newsMLId=20110603000619)

The disputed Korea-U.S. Free Trade Agreement bill was also included in the day’s agenda. “The U.S. Congress is expected to pass the bill in July-August, though there are diverse arguments,” said the prime minister. “Considering the timeline, we felt it necessary to bring up the issue during the National Assembly’s June provisional session.” The Cabinet passed a new version of the FTA bill shortly before the parliamentary interpellation Friday after fixing translation errors. The four-day interpellation will resume next Wednesday and Thursday.

\*\*\*Link\*\*\*

1NC- SPS Costs Capital

SPS requires tons of political capital

David 8 (Leonard, Research Associate – Secure World Foundation and Senior Space Writer – Space.com, “Space-Based Solar Power - Harvesting Energy from Space”, CleanTech, 5-15, [http://www.azocleantech.com/article.aspx? ArticleId=69](http://www.azocleantech.com/article.aspx?%20ArticleId=69))

Space Based Solar Power: Science and Technology Challenges Overall, pushing forward on SBSP "is a complex problem and one that lends itself to a wide variety of competing solutions," said John Mankins, President of Artemis Innovation Management Solutions, LLC, in Ashburn, Virginia. "There's a whole range of science and technology challenges to be pursued. New knowledge and new systems concepts are needed in order to enable space based solar power. But there does not appear, at least at present, that there are any fundamental physical barriers," Mankins explained. Peter Teets, Distinguished Chair of the Eisenhower Center for Space and Defense Studies, said that SBSP must be economically viable with those economics probably not there today. "But if we can find a way with continued technology development ... and smart moves in terms of development cycles to bring clean energy from space to the Earth, it's a home run kind of situation," he told attendees of the meeting. "It's a noble effort," Teets told Space News. There remain uncertainties in SBSP, including closure on a business case for the idea, he added. "I think the Air Force has a legitimate stake in starting it. But the scale of this project is going to be enormous. This could create a new agency ... who knows? It's going to take the President and a lot of political will to go forward with this," Teets said.

2NC- SPS Costs Capital

The plan drains Obama’s political capital --- pushing SPS is unpopular because of the complexity and scale of the program --- that’s David

And --- there’s zero Congressional support for SPS --- its too expensive and tied to unpopular military space programs

Day 8 (Dwayne A., Program Officer – Space Studies Board of the National Research Council, “Knights in Shining Armor”, The Space Review, 6-9, <http://www.thespacereview.com/article/1147/1>)

If all this is true, why is the space activist community so excited about the NSSO study? That is not hard to understand. They all know that the economic case for space solar power is abysmal. The best estimates are that SSP will cost at least three times the cost per kilowatt hour of even relatively expensive nuclear power. But the military wants to dramatically lower the cost of delivering fuel to distant locations, which could possibly change the cost-benefit ratio. The military savior also theoretically solves some other problems for SSP advocates. One is the need for deep pockets to foot the immense development costs. The other is an institutional avatar—one of the persistent policy challenges for SSP has been the fact that responsibility for it supposedly “falls through the cracks” because neither NASA nor the Department of Energy wants responsibility. If the military takes on the SSP challenge, the mission will finally have a home. But there’s also another factor at work: naïveté. Space activists tend to have little understanding of military space, coupled with an idealistic impression of its management compared to NASA, whom many space activists have come to despise. For instance, they fail to realize that the military space program is currently in no better shape, and in many cases worse shape, than NASA. The majority of large military space acquisition programs [have experienced major problems](http://www.aviationnow.com/aw/generic/story_generic.jsp?channel=space&id=news/milspace031008.xml&headline=GAO%20IDs%20Space%20Acquisitions%20Woes), in many cases cost growth in excess of 100%. Although NASA has a bad public record for cost overruns, the DoD’s less-public record is far worse, and military space has a bad reputation in Congress, which would never allow such a big, expensive new program to be started. Again, this is not to insult the fine work conducted by those who produced the NSSO space solar power study. They accomplished an impressive amount of work without any actual resources. But it is nonsensical for members of the space activist community to claim that “the military supports space solar power” based solely on a study that had no money, produced by an organization that has no clout.

2NC- SPS Costs Capital

And --- the high cost makes SPS politically impossible

Boswell 4 (David, Speaker – International Space Development Conference, “Whatever Happened to Solar Power Satellites?”, The Space Review, 8-30, <http://www.thespacereview.com/article/214/1>)

High cost of launching Another barrier is that launching anything into space costs a lot of money. A substantial investment would be needed to get a solar power satellite into orbit; then the launch costs would make the electricity that was produced more expensive than other alternatives. In the long term, launch costs will need to come down before generating solar power in space makes economic sense. But is the expense of launching enough to explain why so little progress has been made? There were over 60 launches in 2003, so last year there was enough money spent to put something into orbit about every week on average. Funding was found to launch science satellites to study gravity waves and to explore other planets. There are also dozens of GPS satellites in orbit that help people find out where they are on the ground. Is there enough money available for these purposes, but not enough to launch even one solar power satellite that would help the world develop a new source of energy? In the 2004 budget the Department of Energy has over $260 million allocated for fusion research. Obviously the government has some interest in funding renewable energy research and they realize that private companies would not be able to fund the development of a sustainable fusion industry on their own. From this perspective, the barrier holding back solar power satellites is not purely financial, but rather the problem is that there is not enough political will to make the money available for further development.

2NC- SPS Costs Capital- AT: Public Popularity Turn

The public hates SPS

Mahan 7 (Rob, Founder – Citizens for Space Based Solar Power, “SBSP FAQ”, <http://c-sbsp.org/sbsp-faq/>)

What are the main hurdles to developing and deploying space-based solar power? Let me start by saying that I believe there are three solutions to every complex problem. First, the technical solution – how are we going to solve the problem (often the easiest). Second, the financial solution – who is going to pay for / profit from the solution. And third, the political solution – who is going to organize the solution … and take credit for it. The technical solution for space-based solar power is exciting because no scientific breakthroughs are needed. It is essentially a complex engineering project. The technical solution will initially be dependent on developing low cost and reliable access to space, but later we could use resources mined from Moon and near Earth objects like asteroids. The financial solution will admittedly be very expensive at first, so there must be an early adopter, like the Defense Department, to provide a market and rewards for those willing to invest in space based solar power and the supporting technologies. Engineering and scientific advancements and the commercialization of supporting technologies will soon lead to ubiquitous and low cost access to space and more widespread use of wireless power transmision. Economies of scale will eventually make space-based solar power affordable, but probably never cheap again, like energy was fifty years ago. Eventual Moon based operations will reduce costs significantly, since it takes twenty-two times less energy to launch from Moon than from Earth’s gravity well and the use of lunar materials will allow heavier, more robust structures. The political solution will most likely be the biggest hurdle to the development of space-based solar power because so many areas have to be negotiated and agreed upon, not only within the United States, but with our allies around the world, too. Strong energy independence legislation is the first step that needs to be taken immediately. Treaties and agreements for the military and commercial use of space must be negotiated and put into place. Universal safety measures must be agreed upon and integrated into related legislation and treaties. Getting widespread voter (i.e. tax-payer) support to prompt Congress to take action may be the highest hurdle of all.

\*\*\*Internal Link\*\*\*

2NC- Political Capital Key

Political capital is key- it overcomes arising obstacles like TAA, opposition from specific Congress members, and the overall controversial political climate – That’s Kim.

Disregard their generic evidence about political capital theory – it is not specific to SKFTA – which needs Obama’s strength to maintain support

Political capital is key to successfully passing KORUS

WSJ 10 (Wall Street Journal, “A Korea-U.S. Trade Deal, At Last”, 12-6, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704767804576000542290721476.html)

The Korea pact is a step forward, but now the President has to sell it. What a long, strange trip it's been for the South Korea-U.S. free trade agreement. The two sides announced this weekend that they've reached a deal on revisions to the draft that was signed in 2007 but never ratified. It comes not a moment too soon, given the boost this will give to a U.S. economy stumbling its way to recovery and with tensions rising on the Korean peninsula. The saga is also a lesson to future U.S. Presidents on the importance of trade leadership. Having campaigned against the pact in 2008, President Obama rediscovered its benefits once in office. Yet by then he was forced to re-open negotiations to justify his earlier opposition. The result is a deal that is slightly better than the excellent 2007 text in some ways, but slightly worse in others. And this after a delay that has cost the U.S. global credibility on economic issues, not to mention the cost to U.S. growth. The good news is that the 2007 agreement stays mostly in place. South Korea still offers significant opening of its sheltered economy to American manufactured goods, agriculture and services. Within five years of ratification the deal will eliminate tariffs on 95% of the countries' trade in goods, and it also clears the way for greater trade in services by, for instance, opening Korea's banking industry. Meanwhile, some of the changes to that 2007 text are helpful. The trade in cars was the main sticking point, especially as Detroit worried about Korea's longstanding use of technical barriers like onerous safety standards to limit imports. Negotiators have added a provision that ensures new environmental standards proposed by Seoul over the past three years won't become de facto trade barriers. Yet some of the new auto provisions are worse than what Detroit had before. Conspicuously, Korea's current 8% tariff on imported U.S. cars—which would have been eliminated immediately upon ratification under the 2007 deal—now will be cut in half immediately but eliminated only after five years. Compare that to the European Union's agreement with Korea, which is signed and due to take effect next July. That deal gradually phases out Korea's 8% car tariff over four years. That means that over the next few years Detroit will miss what would have been the advantage of zero tariffs compared to rates of 2% to 6% on EU cars, and toward the end of the five-year period tariffs on EU cars will be lower than on American cars. The biggest mistake Mr. Obama and Democrats made was allowing one vocal lobby—Detroit and its unions—to hijack debate on a comprehensive deal covering almost all trade. Consider the main "victory" for Detroit: Korea has agreed to let America phase out its 25% tariff on pickup trucks more slowly. That will come at a stiff price to American buyers of those trucks, including many small businesses that delayed purchases during the recession. Some farmers have also become collateral damage. Seoul couldn't walk away from re-opened talks empty-handed, and one concession it extracted is a two-year delay, to 2016, in eliminating tariffs on some U.S. pork. American pork producers are excited about any deal, but they still would have been better off under the 2007 text. Chilean pork already enjoys lower tariffs thanks to the Chile-Korea FTA and has been gaining market share. The new tariff-elimination date also falls only six months before Korea's tariffs on EU pork will end under that deal, leaving Americans far less than the two-and-a-half years they would have had under the earlier text to get a marketing jump on their competitors. These caveats should not deter Congress from ratifying what is still an excellent deal. Mr. Obama has asked GOP House Speaker-designate John Boehner to assist in getting the pact approved, and we're told Mr. Boehner has suggested grouping this deal together with pending agreements with Colombia and Panama in a single House vote. This would make it easier for pro-trade forces in Congress to concentrate their political capital. Mr. Boehner will bring a majority or more of his GOP Members along, but Mr. Obama will have to spend his own political capital to rebuild American public support for free trade and gain Democratic support. The President would have made more progress toward his goal of doubling American exports if he had supported this deal in 2008 and pressed it through Congress in 2009. The failure in leadership was to side with the United Auto Workers and other unions against the national interest. Those who think they'll lose from trade always have the strongest motivation to lobby, while the consumers and businesses that benefit (such as American pickup truck buyers) are harder to organize. Every American President since Hoover in the 1920s has taken the broad view, speaking up for the many trade beneficiaries. U.S. public support for freer trade has eroded amid the recession and the lack of Presidential leadership. It is crucial for U.S. competitiveness in particular, and the world economy more broadly, that Mr. Obama and his allies make a strong and unapologetic case that trade is in the best interests of American businesses and workers.

Political capital is key to maintain support

Wharton 1-12 (School – UPenn, "U.S.-South Korea Trade Pact: A Turning Point for American Exports?," http://knowledge.wharton.upenn.edu/article.cfm?articleid=2671)

With Portman now in the Senate and other pro-trade Republicans in key positions -- such as new Speaker John Boehner of Ohio and Majority Whip Eric Cantor of Virginia -- it is tempting to believe that both the House and the Senate will quickly push through the Korea agreement and then move on to Colombia, Panama and other trade pacts. But everything hinges on the ability of the President to assert his leadership on the Korea deal. "The President has demonstrated leadership," says Dittrich, "and we have no reason to think that he won't continue to do so." The battle over the Korea agreement seems likely to pit Obama on one side -- along with pro-trade Republicans. On the other side will be anti-trade Democrats and Tea Party Republicans. Many leaders of the business community fear that the Tea Party will undermine their efforts to promote pro-trade initiatives by shooting down this deal and others. "You can't assume, as in the past, that a Republican Congress is entirely pro-trade," says USCIB's Mulligan. "The Republicans have developed this populist tinge, and they are focusing on the China trade" as a key target.

PC key to placate opposition

Linciome 10 (Scott, Int'l Trade Attorney, Published Author, “Should Free Traders Be Concerned about KORUS and the Short-term Prospects for US Trade Policy? "http://lincicome.blogspot.com/2010/11/should-free-traders-be-concerned-about.html)

\* Second, the Seoul impasse proved without question that the Administration simply is unwilling to expend the political capital necessary to move KORUS as-is, despite the fact that (a) most congressional vote-counters have opined that the KORUS votes are there right now (and certainly will be in the 112th Congress); and (b) as I noted last week, Trade Promotion Authority ensures that no single congressman or senator, no matter how powerful, can sidetrack the FTA's implementing legislation once Obama submits it to Congress. Thus, the President has shown us that, regardless of his pro-KORUS rhetoric, he's unwilling to fight for the current agreement and needs to find a new way forward. I don't happen to think that there is such a "new way," but that doesn't mean that the White House isn't exploring every option out there - including attempts to garner support from the unlikeliest of sources (i.e., Michaud & Co.). And, like I said in point #1, if they're going to re-open the deal anyway....... \* Third, over the past two years, the President has repeatedly proven himself utterly unwilling or unable to confront the protectionist wing of the Democratic Party, so why should this change now? Just because he said he supports KORUS? Come on. Just look at the depressing facts for a second. Obama has placated his anti-trade base (and their congressional muscle) on Buy American, Mexican Trucks, Chinese Chicken Imports, Section 421 (tires), Section 301 (Chinese "green" subsidies), changes to US trade remedies laws, carbon tariffs - the list literally goes on and on. He shelved his early 2009 support for the Colombia and Panama FTAs (and KORUS until last June) at the first whiff of congressional stink. He has embraced mercantilism and adopted a "trade policy" in the NEI that is as unoffensive as it is ineffectual. And when, much to the delight of free traders and the world's leaders, he finally made a "stand" on an absolute no-brainer in KORUS, he quit at the finish line with literally the whole world watching. In short, when Obama's big moment to prove us doubters wrong came, he "voted present." Again. Yet after all of this, John B. (quite condescendingly) assumes that Obama (a) really, really wants to move the KORUS agreement through Congress and (b) will grow a spine and confront Michaud & Co. in order to get that done. Maybe he will, but I'm the naive one for now having a little doubt about that? Really? Physician, heal thyself. Look, everyone knows that completing and implementing big trade agreements like KORUS or NAFTA (or the WTO's Doha Round) requires strong leadership from the top. The President alone has the platform to debunk the myriad protectionist myths out there and to champion the national interest over insular constituent politics. But in order to do this, he must have both the ability and desire to take on partisan protectionists, loudly advocate free trade, and then actually advance and implement the trade liberalization policies that he champions. Bill Clinton and George W. Bush had that ability/desire, and they backed up their rhetoric with action. So far, Barack Obama hasn't.

Political Capital Key- A2: Dickinson

Presidential leadership shapes the agenda

Kuttner 11 (Robert, Senior Fellow – Demos and Co-editor – American Prospect, “Barack Obama's Theory of Power,” The American Prospect, 5-16, http://prospect.org/cs/articles?article=barack\_obamas\_theory\_of\_power)

As the political scientist Richard Neustadt observed in his classic work, Presidential Power, a book that had great influence on President John F. Kennedy, the essence of a president's power is "the power to persuade." Because our divided constitutional system does not allow the president to lead by commanding, presidents amass power by making strategic choices about when to use the latent authority of the presidency to move public and elite opinion and then use that added prestige as clout to move Congress. In one of Neustadt's classic case studies, Harry Truman, a president widely considered a lame duck, nonetheless persuaded the broad public and a Republican Congress in 1947-1948 that the Marshall Plan was a worthy idea. As Neustadt and Burns both observed, though an American chief executive is weak by constitutional design, a president possesses several points of leverage. He can play an effective outside game, motivating and shaping public sentiment, making clear the differences between his values and those of his opposition, and using popular support to box in his opponents and move them in his direction. He can complement the outside bully pulpit with a nimble inside game, uniting his legislative party, bestowing or withholding benefits on opposition legislators, forcing them to take awkward votes, and using the veto. He can also enlist the support of interest groups to pressure Congress, and use media to validate his framing of choices. Done well, all of this signals leadership that often moves the public agenda.

2NC- AT: Political Capital Low

-- Political capital is high –

Bin laden’s death

Bowman 5-2 (Quinn, “Political Checklist: Bin Laden Death Yields Political Capital for Obama,” PBS, 2011, http://www.pbs.org/newshour/rundown/2011/05/political-checklist-biden-laden-death-yields-political-capital-for-obama.html)

A day after the dramatic announcement that U.S. forces had killed Osama bin Laden, the world's most-wanted terrorist, David Chalian, Gwen Ifill and Judy Woodruff assess how the news could impact President Obama's political standing. The team agrees that while it is unclear how this will affect the 2012 race, the moment stands to unite even President Obama's political opponents in praising his administration's successful pursuit of the man who was the driving force behind al-Qaida.

GOP radicalism

Kuttner 5-16(Robert, Senior Fellow – Demos and Co-editor – American Prospect, “Barack Obama's Theory of Power,” The American Prospect, 2011, http://prospect.org/cs/articles?article=barack\_obamas\_theory\_of\_power)

Thanks to the sheer radicalism of the Republican program, the awkward divisions between the Tea Party caucus and the GOP congressional leadership, and the pressure from Wall Street not to play chicken with the debt ceiling, Obama is now tactically better positioned than the Republicans. As Clinton did, he can make the House Republicans blink first, if he chooses to keep playing hardball. Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security continue to be wedge issues that could divide the Republicans and unify most Democrats. It's worth recalling that Obama's popularity dropped when Republicans contended that his health reform would jeopardize Medicare. That was a fable -- but now it's Republicans who are deliberately dismantling Medicare as we know it. Obama, in spite of himself, may also get lucky when it comes to the bipartisan Gang of Six. Sherrod Brown, the progressive Ohio senator, observes that the long-sought grand fiscal bargain to cut Social Security and raise taxes may be a bridge too far. Too many Democrats, not least Senate Democrat Leader Harry Reid, won't agree to more than token trims in Social Security, Brown notes, and too few Republicans would accept tax increases on the rich.

\*\*\*AT: Link Turns\*\*\*

A2: Winner’s Win

Controversial issues aren’t wins

Mann 10 (Thomas, Senior Fellow for Governance Studies – Brookings Institution, “American Politics on the Eve of the Midterm Elections”, November, http://www.brookings.edu/articles/2010/11\_midterm\_elections\_mann.aspx)

HIGHLY POLARISED That perception of failure has been magnified by the highly contentious process by which Obama’s initiatives have been adopted in Congress. America has in recent years developed a highly polarised party system, with striking ideological differences between the parties and unusual unity within each. But these parliamentary-like parties operate in a governmental system in which majorities are unable readily to put their programmes in place. Republicans adopted a strategy of consistent, unified, and aggressive opposition to every major component of the President’s agenda, eschewing negotiation, bargaining and compromise, even on matters of great national import. The Senate filibuster has been the indispensable weapon in killing, weakening, slowing, or discrediting all major legislation proposed by the Democratic majority.

Capital can’t be replenished

Pika 2 (Joseph, et al., Professor of Political Science – University of Delaware, The Politics of the Presidency, Fifth Edition, p. 293-294)

Resources: Political Capital. One of the most important resources for a president is political capital. This is the reservoir of popular and congressional support with which newly elected presidents being their terms. As they make controversial decisions, they “spend” some of their capital, which they are seldom able to replenish. They must decide which proposals merit the expenditure of political capital and in what amounts. Reagan, for example, was willing to spend his capital heavily on reducing the role of the federal government, cutting taxes, and reforming the income tax code, but not on antiabortion or school prayer amendments to the Constitution. Material resources determine which proposals for new programs and the emphasis to be placed on existing programs.

Studies prove

Bond and Fleisher 96 (Jon R. and Richard, Professors of Political Science – Texas A&M University, The President in Legislation, p. 223)

Presidency-centered variables, however, provide an even weaker explanation of presidential success. We found little support for the thesis that the weakness of legislative parties increases the importance of presidential skill or popularity for determining presidential success on roll call votes. Our analysis reveals that presidents reputed to be highly skilled do not win consistently more often than should be expected given the conditions they faced. Similarly, presidents reputed to be unskilled do not win significantly less often than expected. The analysis of presidential popularity reveals that the president's standing in the polls has only a marginal impact on the probability of success or failure.

Not true for Obama

Galston 10 (William, Senior Fellow for Governance Studies – Brookings Institution, “President Barack Obama’s First Two Years: Policy Accomplishments, Political Difficulties”, 11-4, http://www.brookings.edu/papers/2010/110 4\_obama\_galston.aspx)

Rather than doing this, President Obama allowed himself to get trapped in legislative minutia, even as the country remained mired in a kind of economic slump that most Americans had never experienced and could not understand. Their reaction combined confusion and fear, which the president did little to allay. Ironically, a man who attained the presidency largely on the strength of his skills as a communicator did not communicate effectively during his first two years. He paid a steep political price for his failure. From the beginning, the administration operated on two fundamental political premises that turned out to be mistaken. The first was that the economic collapse had opened the door to the comprehensive change Obama had promised. As incoming Chief of Staff Rahm Emanuel famously put it, “you never want a serious crisis to go to waste.” In fact, as Emanuel himself came to realize, there was a tension between the steps needed to arrest the economic decline and the measures needed to actualize the president’s vision of fundamental change. The financial bailout and the stimulus package made it harder, not easier, to pass comprehensive health reform. Second, the administration believed that success would breed success—that the momentum from one legislative victory would spill over into the next. The reverse was closer to the truth: with each difficult vote, it became harder to persuade Democrats from swing districts and states to cast the next one. In the event, House members who feared that they would pay a heavy price if they supported cap-and-trade legislation turned out to have a better grasp of political fundamentals than did administration strategists. The legislative process that produced the health care bill was especially damaging. It lasted much too long and featured side-deals with interest groups and individual senators, made in full public view. Much of the public was dismayed by what it saw. Worse, the seemingly endless health care debate strengthened the view that the president’s agenda was poorly aligned with the economic concerns of the American people. Because the administration never persuaded the public that health reform was vital to our economic future, the entire effort came to be seen as diversionary, even anti-democratic. The health reform bill was surely a moral success; it may turn out to be a policy success; but it is hard to avoid the conclusion that it was—and remains—a political liability. Indeed, most of the Obama agenda turned out to be very unpopular. Of five major policy initiatives undertaken during the first two years, only one—financial regulatory reform—enjoyed majority support. In a September 2010 Gallup survey, 52 percent of the people disapproved of the economic stimulus, 56 percent disapproved of both the auto rescue and the health care bill, and an even larger majority—61 percent—rejected the bailout of financial institutions.[[v]](http://www.brookings.edu/papers/2010/1104_obama_galston.aspx" \l "_edn5) Democrats’ hopes that the people would change their minds about the party’s signature issue—universal health insurance—after the bill passed were not fulfilled. (It remains to be seen whether sentiment will change in coming years as provisions of the bill are phased in—that is, if they survive what will no doubt be stiff challenges in both Congress and the states.)

A2: Public Popularity Link Turn

Not key to agenda – political capital outweighs

Bouie 11 (Jamelle, Journalist and Graduate – University of Virginia, “Political Capital,” The American Prospect, 5-5, http://prospect.org/csnc/blogs/tapped\_archive?month=05&year=2011&base\_name=political\_capital)

Unfortunately, political capital isn't that straightforward. As we saw at the beginning of Obama's presidency, the mere fact of popularity (or a large congressional majority) doesn't guarantee support from key members of Congress. For Obama to actually sign legislation to reform the immigration system, provide money for jobs, or reform corporate taxes, he needs unified support from his party and support from a non-trivial number of Republicans. Unfortunately, Republicans (and plenty of Democrats) aren't interested in better immigration laws, fiscal stimulus, or liberal tax reform. Absent substantive leverage -- and not just high approval ratings -- there isn't much Obama can do to pressure these members (Democrats and Republicans) into supporting his agenda. Indeed, for liberals who want to see Obama use his political capital, it's worth noting that approval-spikes aren't necessarily related to policy success. George H.W. Bush's major domestic initiatives came before his massive post-Gulf War approval bump, and his final year in office saw little policy success. George W. Bush was able to secure No Child Left Behind, the Homeland Security Act, and the Authorization to Use Military Force in the year following 9/11, but the former two either came with pre-9/11 Democratic support or were Democratic initiatives to begin with. To repeat an oft-made point, when it comes to domestic policy, the presidency is a limited office with limited resources. Popularity with the public is a necessary part of presidential success in Congress, but it's far from sufficient.

\*\*\*Impacts\*\*\*

2NC Impact Overview

Korean war outweighs and turns the case ---

A --- Magnitude --- war on the Korean peninsula would escalate to great power conflict given its proximity to Russia and China --- the US would get drawn-in because of our security alliance with the South --- the resulting conflict guarantees extinction

Hayes and Green 10 (Peter, Professor of International Relations – Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology and Director – Nautilus Institute, and Michael Hamel, Victoria University, “The Path Not Taken, the Way Still Open: Denuclearizing the Korean Peninsula and Northeast Asia”, Nautilus Institute Special Report, 1-5, http://www.nautil us.org/fora/security/10001HayesHamalGreen.pdf)

At worst, there is the possibility of nuclear attack1, whether by intention, miscalculation, or merely accident, leading to the resumption of Korean War hostilities. On the Korean Peninsula itself, key population centres are well within short or medium range missiles. The whole of Japan is likely to come within North Korean missile range. Pyongyang has a population of over 2 million, Seoul (close to the North Korean border) 11 million, and Tokyo over 20 million. Even a limited nuclear exchange would result in a holocaust of unprecedented proportions. But the catastrophe within the region would not be the only outcome. New research indicates that even a limited nuclear war in the region would rearrange our global climate far more quickly than global warming. Westberg draws attention to new studies modelling the effects of even a limited nuclear exchange involving approximately 100 Hiroshima-sized 15 kt bombs2 (by comparison it should be noted that the United States currently deploys warheads in the range 100 to 477 kt, that is, individual warheads equivalent in yield to a range of 6 to 32 Hiroshimas).The studies indicate that the soot from the fires produced would lead to a decrease in global temperature by 1.25 degrees Celsius for a period of 6-8 years.3 In Westberg’s view: That is not global winter, but the nuclear darkness will cause a deeper drop in temperature than at any time during the last 1000 years. The temperature over the continents would decrease substantially more than the global average. A decrease in rainfall over the continents would also follow…The period of nuclear darkness will cause much greater decrease in grain production than 5% and it will continue for many years...hundreds of millions of people will die from hunger…To make matters even worse, such amounts of smoke injected into the stratosphere would cause a huge reduction in the Earth’s protective ozone.4 These, of course, are not the only consequences. Reactors might also be targeted, causing further mayhem and downwind radiation effects, superimposed on a smoking, radiating ruin left by nuclear next-use. Millions of refugees would flee the affected regions. The direct impacts, and the follow-on impacts on the global economy via ecological and food insecurity, could make the present global financial crisis pale by comparison. How the great powers, especially the nuclear weapons states respond to such a crisis, and in particular, whether nuclear weapons are used in response to nuclear first-use, could make or break the global non proliferation and disarmament regimes. There could be many unanticipated impacts on regional and global security relationships5, with subsequent nuclear breakout and geopolitical turbulence, including possible loss-of-control over fissile material or warheads in the chaos of nuclear war, and aftermath chain-reaction affects involving other potential proliferant states. The Korean nuclear proliferation issue is not just a regional threat but a global one that warrants priority consideration from the international community.

B --- Timeframe and probability --- conflict on the peninsula is likely and would quickly escalate

Doyne 10 (Shannon, Reporter – NYT, and Holly Ojalvo, New York Times – Learning Blog, 12-3, http://learning .blogs.nytimes.com/2010/12/03/on-the-brink-teaching-about-tension-in-north-and-south-korea/?src=twrhp)

On the Brink: Teaching About Tension in North and South Korea

Skirmishes between North Korea and South Korea have been far from rare in recent years, but the shots exchanged last week brought a new level of tension between the two nations — and to world diplomacy.

Recently, [leaked intelligence](http://www.nytimes.com/2010/11/30/world/asia/30korea.html) revealed that South Korea and the United States had discussed a situation that included the fall of the communist regime in North Korea and the subsequent reunification of Korea. North Korea has announced that it believes South Korea [intends to invade](http://www.nytimes.com/2010/12/02/world/asia/02korea.html), a troubling piece of information, as it is now known that North Korea has a new uranium enriching program.

C --- Turns the case ---

Impact- Korea War

Rejection causes Korean war --- it’s a key test of U.S. commitment to the region

Wharton 11 (Knowledge@Wharton, “U.S.-South Korea Trade Pact: A Turning Point for American Exports?”, 1-12, http://knowledge.wharton.upenn.edu/article.cfm?articleid=2671)

Now it seems as if the pessimists may have been wrong all along. Much to the surprise of many who had given up on the issue, the U.S. and South Korea finally reached agreement on a revised pact early in December. If, as many anticipate, the deal is approved by the new Congress next spring, it will be by far the largest U.S. trade pact since NAFTA went into effect in 1994. No longer a small, struggling market, South Korea imports $250 billion in manufactured goods from the rest of the world each year. Its industrial market is much larger and more sophisticated than that of other partners in recent U.S. free-trade pacts. For U.S. exporters, the deal is "huge news," says Charles Dittrich, vice president for regional trade initiatives at the Washington-based National Foreign Trade Council (NFTC). "We have turned a corner -- it means another $11 billion in U.S. exports annually," he notes, citing an analysis by the U.S. International Trade Commission. "The Obama administration has seized the moment and the opportunity." Calling the deal "a win-win for both sides," Laura Baughman, president of Trade Partnership Worldwide, a Washington consultancy, notes that the pact will go beyond merchandise exports and spark demand for a significant volume of U.S. services in such areas as banking, software and tourism. "In economic terms, this is by far the most important [bilateral] free-trade agreement" to date, she says. A great deal is at stake beyond Korea. Approval of the pact could open the door wide to approval of the two other long-delayed U.S. bilateral free-trade deals -- with Colombia (signed by both governments in 2006) and Panama (2007). It could also fuel support for even more ambitious U.S. trade initiatives, such as the Trans-Pacific Partnership, which would add Malaysia, New Zealand and Vietnam to an Asian Rim free-trade area of U.S. partners that already encompasses Australia and Chile. While the Obama administration failed to act on the three pending agreements from the Bush years, some of the country's largest trading partners were aggressively moving forward with their own pacts, threatening the long-term competitiveness of U.S. exporters in many key markets. For example, the European Union signed its own pact with South Korea, and the EU is currently negotiating deals with Argentina, Brazil, Canada and India, among others. Meanwhile, China is negotiating or planning to negotiate bilateral agreements with the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), Australia, Costa Rica and India -- but not with the United States. And Japan is negotiating with Australia, the Gulf Cooperation Council, India and New Zealand. The list goes on. The potential reverberations of those free-trade agreements could be very harmful for U.S. exporters if the U.S.-Korea deal doesn't go through, says Rob Mulligan, who heads the Washington office of the U.S. Council for International Business (USCIB), which represents U.S. companies at the International Chamber of Commerce. Even the timing for approval is of the essence, says William Reinsch, president of the NFTC. The pact needs to go into effect before July 1, when the EU-South Korea deal becomes effective, or the latter pact will set key technical standards for trade between the United States and South Korea. What's more, the fate of the pact has national security implications, says Brian Pomper, a partner at the Akin Gump law firm in Washington, D.C. and a former trade counsel for Sen. Max Baucus, a Montana Democrat who heads the Senate Finance Committee. With a nuclear-armed North Korea once more threatening military conflict, "some may wonder how can the United States give South Korea a stiff arm" by rejecting the deal? South Korean President Lee Myung-Bak has been widely criticized at home for his weak and indecisive response to a recent artillery attack by North Korea. If Congress rejects the deal, it will be a slap in Lee's face. So beyond economic considerations, Pomper says, "this [deal] is the sort of symbol of U.S. leadership in Asia that many other countries -- who are looking at China with a nervous eye -- have been [seeking]. It is reasserting American interests in Asia. The President has put his reputation on the line."

Impact- Korea War- Bioweapons

They’ll use bioweapons --- including smallpox

Jung 9 (Sung-Ki, “N. Korea Has 13 Types of Biological Weapons”, Korea Times, 10-5, http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/nation/2009/10/113\_52961.html)

North Korea is believed to possess 13 types of viruses and germs that it can readily use in the event of a conflict, a ruling party lawmaker said Monday, citing a defense ministry report. The North is believed to be one of the world's largest possessors of chemical and biological weapons. South Korea suspects the communist neighbor has up to 5,000 tons of chemical agents. During a National Assembly audit of the Ministry of National Defense, Rep. Kim Ock-lee of the Grand National Party said diseases that could be caused by North Korean biological weapons include cholera, pest, yellow fever, smallpox, eruptive typhus, typhoid fever and dysentery.

Extinction

Singer 1 (Clifford E., Professor of Nuclear Engineering and Director of the Program in Arms Control, Disarmament, and International Security – University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, “Will Mankind Survive the Millennium?”, http://www.acdis.uiuc.edu/research/S&Ps/2001-Sp/S&P\_XIII/Singer.htm)

There are, however, two technologies currently under development that may pose a more serious threat to human survival. The first and most immediate is biological warfare combined with genetic engineering. Smallpox is the most fearsome of natural biological warfare agents in existence. By the end of the next decade, global immunity to smallpox will likely be at a low unprecedented since the emergence of this disease in the distant past, while the opportunity for it to spread rapidly across the globe will be at an all time high. In the absence of other complications such as nuclear war near the peak of an epidemic, developed countries may respond with quarantine and vaccination to limit the damage. Otherwise mortality there may match the rate of 30 percent or more expected in unprepared developing countries. With respect to genetic engineering using currently available knowledge and technology, the simple expedient of spreading an ample mixture of coat protein variants could render a vaccination response largely ineffective, but this would otherwise not be expected to substantially increase overall mortality rates. With development of new biological technology, however, there is a possibility that a variety of infectious agents may be engineered for combinations of greater than natural virulence and mortality, rather than just to overwhelm currently available antibiotics or vaccines. There is no a priori known upper limit to the power of this type of technology base, and thus the survival of a globally connected human family may be in question when and if this is achieved.

Impact- Korea War- A2: Asia Impact D

Asian conflict is extremely likely --- Korea is the trigger

Tay 10 (Simon, Chair – Singapore Institute of International Affairs, “Asia's Unstable Rise will Get Tougher in 2011”, Today Online, 12-29, http://www.todayonline.com/Commentary/EDC101229-0000091/Asias-unstable-rise-will-get-tougher-in-2011)

Many herald Asia's rise in the wake of the financial crisis. Compared to the United States and Europe, prospects in the region do look good. Events both recent and over the year, however, warn us not to assume the phenomenon is irresistible. While rising, the region is exposed to continuing sources of instability. The current turmoil on the Korean peninsula demonstrates this vividly. An unresolved relic of the Cold War, Pyongyang's nuclear ambitions have been difficult and prolonged despite the diplomatic efforts of the six-party talks. But it was not nuclear warheads that have created the current turmoil. A torpedo sank the Cheonan in March and in November, artillery shells pummelled South Korean military and civilian installations on the disputed island of Yeongpyeong. Old-fashioned weapons are more than enough to create a new sense of uncertainty. Nothing done since March has rebuilt stability. Never mind that South Korea is a major economy and hosted the recent G-20 summit, the first held in Asia. Economic growth in the country, as in much of Asia, is built on tenuous foundations of peace. Unable to manage the situation, Seoul has reinvigorated its old alliance with the US. Ties with China are inevitably affected. Like most Asians, South Korea has looked to the Chinese economy to drive growth. Indeed, it is one of the few countries in Asia to enjoy a trade surplus with China. There was earlier talk about a free trade agreement with Beijing, either bilaterally or including Japan as a third partner. Such economic diplomacy now looks less likely. China is the only country believed to be able to influence Pyongyang. But what Beijing has done since Cheonan in March is judged by many in South Korea as being less than helpful. This highlights a second question about the rise of Asia: The role and attitude of China. There is no single Asia. Much - perhaps too much - depends on this giant country that is changing as it rises. Economically, China is the magnet for the region's future growth. Interdependence in trade and investment with South Korea, Japan, Asean and even Taiwan - especially after their free trade agreement - is real and growing. The picture in South Asia is similar, with China now India's No 1 trade partner. Politically, however, Beijing has been much less attractive in 2010. Events on the Korean peninsula come on top of controversies with Asean members in the South China Sea as well as disputes with Japan over the Senkaku Islands. These developments were surprising as China has, for over a decade, sought to befriend and charm Asean neighbours. The current Tokyo leaders had wanted better ties with Beijing. Visiting India in December, for the first time in five years, Chinese Premier Wen Jiabao signed business deals worth US$16 billion ($20.7 billion). But the underlying competition between the two Asian giants continues to simmer. There is strategic competition over sea power as well as distant points in the Himalayas and political influence, as India vies for a seat on the United Nations Security Council where China is the only current Asian permanent representative. That the Chinese leader went on to visit Pakistan also did not escape notice. Many in New Delhi believe Beijing continues to support their old rival in order to preoccupy India. Even in economic relations, trade tensions belie the increase in flows and India has slapped tariffs on a range of Chinese imports including the telecoms sector. The nature of China and its diplomacy are being tested, and how Beijing has acted and will act in the coming months will be judged as showing its character as it grows. Some already ascribe ambition and arrogance to China, while others will wait and see. Perceptions will shape how other Asians react. How the Chinese leadership approach the US-China Summit to be held next month will be looked at carefully not only by Americans but also by other Asians. It is to Asia's credit that through the financial crisis and 2010, the region has continued to rise. But challenges in 2011 continue and, indeed, may be even tougher, not only in economics but the under-lying politics. Growth will be tested but even fundamental peace and stability will come under stress.

Impact- Korea War- Timeframe and Probability

Korean conflict is both likely and will quickly escalate without a strong US-South Korea alliance

Daily Times 7-15 – “North Korea Poses ‘very real’ threat: Mullen”, 2011, http://www.dailytimes.com.pk/default.asp?page=2011\07\15\story\_15-7-2011\_pg4\_1

SEOUL: North Korea poses a “very real” threat to peace and is likely to mount fresh attacks on South Korea unless a strong deterrent is in place, the top US military officer said Thursday. In comments delivered at a time of high cross-border tensions Admiral Mike Mullen said Pyongyang had also given no indication it would drop its nuclear ambitions. “The threat (from the North) remains very real,” Mullen, chairman of the US Joint Chiefs of Staff told to pool reporters after attending the inauguration of a new commander of US forces in South Korea. “North Korea shows no signs of relenting in pursuit of its nuclear capabilities, and I’m not convinced that they won’t provoke again.” Mullen began his Asian tour in Beijing, where he said he urged China “to play a leadership role” in restraining its ally the North. Tensions on the Korean peninsula have flared since the South accused the North of torpedoing one of its warships with the loss of 46 lives in March 2010. The North denied the charge but last November shelled a border island, killing four South Koreans including two civilians and briefly sparking fears of war. In recent weeks the North’s military has threatened reprisals for anti-Pyongyang signs displayed by the South’s troops. It also vows to hit back for the now-banned use by some Seoul military units of portraits of the North’s ruling family as shooting-range targets. Mullen said US and South Korean forces “have a sense of urgency to essentially work on planning to deter the North from further provocations. Whether they will be deterred or not, that’s to be seen.” Earlier Thursday, army General James Thurman took over as commander of the 28,500 US troops in South Korea and vowed to counter any provocations. He will also head the United Nations Command, a legacy of the 1950-53 war in which the US spearheaded a UN force defending the South, and the South Korea-US Combined Forces Command. Thurman, quoted by Yonhap news agency, said both Seoul and Washington are “prepared to honour our commitments, provide stability, deter conflict and, if we must, fight and win.” The general said the alliance “stands ready to counter any provocation intended to destabilise the Korean peninsula”. Mullen told reporters that both the North’s leadership succession plan and a major anniversary next year are factors in its behaviour. Leader Kim Jong-Il is preparing his youngest son Jong-Un as eventual successor. Some analysts believe the son’s role may be formally announced next year, the 100th anniversary of the birth of founding president Kim Il-Sung. Kim’s regime has vowed to create a “great, powerful and prosperous” nation to mark the anniversary of his late father’s birth. Mullen said the succession plan was “not an insignificant part of the whole provocation cycle from my perspective, and if you look back historically to other succession timeframes”. But he said last year’s attacks created a greater sense of urgency for the US-South Korea alliance. “And the expectation, at least from my perspective, is that unless the leadership in the North is deterred, they will continue to do that (attack).”

Impact- Relations

SKFTA’s key to US/South Korean relations

Klingner 9 (Bruce, Senior Research Fellow for Northeast Asia – Heritage Foundation and Danielle Markheim, Senior Analyst in Trade Policy – Heritage Foundation, “KORUS FTA Strengthens the U.S. Economy and Alliance with Korea”, Heritage WebMemo #2485, 6-15, http://heritage.org/Research/Reports/2009/06/KORUS-FTA-Strengthens-the-US-Economy-and-Alliance-with-Korea)

During their June 16 summit, Presidents Barack Obama and Lee Myung-bak will discuss a daunting agenda filled with challenges. Though overshadowed by North Korean provocations, a critically important issue for both countries is reviving the Korea-U.S. free trade agreement (KORUS FTA). Although signed in June 2007, the agreement has yet to be ratified--shunned by the Obama Administration, the Democratic leadership in Congress, and the usual purveyors of protectionism. This important agreement, which would help bolster America's economic and strategic relationship with a critical ally, is gathering dust, shelved indefinitely. A Costly Mistake Continuing to ignore the KORUS FTA would be a costly mistake. The FTA would add an estimated $10 billion to $12 billion to U.S. GDP annually, promote job growth, and expand market access for American businesses by eliminating 95 percent of bilateral tariffs. The FTA would also usher in a new era for U.S. economic engagement with East Asia and expanded opportunities for the American economy. The agreement resolves many of the problems currently thwarting the full economic potential of U.S.-South Korea bilateral trade by: -Giving U.S. businesses an important bridgehead into the Asian market; -Counterbalancing South Korea's growing trade ties with China; -Potentially allowing the U.S. to regain its position as Seoul's preeminent trade partner; -Serving as a powerful statement of Washington's commitment to Asia and broaden the U.S.-South Korea relationship beyond the military alliance; and -Establishing formal channels through which ongoing trade concerns can be addressed.

Relations stop Korean war and turn every impact

Pritchard 10 (Charles L., Visiting Fellow – Brookings Institution, and Scott Snyder, Director – Center for U.S.-Korea Policy and Senior Associate in the International Relations Program – Asia Foundation, U.S. Policy Toward the Korean Peninsula, p. 37)

U.S.-South Korea Relations Strong alliance coordination with South Korea has ensured peninsular stability for more than five decades, initially in response to North Korea's conventional threat and now in promoting a coordinated response to North Korea's efforts to develop nuclear weapons. While successfully deterring North Korea, the alliance also provided the political stability necessary for South Korea's economic and political transformation into a leading market economy with a vibrant democratic political system. South Korea's democratic transformation has allowed a more robust and enduring partnership with the United States that also applies to a growing list of regional and global security, economic, and political issues beyond North Korea. Presidents Obama and Lee recognized the potential for such cooperation through the adoption of a Joint Vision Statement at their White House meeting in June 2009.— Citing shared values between the two countries, the statement outlines an agenda for broadened global cooperation on peacekeeping, postconflict stabilization, and development assistance, as well as for addressing a wide range of common challenges to human security, including "terrorism, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, piracy, organized crime and narcotics, climate change, poverty, infringement on human rights, energy security, and epidemic disease.

Impact- Asian Heg

SKFTA is key to U.S. leadership in Asia

Hill 7 (Christopher, Assistant Secretary for East Asian and Pacific Affairs – U.S. Department of State, “The United States-South Korea FTA: The Foreign Policy Implications”, 6-13, http://merln.ndu.edu/archivepdf/EAP/State/86408 .pdf)

Third, the KORUS FTA will anchor our strategic economic position in East Asia. East Asia and the Pacific region are undergoing a wave of economic integration, with countries binding themselves closer together through steady progress in liberalization of trade and investment. Several plurilateral free trade agreements are in play, and some 19 free trade agreements have gone into force between Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) economies, with at least an equal number of future agreements under negotiation or exploration. The United States has participated as a leader via our gold-standard FTAs with Australia and Singapore. Ratification of the KORUS FTA will further cement U.S. leadership in the dynamic Asian region and debunk critics who falsely complain that we’ve neglected this part of the world. South Korea, like the United States, has taken an aggressive approach toward binding trade liberalization. It has completed FTAs with Chile and the European Free Trade Area (EFTA) and is working on a second phase of negotiations with five of the ten ASEAN countries (having already completed a framework and trade in goods agreement). South Korea is also in the final stages of FTA negotiations with Canada, negotiating an agreement with India, just starting negotiations with the EU, and is studying the feasibility of launching an FTA with China. Negotiations with Japan have been on hold the last two years, but it is possible they could be revived. Thus, by ratifying the KORUS FTA, our firms will enjoy a competitive advantage in South Korea – Asia’s third-largest economy – ahead of others. On the other hand, if we fail to ratify, we will not just stand still, we will move backwards.

Global nuclear war

Walton 7 (C. Dale, Lecturer in International Relations and Strategic Studies – University of Reading, Geopolitics and the Great Powers in the 21st Century, p. 49)

Obviously, it is of vital importance to the United States that the PRC does not become the hegemon of Eastern Eurasia. As rioted above, however, regardless of what Washington does. China’s success in such an endeavor is not as easily attainable as pessimists might assume. The PRC appears to be on track to be a very great power indeed. hut geopolitical conditions are not favorable for any Chinese effort to establish sole hegemony; a robust multipolar system should suffice to keep China in check, even with only minimal American intervention in local squabbles. The more worrisome danger is that Beijing will cooperate with a great power partner, establishing a very muscular axis. Such an entity would present a critical danger to the balance of power, thus both necessitating very active American intervention in Eastern Eurasia and creating the underlying conditions for a massive, and probably nuclear, great power war. Absent such a “super—threat,” however, the demands on American leaders ill be far more subtle: creating the conditions for Washington’s gentle decline from playing the role of unipolar quasi-hegemony to being “merely” the greatest of time worlds powers, while aiding in the creation of a healthy multipolar system that is not marked by close great power alliances.

Impact- US Economy

KORUS key to US economy- exports, services, investment, business interaction

Meltzer and Cardenas 7-29 – Joshua, Brookings Institution Fellow on Global Economy and Development; Mauricio, Brookings Institution Director of the Latin America Initiative, “Korea, Columbia, Panama: Pending Trade Accords Offer Economic and Strategic Gains for the United States”, http://www.brookings.edu/papers/2011/07\_trade\_accords\_cardenas\_meltzer.aspx

The economic benefits to the United States from KORUS are especially significant, as the agreement will provide preferential market access to the world’s 11th largest—and a fast-growing—economy. In 2010, U.S.-Korea trade was worth $88 billion, comprising U.S. exports of $39 billion and imports of $49 billion, making Korea the United States’ seventh largest trading partner. According to the independent, quasi-judicial U.S. International Trade Commission (ITC), exports resulting from KORUS will increase the U.S. gross domestic product (GDP) by up to $12 billion. This constitutes a remarkable gain in both real and percentage terms. To the United States, KORUS offers diverse economic advantages. Most strikingly, KORUS will open Korea’s service market to U.S. exports, allowing the United States to exploit its competitive advantages in financial services, education and information and communications technologies. The agreement also will lead to increased imports from Korea, which in turn will help the United States achieve greater economic specialization. The likely effects of more specialization—and of increased Korean investment in the United States—include greater U.S. efficiency, productivity, economic growth and job growth. Meanwhile, U.S. investors will gain new opportunities in the increasingly active Asia-Pacific region. Lately, passage of KORUS has assumed enhanced importance with the impasse in the World Trade Organization’s Doha Round. No longer can the United States reasonably anticipate that Doha will lead to improved access to the Korean market. Moreover, an FTA between Korea and the European Union (EU) that took effect July 1st confers preferential access to European exporters, undermining the competitiveness of U.S. businesses in Korea. Even before the European FTA, the United States had been losing valuable ground in Korea. Between 2000 and 2010, the United States fell from first to third in the ranking of Korea’s trading partners (reversing positions with China), as U.S. products declined from 18 to only 9 percent of Korean imports. Failure to approve the agreement can be expected to lead to a further decline. These moves will strongly assist U.S. producers of electronic equipment, metals, agricultural products, autos and other consumer goods. For example, agricultural exports are expected to rise $1.8 billion per year. On the services front, KORUS will increase U.S. businesses’ access to Korea’s $560 billion services market. Financial services providers, the insurance industry and transportation firms stand to benefit substantially. KORUS usefully builds on the link between investment and services by improving the ability of U.S. law firms to establish offices in Korea. In addition, the agreement establishes a Professional Services Working Group that will address the interests of U.S. providers of legal, accounting and engineering services, provided that U.S. representatives engage actively in the group. KORUS also requires that regulations affecting services be developed transparently and that the business community be informed of their development and have an opportunity to provide comments, which the Korean government must answer. On the investment front, KORUS affords a chance to strengthen a bilateral investment relationship that probably is underdeveloped. In 2009, the U.S. foreign direct investment flow to Korea was $3.4 billion, while there was a net outflow of Korean foreign direct investment to the United States of $255 million. KORUS supports market access for U.S. investors with investment protection provisions, strong intellectual property protection, dispute settlement provisions, a requirement for transparently developed and implemented investment regulations and a similar requirement for open, fair and impartial judicial proceedings. All this should markedly improve the Korean investment climate for U.S. business. It will strengthen the rule of law, reducing uncertainty and the risk of investing in Korea. On the governance side, KORUS establishes various committees to monitor implementation of the agreement. The most significant of these is the Joint Committee that is to meet annually at the level of the U.S. Trade Representative and Korea’s Trade Minister to discuss not only implementation but also ways to expand trade further. KORUS establishes committees to oversee the goods and financial services commitments, among others, and working groups that will seek to increase cooperation between U.S. and Korean agencies responsible for regulating the automotive sector and professional services. These committees and working groups, enriched through regular interaction between U.S. and Korean trade officials, should increase levels of trust and understanding of each county’s regulatory systems and help officials identify opportunities to deepen the bilateral economic relationship.

SKFTA key to U.S. exports --- backbone of growth

Gerwin 10 (Edward F., Senior Fellow for Trade and Global Economic Policy – Third Way, “5 Reasons America Needs Korea Free Trade Deal”, Wall Street Journal, 12-16, http://blogs.wsj.com/economics/2010/12/16/guest-contribution-5-reasons-america-needs-korea-free-trade-deal/)

But beyond autos and animals, there are other key reasons why America needs the Korea FTA. Here are five: 1. America Must Export to Grow. Over the next 5 years, an astounding 87% of global growth will take place outside the United States. By 2030, the world is will have some 2 billion new middle class consumers. Meanwhile, America is growing at an anemic 2.5%. To grow, we must export. Of the world’s 12 largest economies, we are dead last in the share that exports add to our economy. The Korea FTA can help to reverse this, by enabling our manufacturers, farmers and service firms to tap into a vibrant Korean market that is growing twice as fast as ours. 2. America’s Exporters and Workers Deserve Fairness. Korea imposes an array of unfair trade barriers on American exports. Harley-Davidson “Fat Boy” motorcycles are subject to 8% duties, varieties of Campbell’s soup face duties of 30% and U.S. farm products face an average applied duty of 52%. Additionally, U .S. manufacturers and farmers are often shut out of Korea’s opaque regulatory process. These and others barriers are unfair to American companies and their workers. But they are often entirely legal under international trade rules. Only a reciprocal trade deal will remove or reduce Korea’s trade barriers on a comprehensive basis, by eliminating or significantly reducing tariffs, opening up Korea’s services and procurement sectors and making Korea’s regulatory and customs rules more transparent. Harleys, for instance, would be duty-free immediately, as would two-thirds of American farm exports. 3. America Gets A Good Deal. Free Trade Agreements work for America. In 2009, our FTAs with 17 countries accounted for 40% of U.S. goods exports and 31% of our goods imports. One reason for the success of FTAs in promoting U.S. exports is that we often have more to gain because other countries must usually eliminate higher trade barriers than the United States. This is certainly true of Korea. Under the FTA, for example, Korea would eliminate duties that effectively average 9%, while America would eliminate duties that average only 3.5%. 4. America Must Compete for Trade Deals — or Fall Behind. America can get back in the game by implementing the Korea FTA. While we have been on the sidelines, competitors like China, the European Union, India and Japan have aggressively pursued new trade deals to win fairer treatment for their exports. Asia-Pacific countries have been particularly active, and are now considering or negotiating over 75 new trade deals. The EU-Korea FTA should take effect next year and would ultimately provide EU products with a price advantage in Korea averaging 9% over non-FTA products. America must secure similar benefits to assure that our companies can gain new business and keep current sales to Korea. For example, without an FTA, U.S. pork would be priced out of South Korea within a decade, and American pork producers would lose their sixth largest export market and sales of $215 million.

Impact- Trade

KORUS is crucial to expanding trade

Meltzer and Cardenas 7-29 – Joshua, Brookings Institution Fellow on Global Economy and Development; Mauricio, Brookings Institution Director of the Latin America Initiative, “Korea, Columbia, Panama: Pending Trade Accords Offer Economic and Strategic Gains for the United States”, http://www.brookings.edu/papers/2011/07\_trade\_accords\_cardenas\_meltzer.aspx

Congressional passage of KORUS will send an important signal to all countries in the Asia-Pacific region that the United States intends to remain economically engaged with them, rather than retreat behind a wall of trade barriers, and is prepared to lead development of the rules and norms governing trade and investment in the region. KORUS will provide an important economic complement to the strong, historically rooted U.S. military alliance with Korea. It also will signal a renewed commitment by the United States in shaping Asia’s economic architecture. The last decade has seen declining U.S. economic significance in Asia. Just as the United States has slipped from first to third in its ranking as a trading partner of Korea, similar drops are occurring with respect to Japan, Indonesia, Malaysia and other Asia-Pacific economic powers. In all of Northeast and Southeast Asia, the United States has only one FTA in effect, an accord with the Republic of Singapore. Passage of KORUS now would be particularly timely, both as a sign of U.S. engagement with Asia and as a mechanism for ensuring robust growth in U.S.-Asia trade and investment. To illustrate how KORUS might affect U.S. interests throughout the region, consider regulatory transparency. The KORUS transparency requirements could serve as a model for how countries can set and implement standards. They might for example, influence the unfolding Trans-Pacific Partnership negotiations, talks that could set the stage for a broader Asia-Pacific FTA. U.S. producers, investors and providers of commercial and professional services could only benefit from a regional trend toward greater transparency and the lifting of barriers that would ensue. Other KORUS provisions favorable to the United States could function as similar benchmarks in the development of U.S. relations with Asia-Pacific nations and organizations.

Extinction

Pazner 8 (Michael J., Faculty – New York Institute of Finance, Financial Armageddon: Protect Your Future from Economic Collapse, p. 137-138)

The rise in isolationism and protectionism will bring about ever more heated arguments and dangerous confrontations over shared sources of oil, gas, and other key commodities as well as factors of production that must, out of necessity, be acquired from less-than-friendly nations. Whether involving raw materials used in strategic industries or basic necessities such as food, water, and energy, efforts to secure adequate supplies will take increasing precedence in a world where demand seems constantly out of kilter with supply. Disputes over the misuse, overuse, and pollution of the environment and natural resources will become more commonplace. Around the world, such tensions will give rise to full-scale military encounters, often with minimal provocation. In some instances, economic conditions will serve as a convenient pretext for conflicts that stem from cultural and religious differences. Alternatively, nations may look to divert attention away from domestic problems by channeling frustration and populist sentiment toward other countries and cultures. Enabled by cheap technology and the waning threat of American retribution, terrorist groups will likely boost the frequency and scale of their horrifying attacks, bringing the threat of random violence to a whole new level. Turbulent conditions will encourage aggressive saber rattling and interdictions by rogue nations running amok. Age-old clashes will also take on a new, more heated sense of urgency. China will likely assume an increasingly belligerent posture toward Taiwan, while Iran may embark on overt colonization of its neighbors in the Mideast. Israel, for its part, may look to draw a dwindling list of allies from around the world into a growing number of conflicts. Some observers, like John Mearsheimer, a political scientists at the University of Chicago, have even speculated that an “intense confrontation” between the United States and China is “inevitable” at some point. More than a few disputes will turn out to be almost wholly ideological. Growing cultural and religious differences will be transformed from wars of words to battles soaked in blood. Long-simmering resentments could also degenerate quickly, spurring the basest of human instincts and triggering genocidal acts. Terrorists employing biological or nuclear weapons will vie with conventional forces using jets, cruise missiles, and bunker-busting bombs to cause widespread destruction. Many will interpret stepped-up conflicts between Muslims and Western societies as the beginnings of a new world war.

Impact- Trade

SKFTA jump-starts global trade liberalization

Hill 7 (Christopher, Assistant Secretary for East Asian and Pacific Affairs – U.S. Department of State, “The United States-South Korea FTA: The Foreign Policy Implications”, 6-13, http://merln.ndu.edu/archivepdf/EAP/State/86408 .pdf)

Fourth, and finally, the KORUS FTA will give impetus to global trade liberalization: By demonstrating that two large, advanced economies can conclude a highquality agreement eliminating both tariff and non-tariff barriers to trade and investment, the KORUS FTA could help spur further trade liberalization both within the Asia- Pacific region and globally. It will send a signal to our other trading partners, encouraging them to open their economies and creating a competitive dynamic that would spur more rapid progress on the multilateral trade liberalization front. Conclusion The impact of this FTA will go far beyond bilateral commercial benefits. It is a powerful symbol of the U.S.-South Korea partnership, augmenting our longstanding bilateral security alliance and the robust ties between the South Korean and American people. It will create a new dynamic, reflecting both the growing sophistication of our bilateral relationship and the Republic of Korea’s increasingly positive role in the world.

Impact- Clean Tech

Deal is key to U.S. clean tech leadership

Kim 10 (Anthony, Policy Analyst in the Center for International Trade and Economics – Heritage Foundation, “Time to Build a Clean Energy Future through the KORUS FTA”, Heritage WebMemo #2943, 6-28, http://heritage.org/Research/Reports/2010/06/Time-to-Build-a-Clean-Energy-Future-through-the-KORUS-FTA)

“Clean energy” has become a political and economic buzzword for the broad policy debate on how to deal with energy challenges and achieve green growth in the future. Indeed, the global clean energy industry presents a critical market opportunity for the United States, one that could lead to dynamic exports and job creation. In order to capitalize on such economic opportunities, America’s clean energy strategy must be driven by practical policy actions that, at their core, all promote free trade. The pending Korea–U.S. Free Trade Agreement, known as the KORUS FTA, is a ready-made vehicle for pioneering a clean energy future and ensuring greater prosperity in the two nations. If President Obama is genuinely serious about clean energy and successfully expanding markets for American entrepreneurs, he should submit the KORUS FTA for congressional ratification without further delay, according to the November 2010 timetable he indicated during the recent G-20 summit in Toronto. Freer Trade Is Key to Clean Energy and Protecting the Environment When a country lowers its barriers to trade, it opens its economy to competitive opportunities for greater efficiency and dynamic economic growth. Competition spurs the movement of labor and capital from industries that cannot compete to those that can, enabling a nation to both produce more efficiently and attract new investment. The need to adhere to such a strategy is no less important today than in previous eras. Free trade expands the base for vibrant innovation and growth. In countries around the world, trade has been shown to be one of the greatest drivers of technological change. Clean energy technology is no exception. Indeed, the most practical improvements in clean energy technology efficiency and environmental protection over the past decades have not stemmed from government mandates, but by freer trade and economic freedom. The KORUS FTA: Compelling Case for Advancing Green Growth In 2007, the U.S. and South Korea concluded a free trade pact that in part reflects and in part encourages a virtuous economic relationship between the two nations. The agreement has been characterized as “strong and balanced” and as “an agreement for the 21st century.” Key features of the agreed trade deal include reducing tariff rates on 95 percent of all consumer and industrial products, improving transparency and intellectual property rights protection, and addressing standards and regulations. Indeed, if timely ratified, America firmly stands to gain from the KORUS FTA, particularly given its competitive edge in innovation, commercialization, and deployment of advanced technologies. South Korea has been heralded as a leader in crafting green growth strategies in recent years. Since 2008, South Korean President Lee Myung-bak’s long-term vision of “Low Carbon, Green Growth” has driven policy to dramatically expand clean energy usage. Significant components of the plan aim to attract international partners and foreign technologies. This presents a tremendous market opportunity for American entrepreneurs. According to the U.S. Department of Commerce, most if not all of the targeted economic sectors under the “green growth vision” are in sectors of U.S. competitive strength. Key U.S. exports to those sectors include industrial electronic machinery, auto parts, power generation equipment, and scientific equipment. These exports are all directly or indirectly related to clean energy technology. Time for Action As America has a comparative advantage over South Korea in commercializing and deploying clean energy technology such as solar, wind, nuclear, and smart grids, the trade pact would capitalize on an existing strength. The U.S. need not fear clean energy competition from South Korea. Business and workers in both countries would benefit. Unfortunately, the final step for the KORUS FTA has been stymied by U.S. politics. Bowing to domestic labor union pressure, President Obama has not moved the agreement forward for congressional ratification, a decision that is costing America jobs and technological advancement. If America wants to tap into the multi-billion-dollar market opportunity for its entrepreneurs and workers, the time to act is now. Specifically: President Obama should firmly abide by his timeline for the passage of the KORUS FTA as that he announced at the G 20 summit in Toronto; and Congress should not allow domestic political considerations to trump the tremendous market opportunities available in the KORUS FTA. South Korea has been actively moving forward free trade deals with other countries. For example, South Korea is poised to ratify a landmark free trade agreement with the European Union, a move that could undermine U.S. competitiveness in various sectors, including clean energy technology. As the Department of Commerce correctly predicts, “U.S. companies would be clearly disadvantaged” if South Korea’s other pending free trade agreements become effective without action on the KORUS FTA. Liberalizing Trade: A Fundamental Part of Clean Energy This year marks the 60th anniversary of the Korean War, a conflict in which America and South Korea fought together in defense of freedom and democracy. There could be no more appropriate time to implement the KORUS FTA. Accelerating U.S. clean energy innovation and production has become an economic necessity for America’s future. Liberalizing trade should be a fundamental part of any U.S. strategy to promote clean energy technology. The KORUS FTA poses a practical policy choice to achieve that goal. Now is the time for President Obama to act.

Prevents extinction from resource wars, great power competition, and warming

Klarevas 9 (Louis, Professor at the Center for Global Affairs – New York University, “[Securing American Primacy While Tackling Climate Change: Toward a National Strategy of Greengemony](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/louis-klarevas/securing-american-primacy_b_393223.html)”, Huffington Post, 12-15, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/louis-klarevas/securing-american-primacy\_b\_393223.html)

By not addressing climate change more aggressively and creatively, the United States is squandering an opportunity to secure its global primacy for the next few generations to come. To do this, though, the U.S. must rely on innovation to help the world escape the coming environmental meltdown. Developing the key technologies that will save the planet from global warming will allow the U.S. to outmaneuver potential great power rivals seeking to replace it as the international system's hegemon. But the greening of American strategy must occur soon. The U.S., however, seems to be stuck in time, unable to move beyond oil-centric geo-politics in any meaningful way. Often, the gridlock is portrayed as a partisan difference, with Republicans resisting action and Democrats pleading for action. This, though, is an unfair characterization as there are numerous proactive Republicans and quite a few reticent Democrats. The real divide is instead one between realists and liberals. Students of realpolitik, which still heavily guides American foreign policy, largely discount environmental issues as they are not seen as advancing national interests in a way that generates relative power advantages vis-à-vis the other major powers in the system: Russia, China, Japan, India, and the European Union. Liberals, on the other hand, have recognized that global warming might very well become the greatest challenge ever faced by mankind. As such, their thinking often eschews narrowly defined national interests for the greater global good. This, though, ruffles elected officials whose sworn obligation is, above all, to protect and promote American national interests. What both sides need to understand is that by becoming a lean, mean, green fighting machine, the U.S. can actually bring together liberals and realists to advance a collective interest which benefits every nation, while at the same time, securing America's global primacy well into the future. To do so, the U.S. must re-invent itself as not just your traditional hegemon, but as history's first ever green hegemon. Hegemons are countries that dominate the international system - bailing out other countries in times of global crisis, establishing and maintaining the most important international institutions, and covering the costs that result from free-riding and cheating global obligations. Since 1945, that role has been the purview of the United States. Immediately after World War II, Europe and Asia laid in ruin, the global economy required resuscitation, the countries of the free world needed security guarantees, and the entire system longed for a multilateral forum where global concerns could be addressed. The U.S., emerging the least scathed by the systemic crisis of fascism's rise, stepped up to the challenge and established the postwar (and current) liberal order. But don't let the world "liberal" fool you. While many nations benefited from America's new-found hegemony, the U.S. was driven largely by "realist" selfish national interests. The liberal order first and foremost benefited the U.S. With the U.S. becoming bogged down in places like Afghanistan and Iraq, running a record national debt, and failing to shore up the dollar, the future of American hegemony now seems to be facing a serious contest: potential rivals - acting like sharks smelling blood in the water - wish to challenge the U.S. on a variety of fronts. This has led numerous commentators to forecast the U.S.'s imminent fall from grace. Not all hope is lost however. With the impending systemic crisis of global warming on the horizon, the U.S. again finds itself in a position to address a transnational problem in a way that will benefit both the international community collectively and the U.S. selfishly. The current problem is two-fold. First, the competition for oil is fueling animosities between the major powers. The geopolitics of oil has already emboldened Russia in its 'near abroad' and China in far-off places like Africa and Latin America. As oil is a limited natural resource, a nasty zero-sum contest could be looming on the horizon for the U.S. and its major power rivals - a contest which threatens American primacy and global stability. Second, converting fossil fuels like oil to run national economies is producing irreversible harm in the form of carbon dioxide emissions. So long as the global economy remains oil-dependent, greenhouse gases will continue to rise. Experts are predicting as much as a 60% increase in carbon dioxide emissions in the next twenty-five years. That likely means more devastating water shortages, droughts, forest fires, floods, and storms. In other words, if global competition for access to energy resources does not undermine international security, global warming will. And in either case, oil will be a culprit for the instability. Oil arguably has been the most precious energy resource of the last half-century. But "black gold" is so 20th century. The key resource for this century will be green gold - clean, environmentally-friendly energy like wind, solar, and hydrogen power. Climate change leaves no alternative. And the sooner we realize this, the better off we will be. What Washington must do in order to avoid the traps of petropolitics is to convert the U.S. into the world's first-ever green hegemon. For starters, the federal government must drastically increase investment in energy and environmental research and development (E&E R&D). This will require a serious sacrifice, committing upwards of $40 billion annually to E&E R&D - a far cry from the few billion dollars currently being spent. By promoting a new national project, the U.S. could develop new technologies that will assure it does not drown in a pool of oil. Some solutions are already well known, such as raising fuel standards for automobiles; improving public transportation networks; and expanding nuclear and wind power sources. Others, however, have not progressed much beyond the drawing board: batteries that can store massive amounts of solar (and possibly even wind) power; efficient and cost-effective photovoltaic cells, crop-fuels, and hydrogen-based fuels; and even fusion. Such innovations will not only provide alternatives to oil, they will also give the U.S. an edge in the global competition for hegemony. If the U.S. is able to produce technologies that allow modern, globalized societies to escape the oil trap, those nations will eventually have no choice but to adopt such technologies. And this will give the U.S. a tremendous economic boom, while simultaneously providing it with means of leverage that can be employed to keep potential foes in check.

\*\*\*Aff Answers\*\*\*

KORUS Won’t Pass- TAA

KORUS won’t pass- TAA, unions and labor leaders are opposed, and delay until after recess kills passage

AP 7-20 – Julie Pace, “AP sources: Obama delays final work on trade pacts”, 2011, http://www.google.com/hostednews/ap/article/ALeqM5jMahRgCgGhe4liCMqo01FaaJbETQ?docId=ad85d6179b2247ad8fc3f9cca094fda4

The White House has insisted that lawmakers pass TAA alongside the trade deals. But Republicans oppose the administration efforts to link the retraining assistance program to the pacts. Even if the administration had been able to send the trade deals to Congress this summer, it is unclear whether there would have been a clear path to passage given the disagreements on TAA. But the future for the trade deals only becomes more uncertain this fall, as political considerations could make it difficult for Obama to push for their passage heading into an election year. Two core constituencies for Obama, unions and labor leaders, are largely opposed to the free trade agreements All three trade deals were signed during the George W. Bush administration, but none of them advanced in the Democratic-controlled Congress.

KORUS won’t pass- TAA and opposition from labor groups

Area Development 7-28 – “Free Trade Agreements Stymied by Political Roadblocks”, James T. Berger, CEO of Market Strategies in an Illinois-based marketing consulting firm, http://www.areadevelopment.com/EconomicsGovernmentPolicy/July2011/US-free-trade-agreements-organized-labor-736537383.shtml?Page=2

The South Korean agreement, as well as agreements with Colombia and Panama (a total package valued at $13 billion) is on the threshold of being sent to Congress for ratification — but there is a roadblock. None of these free trade agreements (FTAs) will go to Congress unless an accord with Congress is reached on expanded subsidies for jobless workers. According to White House economic aide Gene Sperling, “The administration will not submit implementing legislations on the three pending FTAs until we have an agreement with Congress on the renewal of a robust, expanded TAA (trade adjustment assistance) consistent with the objectives of the 2009 trade adjustment assistance law.” The bottom line is that the White House wants Congress to authorize more than $2 billion in trade adjustment assistance or it will block these major trade agreements that promise to create thousands of new jobs and positively impact a number of important U.S. industries. A Wall Street Journal editorial of May 20, 2011 points out that “those familiar with the tactics of this White House won’t be surprised to learn that that beneficiaries of the program that Mr. Obama wants to resurrect include union workers whose job losses had nothing to do with foreign competition.” On the other hand, organized labor has expressed major opposition to the most important of the treaties, the South Korean pact. In a news release dated December 9, 2010, the United Steelworkers (USW) voiced the following opposition: “After thorough review, the USW Executive Board views the agreement as falling far short of what is necessary to ensure that U.S. workers and businesses have a fair deal…The auto sector is of vital importance to our members who make the glass, tires, steel, plastics, and countless other products that are part of the supply chain in the auto and auto parts sector…Promises made by previous administrations as to the enormous benefits of free trade agreements have simply not come to pass for American workers. Indeed, our trade deficit continues to sap our nation’s economic strength and the existing FTAs have not provided the benefits that were promised…In the auto sector, imports of vehicles and parts from Korea have exceeded exports by 14-to-1 or more over the last decade. Korean transplant auto production here in the United States, while providing welcome jobs, continues to act as a magnet for foreign components as their domestic content averages only about 40 percent…”

KORUS Won’t Pass- Debt Ceiling

Debt ceiling debate derails momentum

Stangarone 5-16 (Troy, Director of Congressional Affairs and Trade – Korea Economic Institute “Passing FTA may take longer,” Korea JoongAng Daily, 2011, http://joongangdaily.joins.com/article/view.asp?aid=2936209)

Further complicating the picture is the debate over raising the debt ceiling in the United States. Unlike most countries, the United States has a statutory limit on its borrowing and is expected to reach that limit this August. Earlier this year, there were contentious talks over the budget that dominated the time and attention of the administration and Congressional leaders as they worked to avoid a government shutdown. The debt ceiling talks have the potential to do the same. This could remove much of the capacity available for the White House and the Congressional leadership to hash out their differing positions on timing and sequencing of the FTAs, which is largely tied to continued progress by Colombia on reaching benchmarks set in a recent agreement to address concerns about labor rights and violence against union members in Colombia. All this means that we should not expect the Korus FTA to be voted on before late summer or the fall. While the recent decision to move forward on the drafting of the legislation for the pending FTAs should be viewed as the positive development that it is, the domestic debates over TAA and the debt ceiling are likely to drag out the process. There are real differences over how the trade agenda should work that Democrats and Republicans still must resolve and reaching an agreement that is acceptable will take time.

KORUS Won’t Pass- AT: Compromise on Debt Ceiling

No chance of debt ceiling compromise- Republicans determined to prevent Obama from being re-elected and willing to accept the consequences of defaulting

Irish Times 7/27 (Lara Marlowe, 7/27/11, " Right-wing Republicans prefer ruin to compromise ", http://www.irishtimes.com/newspaper/opinion/2011/0728/1224301495723.html)

ANALYSIS: WITH THE US days from defaulting on its debt, the ugly truth is that a significant portion of the Republican Party would rather bring the US and world economies crashing down around them in an economic Samson option than entertain the possibility of compromise. As the ranking Republican in the Senate, Mitch McConnell, said after last November's midterm elections, the number one priority for the Republicans is to prevent Barack Obama from being re-elected. If they have to destroy the country in the process, so be it. In doom laden Washington, it's the morning after the midterms. The 87 Republican freshmen elected last November, along with a handful of Tea Party cohorts in the Senate, are the hardest of hardliners. The Tea Party's victory has come home to roost. At least 60 House Republicans have declared they will not, under any circumstances, vote to raise the debt ceiling. Still more demand that Congress pass a balanced budget amendment first. The holdouts are ignoring advice from the Wall Street Journal , Standard & Poor's rating agency, the US Chamber of Commerce, the manufacturers' association and even Grover Norquist, the Republican guru of anti-tax pledges. The rift within the American right pits traditional, pro-business moderates against the Tea Party populists who view the government and Wall Street with equal suspicion. The group who've come to be known as the Default Caucus seem wilfully and blissfully unaware of the probable consequences of their obstinacy. A Pew Research Center poll found that 53 per cent of Republicans, and 65 per cent of Tea Party supporters, say they believe the US can glide by the August 2nd deadline without major problems. They've been strengthened in this by the Republican presidential candidate, Michele Bachmann. Reports that the treasury has tens of billions of dollars stashed away and could continue paying bills for several days beyond August 2nd encourage the Tea Party to dig in its heels. On Monday night, President Obama warned of the risk of “sparking a deep economic crisis” if the debt ceiling is not lifted. “Our country's AAA credit rating would be downgraded . . . Interest rates would skyrocket . . . which amounts to a huge tax hike on the American people,” he warned. Poppycock, says the Default Caucus. They don't believe Obama or the Treasury, which they see as an arm of his administration. When outside experts were brought in to Congress to explain the potential consequences of default – including a “death spiral” in the bond market prompted by a loss of confidence – many of the Tea Party intransigents refused to attend. Six days ago, Speaker of the House John Boehner and Obama neared agreement on a “grand bargain” that would have addressed the two problems which the US must tackle to rein in runaway spending: the dual necessity of raising taxes on the ultra-rich and reducing the cost of social security and healthcare for ageing baby boomers. Boehner was whipped back into line by the Tea Party, and walked out on talks. By entertaining the possibility of raising the age eligibility for Medicare – the federal system of health insurance for people over 65 years of age and for certain younger people with disabilities – to 67, considering means testing and a re-indexing of social security payments, Obama outraged the left of his own party. Neither Republican nor Democratic plans for averting a default appear to have enough support to pass. The Senate Democratic majority leader Harry Reid's plan meets the Republicans' two main conditions: spending cuts would exceed the increase in the debt ceiling, and there is nothing that could be construed as a tax rise. The Republicans have rejected it. The fact that neither the Reid plan nor the Boehner plan – which was being redrafted yesterday after Boehner got his figures wrong – include any increased revenue, ie taxes – is in itself a major victory for the Tea Party. At its core, the titanic row over the debt ceiling is about that most basic political and economic issue: social justice. Obama alluded to this on Monday night, when he said it wasn't fair to “ask a senior citizen to pay more for her Medicare before we ask a corporate jet owner or the oil companies to give up tax breaks . . . ask a student to pay more for college before we ask hedge fund managers to stop paying taxes at a lower rate than secretaries”. Wall Street financier Steve Rattner says that the 400 richest Americans pay only 18 per cent of their income in taxes – compared with 30 per cent before – thanks to George W Bush's tax cuts. It is a great irony of the crisis that lower middle class white people who comprise the rank and file of the Tea Party are fighting to protect the privileges of the billionaires who bankroll them. By allowing taxation of the rich to drop out of the equation, Obama has probably lost the battle for social justice in his war with the Republicans. Two pertinent historical precedents have been raised. In 1790, the Founding Fathers faced default on the infant country's debt. Treasury secretary Alexander Hamilton was in the position of Timothy Geithner today, fearing discredit on world markets. Southern members of Congress were persuaded to allow the federal government to “assume” states' debts in exchange for making Washington DC a slave capital. The perils of moral compromise are blatantly obvious today. But compromise is what Obama strives for. In his recent speeches and press conferences, the word appears over and over; never in Republican parlance. The debt ceiling has been raised 100 times since 1940, so this ought not to have turned into a crisis of global proportions. The 14th amendment of the constitution says: “The validity of the public debt of the US . . . shall not be questioned.” Former president Bill Clinton has suggested that Obama invoke the post-civil war 14th amendment to unilaterally raise the debt ceiling. This is Obama's nuclear option, and he's unlikely to take it. The backlash from Republicans would be horrendous. “We remember the Americans who put country above self, and set personal grievances aside for the greater good,” Obama said on Monday night. It sounded like a hopeless exhortation to Republicans, and the prelude to his own capitulation.

No Political Capital

Obama wasted all of his capital on health care and attempting to pass immigration

New America Media 7/26 (7/26/11, " Obama Promises Reform, NCLR Sees Deportations ", http://newamericamedia.org/2011/07/obama-promises-reform-nclr-sees-deportations.php)

In a general sense, says Ortega, Obama has served the Latino community through the appointments of figures like Hilda Solis as secretary of the treasury and Sonya Sotomayor to the Supreme Court. But Ortega underscored that Obama “burnt” a lot of political capital on health care reform and his inability to move forward on issues like immigration.

Obama has no political capital- disconnect with the public and he’s too soft

Wall Street Pit 7/27 (Robert Reich, 7/27/11, " The Empty Bully Pulpit ", <http://wallstreetpit.com/80354-the-empty-bully-pulpit>)

I thought I’d seen Washington at its worst. I was there just after Watergate. I was there when Jimmy Carter imploded. I was there during the government shut-down of 1995. But I hadn’t seen the worst. This is the worst. How can it be that with over 9 percent unemployment, essentially no job growth, widening inequality, falling real wages, and an economy that’s almost dead in the water — we’re locked in a battle over how to cut the budget deficit? Part of the answer is a Republican Party that’s the most irresponsible and rigidly ideological I’ve ever witnessed. Part of the answer is the continuing gravitational pull of the Great Recession. But another part of the answer lies with the President — and his inability or unwillingness to use the bully pulpit to tell Americans the truth, and mobilize them for what must be done. Barack Obama is one of the most eloquent and intelligent people ever to grace the White House, which makes his failure to tell the story of our era all the more disappointing and puzzling. Many who were drawn to him in 2008 (including me) were dazzled by the power of his words and insights — his speech at the 2004 Democratic convention, his autobiography and subsequent policy book, his talks about race and other divisive issues during the campaign. We were excited by the prospect of a leader who could educate — an “educator in chief” who would use the bully pulpit to explaini what has happened to the United States in recent decades, where we must go, and why. But the man who has occupied the Oval Office since January, 2009 is someone entirely different — a man seemingly without a compass, a tactician who veers rightward one day and leftward the next, an inside-the Beltway dealmaker who doesn’t explain his comprises in light of larger goals. In his inaugural address, Obama warned that “the nation cannot prosper long when it favors only the prosperous.” In private, he professes to understand that the growing concentration of income and wealth at the top has robbed the middle class of the purchasing power it needs to keep the economy going. And it has distorted our politics. He is well aware that the Great Recession wiped out $7.8 trillion of home values, crushing the nest eggs and eliminating the collateral that had allowed the middle class to keep spending despite declining real wages — a decrease in consumption that’s directly responsible for the anemic recovery. But instead of explaining this to the American people, he joins the GOP in making a fetish of feducing the budget deficit, and enters into a hair-raising game of chicken with House Republicans over whether the debt ceiling will be raised. Never once does he tell the public why reducing the deficit has become his number one economic priority. Americans can only conclude that the Republicans must be correct — that diminishing the deficit will somehow revive economic growth and restore jobs. Instead of powerful explanations we get the type of bromides that issue from every White House. America must “win the future,” Obama says, by which he means making public investments in infrastructure, education, and basic R&D. But then he submits a budget proposal that would cut nondefense discretionary spending (of which these investments constitute more than half) to its lowest level as a share of gross domestic product in over half a century. A president can be forgiven for compromising, if his base understands why he is doing so. That the health-care law doesn’t include a public option, that financial reform doesn’t limit the size of the biggest Wall Street banks, even that cuts may have to be made to Medicare or Social Security — all could be accepted in light of the practical necessities of politics, if only we understood where the President is leading us. Why is Obama not using the bully pulpit? Perhaps he’s too embroiled in the tactical maneuvers that pass for policy making in Washington, or too intent on preserving political capital for the next skirmish, or cynical about how the media will relay or distort his message. He may also disdain the repetition necessary to break through the noise and drive home the larger purpose of his presidency. I have known (and worked for) presidents who succumbed to all these, at least for a time. A more disturbing explanation is that he simply lacks the courage to tell the truth. He wants most of all to be seen as a responsible adult rather than a fighter. As such, he allows himself to be trapped by situations — the debt-ceiling imbroglio most recently — within which he tries to offer reasonable responses, rather than be the leader who shapes the circumstances from the start. Obama cannot mobilize America around the truth, in other words, because he is continuously adapting to the prevailing view. This is not leadership.

No Political Capital

Obama’s political capital has diminished to nothing- extending Bush tax cuts sapped it all to the point where he’s now all talk

New York Post 7/25(7/25/11, " Bam's Desperation ", http://www.nypost.com/p/news/opinion/opedcolumnists/bam\_desperation\_e95DUHyoFweswo4CLs2jyI)

President Obama likes to present himself as the only adult left in Washington, but last night's televised address to the nation had more than a whiff of childish desperation about it. It's clear: The only thing that matters to him right now is not the fate of the country but his re-election. Discussing the looming Aug. 2 deadline to raise the debt ceiling -- the subject of fierce debate and negotiation for the past few weeks -- the president last night once again (a) blamed Bush, (b) demonized the successful, (c) denounced "tax breaks" for corporate jets and oil companies, (d) threatened the country's seniors, veterans and contractors with the chimera of "default" and (e) dredged up the ghost of Ronald Reagan to try and cast himself as the great compromiser. Reuters The blame game: President Obama, presenting his side of the debt war to the nation last night, scapegoats Bush and successful people. Neither plan dispels the air of unreality that attends any discussion of the nation's finances inside the Beltway, but at least neither includes any of the new "revenues" (taxes) that President Obama has been petulantly demanding. In the third year of the Obama recession, the country is unemployed, demoralized and just plain tapped out. And with ratings agencies like Moody's eyeing our credit rating like repo men, a downgrade from AAA would have a devastating ripple effect throughout the entire economy. Ever since Obama was forced last December into retaining the Bush tax cuts, he's watched his once-formidable stash of political capital dwindle to almost nothing. Yet he still refuses to move away from his tax-raising, soak-the-rich monomania. "Don't call my bluff," Obama had ominously warned House Republicans, but last night, he called his own bluff, putting (as usual) no specifics on the table, but continuing his class-warfare jihad, again dragging in "people like me [who get] tax breaks we don't need and didn't ask for." And yet bluffs must be called if the nation is to finally stagger home sober from this prolonged spending binge with a few bucks still left in its pocket -- and that's just what Boehner did. Reassuring the nation that the United States "cannot default on its debt obligations," the speaker explained that the president "wanted a blank check six months ago and he wants a blank check today." He's not going to get it. Democratic reactionaries are still fiercely wedded to the infinitely expanding entitlement state. The idea that the nation's wealth might someday run out seemingly has never entered their heads. Obama won't be running against Boehner in the next election, but last night's dueling speeches starkly laid out the choices of the 2012 election: The blame game or fiscal sobriety? More irresponsible spending in the name of "social justice," or a return to first principles? Quoting Jefferson, the president said, "Every man cannot have his way in all things." Obama should heed his own words, let Congress sort this out, and worry about re-election later. The time for talk is over, but alas, talk is all this president has.

Debt ceiling debate is killing Obama’s political capital

Lubbock Avalanche Journal 7-31 –“The Wolf and the Impending Recession”, 2011, http://lubbockonline.com/interact/blog-post/may/2011-07-31/wolf-and-impending-recession

Obama has created a crisis in order to push the Republicans to increase the debt ceiling to accommodate his lavish Socialist spending habits. In order avert the crisis, Obama has also demanded punishing tax increases on corporations and anyone making more than $200,000 per year. Obama has cried “wolf” again, and this is the time that Obama has cried “wolf” once too often. Obama created a crisis that would not have existed without his efforts. In doing so, it appears Obama has tipped us over the brink into another recession. Obama’s reckless massive spending has caused the United States government to run out of money – a problem that could easily be solved by defunding ObamaCare, The Department of Education, and many other meddlesome and destructive bureaucracies that plague the honest efforts of We the People. The American people understand what Obama has done to our nation, and the majority of the American people do not want the Federal debt limit raised. They understand Obama’s Socialist ploy to weaken the United States of America until it is like a European Union country. Obama has lost enough political capital with the American People that he cannot recover. President Herbert Hoover warned us to be on guard against Socialist usurpers like Obama, "Every collectivist revolution rides in on a Trojan horse of 'emergency'. It was the tactic of Lenin, Hitler, and Mussolini. In the collectivist sweep over a dozen minor countries of Europe, it was the cry of men striving to get on horseback. And 'emergency' became the justification of the subsequent steps. This technique of creating emergency is the greatest achievement that demagoguery attains." The battle over the debt ceiling increase has greatly diminished Obama’s popularity and has severely weakened him politically. Dick Morris commented on the effects of the debt limit bill that will be passed, But the real outcome will be to have brought Obama’s job approval down from its bin Laden high of 55% to a new Gallup low of 40%. That is ground he won’t be able to make up. And, put through the rigors of tension and uncertainly, the economy will sink further into a double dip recession. A recession brought on, in large part, by Obama’s crying wolf over the debt limit and creating an environment of financial and economic terror around its passage. Republicans proved they can govern by passing their one-house debt limit increase. Their fiscal conservative credentials are intact. And Obama looks, once more, like a weak and easily cowed incompetent to his backers and a big spending and borrowing liberal to the rest of us. Obama’s Rasmussen Reports Presidential Approval Index has not equaled its present level of -21 since 16 March 2011. The Rasmussen Reports daily Presidential Tracking Poll for Saturday shows that 23% of the nation's voters Strongly Approve of the way that Barack Obama is performing his role as president. Forty-four percent (44%) Strongly Disapprove, giving Obama a Presidential Approval Index rating of -21 (see trends). The voters are dissatisfied with how Obama has handled our economy. The latest Rasmussen Reports national telephone survey shows that 36% of Likely U.S. Voters give the president good or excellent marks when it comes to the economy. But 50% say the president is doing a poor job, up seven points from 43% two weeks ago. (To see survey question wording, click here.) Obama talking down our economy and talking up borrowing trillions of dollars is going to have a serious negative impact on our economic status. It appears Obama has now precipitated the second dip of the Obama Recession.

Winner’s Win

Winner’s win

Green 10 – David Michael Green, Professor of Political Science at Hofstra University, 6-11, “The Do-Nothing 44th President”, http://www.opednews.com/articles/The-Do-Nothing-44th-Presid-by-David-Michael-Gree-100611-648.html

Moreover, there is a continuously evolving and reciprocal relationship between presidential boldness and achievement. In the same way that nothing breeds success like success, nothing sets the president up for achieving his or her next goal better than succeeding dramatically on the last go around. This is absolutely a matter of perception, and you can see it best in the way that Congress and especially the Washington press corps fawn over bold and intimidating presidents like Reagan and George W. Bush. The political teams surrounding these presidents understood the psychology of power all too well. They knew that by simultaneously creating a steamroller effect and feigning a clubby atmosphere for Congress and the press, they could leave such hapless hangers-on with only one remaining way to pretend to preserve their dignities. By jumping on board the freight train, they could be given the illusion of being next to power, of being part of the winning team. And so, with virtually the sole exception of the now retired Helen Thomas, this is precisely what they did.

Obama needs a win to create capital

Hunter 10 – Daily Kos contributing editor, “Political death by a thousand cuts”, 11-17, http://www.dailykos.com/story/2010/11/17/921164/-Political-death-by-a-thousand-cuts

It may be a petty, minor thing, but this is getting to the point where Obama is looking weak in many, many separate situations, and it's becoming a car wreck for the White House. Having him doing public post-election soul searching; having him give repeated noises in the press about preemptively caving on whatever it is the GOP might be asking for: it's a messaging/political disaster. He took a stout midterm loss and turned it into his own midterm disaster. At some point someone in this White House has to start figuring out that, screw actual policy, they're getting their asses kicked purely on the PR front, and Obama's not going to get reelected if he looks like a quivering pushover. We know from the healthcare fiasco that there's a bunch of folks in this White House who care more about protecting Obama's image than actually getting useful stuff done: well, image-hoarders, now might be the perfect time to pay attention to what the nice news channels are telling you. Instead, this is rapidly becoming another perfect example of being so miserly with your "limited" political capital that you end up losing all of it. Obama is keeping his powder so dry that he's losing battles without firing a shot. Long story short, if McConnell or Boehner can't find time to meet at the president's convenience, Obama should just call off the meeting and be done with it. When you're President of the United States you shouldn't be losing pissant little power plays .Korea War Defense- 2AC

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.

Doesn’t escalate – no retaliation

Lankov 12-19 (Andrei, Professor – Kookmin University (Seoul), “How to stop the next Korean war,” 2010, East Asia Forum, http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2010/12/19/how-to-stop-the-next-korean-war/)

In the past, the South Korean public and government have demonstrated almost inhuman patience every time they faced a North Korean provocation — and they have had to face such provocations regularly. Over the last few decades, North Korean agents bombed one civilian airliner and hijacked another, assaulted the presidential palace, blew up the half of the cabinet of ministers, and arranged at least two assassination attempts against South Korean presidents — not counting numerous kidnappings, commandos raids (with an occasional slaughter of civilians), and the sinking of boats. How did South Korea react to all these acts? In the same, time-tested way: by doing nothing. This unusual restraint reflects the grim reality of the South Korean situation. Half the country’s entire population, some 24 million people, lives in the capital Seoul and its vicinity, well within the range of North Korean artillery. The country’s infrastructure is highly developed and hence highly vulnerable. Since the late 1950s, war has simply not been an option; as Seoul’s frustrated strategists assumed that a retaliatory strike would lead to war — or else prove useless. This assumption was probably correct. North Korea watchers often describe its provocative actions as either irrational or driven by succession politics. This time, Kim Jong Il’s drive to install his son as his heir does seem involved, but on balance Pyongyang’s recent attacks are rational acts — essentially diplomatic demarches, albeit undertaken in somewhat unusual form. In the late 1990s, under the ‘sunshine policy,’ South Korea began providing the North with unconditional aid, but in 2008 the newly elected right-wing administration dramatically reduced the amount. After the second nuclear test in May 2009, the United States halted its aid programs, switching to a policy of ‘strategic patience’ — in other words, ignoring North Korea. None of this drove the North to economic collapse, as many U.S. policymakers hoped, but it did achieve one thing: It made Pyongyang highly dependent on Beijing’s financial and diplomatic largesse. This was not a development North Korean leaders welcomed, mind you — they despise and distrust China (suspicions likely only confirmed by the recent WikiLeaks disclosures). The North Korean regime would like to revive its old strategy of having two or three competing sponsors who can be easily played against one another. So, Pyongyang decided to teach Seoul and Washington a lesson, to show that North Korea is too troublesome to be simply ignored. To the Americans, this message was delivered when Siegfried Hecker, the former director of the Los Alamos National Laboratory, was shown a new state-of-the-art plant producing enriched uranium. For the South, the same message was delivered by artillery shells. North Korean strategists wanted to demonstrate that they can hit a South Korean government — even a hawkish one like that of current President Lee Myung-bak — hard. While Kim Jong Il’s regime revels in its international isolation, it knows that such military incidents are bad for the South, whose lifeblood is global trade. Potential business partners blanche at newspaper headlines about ‘Korea on the brink of war’: Economic performance is the single most important thing the average South Korean voter cares about. South Koreans do not like living in a constant state of siege. Even if the current government remains stubborn, North Korean planners figure, chances are that economic troubles and a general sense of unease will contribute to Lee’s eventual defeat at the polls. The ongoing succession adds another wrinkle. Kim Jong Un, the world’s youngest four-star general, wants to show his toughness — much like his father did when he began preparing to take over in the 1970s and 80s. We shouldn’t overestimate the succession process’s importance, however: Pyongyang would do something along this line anyway — and since the South Korean government is not giving in, another attack is likely to follow soon, in the next few months. South Koreans expect that this time their government will retaliate, and it seems that military leaders — especially after Lee’s recent shakeup of the top ranks — share this mood. It’s an understandable reaction, no doubt. But it is also dangerous and counterproductive. To start with, even if a massive South Korean counterstrike were successful, it would exercise no impact on Pyongyang’s political behavior. For instance, with its impressive technological superiority, the South Korean military could probably sink half the North Korean navy in about an hour. In most places, that sort of defeat would have serious political consequences — but not in North Korea. The lives of the common soldiers and sailors are of no political significance there. The tiny North Korean elite has demonstrated that it is ready to sacrifice as many of the common people as necessary to stay in control (during the famine of the late 1990s, as many as 1 million people perished, with no discernable political repercussions for the government). The death of a few hundred soldiers will be seen as a sorry but fully acceptable price — and will not even deter Pyongyang from planning a new round of provocations. Some argue that such a military disaster would damage the regime, which has staked its reputation on Kim Jong Il’s ‘military first’ doctrine. But Kim’s regime controls the media so completely that even the most humiliating defeat would be presented as a great victory, a spectacular triumph of North Korean arms. Only a handful of generals will know the truth, and these generals understand that they would have no future without the current regime, so they are unlikely to protest. So, nothing can be gained from a massive retaliatory strike. But much can be lost. It may be true that neither side wants war, but there is a danger that a South Korean counterstrike would be seen as excessive in Pyongyang.

A2: Relations Impact

SKFTA not key

Lim 6 (Wonhyuk, Fellow – Korea Development Institute and Nonresident Fellow – Center for Northeast Asian Policy Studies – Brookings Institution, “KORUS FTA: A MYSTERIOUS BEGINNING AND AN UNCERTAIN FUTURE,” Asian Perspective, 30(4), pp. 175-187, http://www.asianperspective.org/articles/v30n4-i.pdf)

Despite these problems, many people seem to presume that the KORUS FTA will be a new glue that holds the alliance together, a quick fix for the strained relationship between the two countries. However, as long as the two countries fail to craft a common strategic vision for the Korean peninsula and East Asia, the extent to which the FTA can compensate for strains in the security alliance is likely to be limited. Moreover, the process leading to such an agreement will be far from smooth. Most importantly, the bilateral nature of negotiations may create the impression that the United States is to blame for heavy adjustment costs that Korea’s “vulnerable” sectors must bear. For multilateral negotiations, anti-liberalization forces stage a protest against globalization, whereas for bilateral negotiations, they can target a particular country. In other words, negotiations for the KORUS FTA actually run the risk of fueling anti-American sentiment in Korea and anti-Korean sentiment in the United States— exactly the opposite of what its proponents intended. This would be a shame, especially in light of the fact that bilateral trade and investment have been the saving grace of ROK-U.S. relations in recent years.

US-South Korea relations resilient.

Ireland 9 (Corydon, Harvard News Office, 9/14, http://news.harvard.edu/gazette/story/2009/09/firm-allies-past-and-present/#)

In a conversation in front of a capacity crowd at the forum, the two diplomats reflected on the historical strength of the alliance and what issues might put it at risk. Both agreed it would take a lot to shake a political relationship that dates back to the 19th century, and one that was forged in steel by the Korean War. It is an alliance “less brittle and far more resilient than it ever has been,” said Stephens. Han, who in 1984 earned a Harvard Ph.D. in economics, called the U.S.-South Korea alliance the foundation of his nation’s “economic growth, prosperity, and security.” It remains so firm and mutual today, he added, that it could be an international model of cooperation — “the exemplar alliance relationship of the future.” Moderating the public conversation between ambassadors was Graham Allison, a terrorism scholar who has studied the threat posed by a nuclear-armed North Korea. He is Douglas Dillon Professor of Government at Harvard Kennedy School (HKS) and director of the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs. Skeptical and probing, Allison prompted the two diplomats to imagine a near future in which the traditional alliance enjoyed by the United States and South Korea goes sour. In sum, he asked, what could go wrong and what issues need attending to? Neither of the ambassadors budged much. In fact, said Han, “there is a very, very fundamental notion that U.S.-Korea relations cannot be swayed by one or two events.” It is and has been an alliance, he said, that has never been “underestimated or disregarded. It was always central.” But it is true, Han added, that the two nations share a set of 21st century problems — global issues that include terrorism, piracy, climate change, and the challenges of development and trade. U.S.-South Korea relations are resilient and strong, said Stephens, but three areas deserve a measure of vigilance: economic crisis, North Korea, and the continued presence of 26,000 American military personnel on Korean soil. “We need to be good neighbors, good friends” on the issue of that presence, she said.

A2: Economy Impact

KORUS doesn’t boost the US economy- no job growth, doesn’t reduce trade deficit, and guts financial regulations

Fletcher 7-17 –Ian Fletcher, Adjunct Fellow at the San Francisco office of the U.S. Business and Industry Council, a Washington think tank founded in 1933. He was previously an economist. “We Don’t Need Free Trade Agreements with Panama, Columbia, and Korea”, 2011, THE MARKET ORACLE, http://www.marketoracle.co.uk/Article29309.html

You think America has learned its lesson from NAFTA, which the Labor Department has estimated cost us 525,000 jobs? Think again. Take the Korea agreement, for example. President Obama and the Republican leadership want it despite the fact that the Economic Policy Institute has estimated it will cost us 159,000 more jobs over the next five years. Yes, you read that correctly. At a time when the president says that his number one economic priority is job creation, and has created an entire commission for that purpose, they're going ahead with it anyway. Even the official U.S. International Trade Commission has admitted that KORUS-FTA will cause significant job losses. And not just in low-end industries: the ITC foresees the electronic equipment manufacturing industry, with average wages of $30.38 in 2008, as a major victim. The supposed logic of America swapping junk jobs for high-end jobs simply isn't the way the economics really works out. Pace free-market mythology, there are actually well-understood reasons for this, if you dig a little into what economists already know. Was this the Obama America voted for in 2008? No. That Obama is at an undisclosed location somewhere. He campaigned against KORUS-FTA during the 2008 campaign. (It was originally negotiated, but not ratified by Congress, by Bush in 2007.) Among other things, that Obama sa7-id: I strongly support the inclusion of meaningful, enforceable labor and environmental standards in all trade agreements. As president, I will work to ensure that the U.S. again leads the world in ensuring that consumer products produced across the world are done in a manner that supports workers, not undermines them. Nice words. Unfortunately, none of them are reflected in KORUS-FTA, which contains no serious new provisions on these issues. This agreement is essentially a NAFTA clone. It is, in fact, the biggest trade agreement since NAFTA, and the first since Canada with a developed country. This agreement, like NAFTA and the dozen or so other free trade agreements America has signed since NAFTA, is fundamentally an offshoring agreement. That is, it is about making it easier for U.S.-based multinationals to move production overseas with confidence in the security of their investments in overseas plants. The provisions to protect workers and consumers are unenforceable window dressing. (That's why they're allowed to be in there in the first place.) Don't be fooled by the fact that some unions, like the United Auto Workers (UAW), have endorsed the agreement. This is just a cynical ploy by the White House to split the trade union movement in order to keep the AFL-CIO neutral. The UAW's out-of-touch leadership is so punch-drunk from the 2008 collapse of the U.S. auto industry that it has lost touch not only with what is good for the American economy as a whole, but with what is good for rank-and-file auto workers. (There's a rumor in circulation they did a deal with the White House in exchange for protecting pension and other obligations in the auto industry bailout. I can't prove this, but it would certainly explain a few things.) Don't take my word for it, either: in the words of Al Benchich, retired president of UAW Local 909: The UAW Administration Caucus is the one-party state that controls the UAW at the International level. Every International officer is a member of the Caucus, and they surround themselves with appointed international reps that unquestioningly do their bidding.No wonder other, more democratic and more intelligent, unions, like Leo Gerard's United Steelworkers, are criticizing the UAW for its decision to support KORUS-FTA. Interestingly, the UAW's past record of criticizing KORUS-FTA is more honest than anything they're saying right now. For example, here's what they originally said about this agreement: KORUS-FTA has inadequate protections and enforcement mechanisms to enforce either the spirit or the letter of the law. Precisely. And changes made since then are, as noted, minimal. As an example of how one-sided the treaty is, consider that it now allows -- to great rejoicing -- America to export 75,000 cars a year to Korea. This translates to a measly 800 jobs. Korea's exports of cars to the U.S. in 2009, on the other hand? Try 476,833. Furthermore, even if the U.S. does get to sell more cars in Korea, American companies will mostly not be making the steel, tires, and other components that go into them, because the agreement allows cars with 65 percent foreign content to count as "American." Worse, it allows goods with as much as 65 percent non-South-Korean content to count as "Korean," opening the door not only to North Korean slave labor but to the whole of China. Talk about the camel's nose in the tent! This is just one example of how KORUS-FTA isn't even as good as the deal the EU just signed with Korea. (The EU got a 55 percent standard on this item.) And remember that the EU and most of its member states, of course, don't really practice free trade anyway: they practice a covertly managed trade that has kept the EU's trade balance within pocket change of zero over the last two decades, while America has been running deficits around the $500 billion mark. "Free trade agreement," in American English, means "free trade agreement." In other languages, it means "gentleman's agreement for managed trade at a low tariff." The Europeans invented this game -- called mercantilism -- back when trade was conducted with sailing ships. South Korea learned it from Japan, which learned it from Germany. Uncle Sam (and maybe John Bull and a few others) are the only naïfs who still don't get it. Despite what the White House and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce are saying, this agreement makes no sense as a strategy to reduce our horrendous trade deficit. America's trade deficits have a long record of going up, not down, when we sign trade agreements with other nations. Paradoxically, trade agreements even seem to sabotage our own trade with foreign nations: according to an analysis by the group Public Citizen, in recent years our exports to nations we have free-trade agreements with have actually grown at less than half the pace of our exports to nations we don't have these agreements with. So these agreements don't hold water as trade-expanding measures. Even leaving aside trade-balance issues, this agreement is a disaster, thanks to something called "investor-state arbitration." Like NAFTA, it compromises American sovereignty and subjects American democracy to having its own laws overruled by foreign judges as interfering with trade. Under NAFTA to date, over $326 million in damages has been paid out by governments as a result of challenges to natural resource policies, environmental protection, and health and safety measures. There about 80 Korean corporations, with about 270 facilities around the U.S., that would acquire the right to challenge our laws under KORUS-FTA. What kind of problems could this cause? The U.S. was forced in 1996 to weaken Clean Air Act rules on gasoline contaminants in response to a challenge by Venezuela and Brazil. In 1998, we were forced to weaken Endangered Species Act protections for sea turtles thanks to a challenge by India, Malaysia, Pakistan and Thailand concerning the shrimp industry. The EU today endures trade sanctions by the U.S. for not relaxing its ban on hormone-treated beef. In 1996, the WTO ruled against the EU's Lome Convention, a preferential trading scheme for 71 former European colonies in the Third World. In 2003, the Bush administration sued the EU over its moratorium on genetically modified foods. It gets worse. KORUS-FTA also signs away our right (and Korea's, too, not that this makes it any better) to a wide range of financial regulations of the kind that might have helped avoid the crisis of 2008. For example, it forfeits our right to limit the size of financial institutions. It forfeits our right to place firewalls between different kinds of financial activities in order to prevent volatility in one market from collapsing another. It prevents us from limiting what financial services financial institutions may offer—Enron Savings & Mortgage, here we come... It bans regulation of derivatives. It ban limits on capital flows designed to tame volatile “hot money.” Why is the U.S. flirting with making such an appalling mistake yet again? Because a) multinational corporations have bought our political system and b) because our government would rather play power politics than keep its own (declining) economic house in order. It is remarkable how stuck we are in the 1950s, with an invincible economy at home and a Cold War abroad. As a report by the Senate Finance Committee once put it: Throughout most of the postwar era, U.S. trade policy has been the orphan of U.S. foreign policy. Too often the Executive has granted trade concessions to accomplish political objectives. Rather than conducting U.S. international economic relations on sound economic and commercial principles, the executive has set trade and monetary policy in a foreign aid context. An example has been the Executive's unwillingness to enforce U.S. trade statutes in response to foreign unfair trade practices.Ironically, it may eventually be our own decline that solves our trade problems, by rescuing us from our own arrogance and stupidity. When we finally realize we can't take our economy for granted, we may finally stop giving away the store in international trade.

SKFTA doesn’t cause job growth

Chan 10 (Sewell, Washington Correspondent – New York Times, “Few New Jobs Expected Soon From Free-Trade Agreement With South Korea,” New York Times, 12-7, http://www.nytimes.com/2010/12/08/business/global/08korea.html)

The revised free-trade agreement with South Korea announced on Friday by the Obama administration has gotten acclaim from corporate leaders and Congressional Republicans. Praising the deal reached by his trade negotiators, President Obama said on Monday that the accord would “boost our annual exports to South Korea by $11 billion” and “support at least 70,000 American jobs.” The Obama administration has been careful to use the verb “support,” not “create.” In fact, the effect of the agreement on aggregate output and employment in the United States “would likely be negligible,” according to a federal study, largely because the United States economy is so much larger than that of South Korea. Indeed, the study found, the country’s overall trade deficit with the rest of the world is likely to grow slightly as a result of the agreement.

Economic decline doesn’t cause war

Miller 00 (Morris, Economist, Adjunct Professor in the Faculty of Administration – University of Ottawa, Former Executive Director and Senior Economist – World Bank, “Poverty as a Cause of Wars?”, Interdisciplinary Science Reviews, Winter, p. 273)

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 undertaken 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 semidemocracies, the ruling elites responded to crises by increasing repression (thereby using one form of violence to abort another).

A2: Asian Leadership Impact

-- SKFTA not key to soft power – presence is more important, their evidence is clearly talking about Colombia FTA, not South Korea

-- Asian leadership is high – and ASEAN solves

Siirila 10 (Aaron, Projects & Outreach Coordinator – East-West Center, “Clinton: “Renewed American leadership in Asia”,” 11-4, http://aseanmattersforamerica.org/clinton-renewed-american-leadership-in-asia/456)

US Secretary of State Hilary Rodham Clinton called ASEAN a “fulcrum for the region’s emerging regional architecture” and declared US intentions to “sustain and strengthen America’s leadership in the Asia-Pacific region” in a speech co-hosted by the East-West Center on October 28 in Hawaii. Full video of the speech is available. One main theme of the speech was a defense of America’s record and continuing commitment to US allies, partners and regional institutions in Asia. It was in the context of the third category – regional institutions – that Clinton singled out ASEAN as a leader: And let me simply state the principle that will guide America’s role in Asian institutions. If consequential security, political, and economic issues are being discussed, and if they involve [US] interests, then we will seek a seat at the table. That’s why we view ASEAN as a fulcrum for the region’s emerging regional architecture. And we see it as indispensable on a host of political, economic, and strategic matters. The speech comes as Clinton departs for a seven-country tour of Asia and just two weeks before President Barack Obama visits Asia for the longest international trip of his presidency. ASEAN features heavily in both itineraries; between them, Clinton and Obama will visit four of the ten ASEAN countries. Clinton went on to describe the many ways the US has engaged with ASEAN over the past two years, including: accession to the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation, opening a US mission to ASEAN, engaging in the ASEAN Defense Ministerial Meeting, two US-ASEAN summits attended by President Obama, and a “leading role” in the ASEAN regional forum. Other regional institutions of importance to the United States included APEC and the East Asia Summit (EAS). Clinton also detailed the many strides in bilateral relations between the US and countries in Southeast Asia. In Thailand, she held out the Creative Partnership Agreement, which brings Thais and Americans together to develop sectors of the Thai economy. In the Philippines, the upcoming 2+2 Strategic Dialogue meeting will bring together US and Filipino defense and foreign secretaries. The US has engaged with both countries to increase their skills in counterterrorism and response to humanitarian disaster. Clinton praised Indonesia for “playing a leading role in the region and especially in regional institutions.” The US is looking forward to launching the new Comprehensive Partnership Agreement this month, during Obama’s visit, and is also placing high hopes on Indonesia’s hosting of the East Asia Summit in 2011. In Vietnam, the US is “cultivating a level of cooperation that would have been unimaginable just 10 years ago.” US-Vietnamese ties are moving forward diplomatically, economically, and in defense-related issues. And the US is working with Singapore to promote economic growth and integration through ASEAN and the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP). The US has also increased its naval presence in Singapore.

-- Asian leadership collapse inevitable – economic crisis and defense spending

Zakheim 9 (Dov, Trustee – Foreign Policy Research Institute, “Security Challenged for the Crisis”, 3-11,

http://www.isn.ethz.ch/isn/Current-Affairs/Security-Watch/Detail/?ots591=4888CAA0-B3DB-1461-98B9-E20E7B9C13D4&lng=en&id=98001)

The economic crisis is likely to further diminish the already weak appetite of allies and friends both to increase or even maintain their current levels of defense expenditure, and to contribute to coalition operations in Afghanistan. Few of our major allies and friends spend as much as 3 percent. of their GDP on defense. Their GDPs, like ours, are in decline and in several cases, such as Japan, are declining at a far faster rate than ours. Korea and Taiwan, like Japan, are suffering from a drop in exports, notably in the automobile sector. Iceland’s financial collapse has received widespread attention. Economic constraints have at times been an excuse for allies not to do more for the common defense of the West; today, that excuse is being buttressed by reality. Whether excuse or reality, the net result will be exactly the same: the United States will be forced to bear an even heavier burden to defend western interests, at a time when it will have fewer resources enabling it to do so. The case of the F-35 provides a distinct example of the interplay between pressures on the US defense budget and alliance relationships. The F-35 program could be one of those affected by the redistribution of defense spending priorities. There are eight countries that currently are co-developing this aircraft, including key allies Britain, Canada and Australia, and many more planning to purchase it, among them Israel, Singapore, and many of the European allies that currently fly F-16s. Any slowdown of the program will increase its costs, and could put it beyond the purchasing power of several F-35 partners. It could also could embitter states that have contributed to its development, furnishing them with yet another reason to be even less inclined to contribute to coalition efforts if Afghanistan, and potentially elsewhere, than they are today.

A2: Trade Impact

-- Globalization is increasing – no evidence that collapse of free trade is coming, just evidence that SKFTA boosts trade

KORUS doesn’t solve global free trade

Bhagwati, 7-24 – Jagdish, professor of Economics at Columbia University, co-author of “Offshoring of American Jobs: What Response From US Economic Policy”, 2011, “The Wrong Way to Free Trade”, <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/07/25/opinion/25bhagwati.html?_r=2>

LATE last week, a longstanding debate over free-trade agreements with South Korea, Colombia and Panama — deals that were negotiated under President George W. Bush but never finalized — stalled once again. President Obama supports the agreements, but only if more retraining for workers is part of the deal, a condition Republican leaders are resisting. Both sides claim to advance the trade agenda, but they are fighting over fairly minor points. Neither side shows the slightest interest in reinvigorating the nearly 10-year-old Doha round of global trade negotiations, which have far greater potential to create prosperity and help working Americans. Bilateral trade agreements are not the same as free trade. Yes, they liberalize trade for the parties involved, but outsiders then face a handicap. The discrimination comes in the form of barriers like tariffs and antidumping charges, which countries impose on imports that they believe are priced artificially low. When the United States negotiates bilateral deals with other countries, the unbalanced nature of the one-on-one negotiations also opens the way for all manner of lobbies to ram their self-serving demands into the agreements. For example, when Washington negotiated free trade deals with Chile and Singapore, Wall Street lobbied to curtail those countries’ right to impose restrictions on capital flows at times of crisis — even though the International Monetary Fund now admits that such restrictions often make sense. Business lobbies have also pressed for excessively favorable treatment on intellectual property rights. American labor unions have learned these same tricks, urging Democratic legislators and administrations to block bilateral trade deals unless their demands for labor protections are met, as they did with the three long-delayed agreements now pending. But larger countries with more clout, like India and Brazil, will allow no such provisions. They correctly see these labor provisions as a form of anticompetitive protectionism. And they point out that it takes chutzpah for the United States to argue for labor rights abroad that often exceed those at home. Moreover, when powerful business and labor interests can extract concessions in those bilateral deals, they have no reason to support a multilateral trade agenda. Mr. Obama’s trade representative, Ron Kirk, points out that business leaders press bilateral trade deals, not the Doha round. The proponents of bilateral deals always complain that multilateralism is too slow. This surely confuses cause and effect. Only presidential leadership can set our trade policy in the right direction: away from bilateral deals and toward Doha. First, Mr. Obama needs to bring the business lobbies on board. Here is one sweetener he can offer: Finish the Doha round on the basis of what has been negotiated and then declare a new round that will start right away and address unresolved issues. The Doha round, after all, was conceived to address the “unfinished agenda” of the preceding Uruguay round, which ended in 1995 with much accomplished but also much left undone. Next, the canard that Doha offers little gain for the United States must be put to rest. C. Fred Bergsten, director of the Peterson Institute for International Economics, has estimated that the annual economic gain to the United States from the Doha round would be only $6 billion to $7 billion — a figure widely cited by Doha’s opponents. But a policy must be judged not just by what it directly achieves but also by what would happen in its absence. The failure of Doha would cause immeasurable harm. It would undermine the credibility of the W.T.O. and its progress in promoting multilateral trade liberalization, and it would begin to erode the binding dispute settlement mechanism, an achievement unparalleled in other international institutions. The value of that mechanism was demonstrated just this month, when a W.T.O. panel ruled for the United States and the European Union in a case challenging China’s restrictions on exports of industrial raw materials. President Obama must persuade labor unions, core Democratic constituents, that they are wrong to buy into the fear-mongering that says trade with poor countries produces poverty in rich countries. In fact, what depresses workers’ wages are deep and continuing technological changes; cheap imports of consumer products help workers by offsetting that effect. The president should ask Democrats and Republicans to immediately add the Doha round, as it has been negotiated over 10 years, into the same all-or-nothing package as the three bilateral deals. Such a bold gesture has a precedent. After sitting on the fence his first year in office, President Bill Clinton embraced the cause of trade, despite the political costs, and fought fiercely, and against great odds, for the Uruguay round. Mr. Obama should do no less.

-- 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 United States and South Korea in the increasingly global economic interests of the other are shrinking in relative terms."27

A2: Trade Impact

-- No war impact

Barbieri 96 (Katherine, Professor of Political Science – University of North Texas, Journal of Peace Research, February, p. 42-43)

This study provides **little empirical support** for the liberal proposition that trade provides a path to interstate peace. Even after controlling for the influence of conti­guity, joint democracy, alliance ties, and relative capabilities, the evidence suggests that in **most instances** trade fails to deter conflict. Instead, extensive economic inter­dependence increases the likelihood that dyads engage in militarized dispute; how­ever, it appears to have little influence on the incidence of war. The greatest hope for peace appears to arise from symmetrical trading relationships. However, the dampening effect of symmetry is offset by the expansion of interstate linkages. That is, extensive economic linkages, be they sym­metrical or asymmetrical, appear to pose the greatest hindrance to peace through trade. Although this article focuses exclusively on the pre-WWII period, elsewhere I provide evidence that the relationships revealed here are also observed in the post­WWII period and more extended period, 1870—1985 (Barbieri, 1995). Why do the findings differ from those presented in related studies of the trade—conflict re­lationship, which reveal an inverse relation­ship between trade and conflict? Several explanations, other than the temporal domain, can be offered. First, researchers differ in the phenomena they seek to explain, with many studies incorporating both conflictual and cooperative interstate behavior (e.g., Gasiorowski, 1986a, b; Gasiorowski & Polachek, 1982; Polachek, 1980, 1992; Polachek & McDonald, 1992). Studies that focus exclusively on extreme forms of conflict behavior, including dis­putes and wars, differ in their spatial and temporal domains, their level of analysis, and their measurement of central con­structs. Preliminary tests reveal that the composition of dyads in a given sample may have a more dramatic impact on the empiri­cal findings than variations in measurement. For example, the decision to focus exclusively on ‘politically relevant dyads’ may be one source of difference (Oneal et al., 19%). Perhaps the primary component missing from this and related research is the inclusion of a more adequate assessment of the costs and benefits derived from interdepen­dence. I have repeatedly argued that the conflictual or pacific elements of interdepen­dence are directly related to perceptions about trade’s costs and benefits. Yet, a more comprehensive evaluation of these costs and benefits is needed to see whether a link truly exists between the benefits enjoyed in a given trading relationship and the inhibition of conflict in that relationship, or con­versely, the presence of net costs for at least one trading partner and the presence of con­flict in that relationship. For example, are trading relationships that contain two partners believed to benefit from trade less conflict-prone than those containing at least one partner perceived to be worse off from trade? I have merely outlined the types of relationships believed to confer the greatest benefits, but such benefits and costs require a more rigorous investigation.

-- Trade is resilient – no collapse

Perroni and Whally 96 (Carlo, University of Warwick and John, University of Western Ontario, American Economic Review, 86(2), May, p. 60)

Furthermore, trade performance in the period since the late 1940’s also clearly stands in sharp contrast to the events of the 1930’s. The largest players, the United States and the EU have consistently displayed a determination to mediate their trade disputes in the 1980’s, triggered by EU enlargement. And today’s global economy is much more interdependent than it was in the 1930’s. Firms and industries have become more reliant on export markets, and there is more interindustry trade. There is also the major difference of the presence of the GATT/WTO, accompanied by bindings on tariffs achieved in eight rounds of negotiations; and, despite its weaknesses, a GATT/WTO dispute-settlement procedure has continued to function.

-- Trade conflicts won’t escalate

Nye 96 (Joseph, Dean of the Kennedy School of Government – Harvard University, Washington Quarterly, Winter)

The low likelihood of direct great power clashes does not mean that there will be no tensions between them. Disagreements are likely to continue over regional conflicts, like those that have arisen over how to deal with the conflict in the former Yugoslavia. Efforts to stop the spread of weapons of mass destruction and means of their delivery are another source of friction, as is the case over Russian and Chinese nuclear cooperation with Iran, which the United States steadfastly opposes. The sharing of burdens and responsibilities for maintaining international security and protecting the natural environment are a further subject of debate among the great powers. Furthermore, in contrast to the views of classical Liberals, increased trade and economic interdependence can increase as well as decrease conflict and competition among trading partners. The main point, however, is that such disagreements are very unlikely to escalate to military conflicts.

A2: Clean Tech Impact

-- Doesn’t solve – need to get China on board

-- US is already leading in clean tech – no one is close

Walsh 11 (Bryan, Staff Writer, Cites Eric Levi, Energy Expert – Council on Foreign Relations, “Tilting at Wind Turbines,” Time, 1-21, http://ecocentric.blogs.time.com/2011/01/21/politics-should-we-stop-freaking-out-about-china-and-clean-tech/)

But nothing is ever that simple between China and the U.S. Even as he is arranging research partnerships in Beijing, Chu is warning that the U.S. faces a "Sputnik moment" on clean tech, with China investing heavily in solar, wind and other renewables with an eye towards cornering the market for what could be the next big global industry. The United Steelworkers union has accused China of illegally subsidizing its clean tech industry at the expense of American workers, and according to the AFL-CIO, the American trade deficit with China on clean energy products cost the U.S. 8,000 jobs in 2010. It's rare to find anything that most Americans appear to agree on any longer—the NFL playoffs, maybe—but it seems to be a fairly universal opinion that China is eating our lunch when it comes to clean tech. Michael Levi, though, has his doubts. The energy expert at the Council on Foreign Relations has a piece in Foreign Policy questioning whether China really is leaping past the U.S. on clean tech. He doubts it, arguing that the perception is fueled by a misunderstanding of the way the Chinese economic and research system really works—and by an underappreciation of American strengths: Yes, China spent more money buying wind turbines and solar panels than any other country last year. But consumption does not necessarily translate into technological leadership -- if it did, the United States would have little to worry about in most product categories. Massive deployment of clean energy will give the Chinese government leverage with foreign firms (because Beijing will be able to demand concessions in exchange for market access) and provide opportunities for incremental innovation. But the cutting edge is, in most cases, far away: The Chinese innovation system still has enormous difficulty moving ideas from the laboratory to commercial application... The purported Chinese dominance in high-tech exports, meanwhile, is the product of statistical sleight of hand. Chu's figures describe the total value of Chinese exports. That gives China credit for the full price tag of every product it exports -- even if it's only responsible for its final assembly. (If China imported a Mercedes and painted it green, it would rack up tens of thousands of export dollars.) A careful analysis would focus instead on value added, which is what drives profits and wages. And on that score, the United States is still firmly in the lead.

A2: Solves Climate Change

KORUS doesn’t solve climate change- weakening of emissions standards and environmental damage

Infoshop News 7-13 – “The FTA Hat Trick and the Climatic Free Fall”, <http://news.infoshop.org/article.php?story=20110713005718218>

Republican Representative Sam Graves shot wide of the mark in a recent article, published on Politico last Friday, touting the upcoming free trade agreements (FTAs) with Korea, Colombia and Panama on the basis of defending small businesses. Although the FTAs being voted on as early as this week may create some jobs, many more would be shipped overseas, feeding into the formula of what has become one of the greatest financial crises of US history. A quick glance at the meteoric decline of the US automotive industry brings a casual observer face to face with the ugly truth that no business, no matter how big or how small (or heavily subsidized), will benefit from free trade in the long run. Graves's own statistics are contravened by a hefty weight of evidence easily found on the website of Trade Justice organization, Public Citizen, but even those figures don't add up to much in light of the most important issue of our era — time may be running out, as Graves puts it, but what's at stake here is far greater than what multi-national corporations consider to be nickles and dimes; with the rise of free trade comes a commensurate decline in global environmental standards, and this “race to the bottom” will produce something significantly worse than lost profits. Even Ford Motors has spoken out against the free trade agreement with Korea, declaring that it will undermine some of the US-American auto-industry's more progressive gestures towards greater emissions standards by encouraging Korea to keep their own standards low. This maneuvering would most hurt domestic car companies, who only would be able to export only one car to Korea per every 52 Korean cars imported to the US in the first place, so it is revealing that General Motors (GM), which owns the fourth largest Korean car company, Daewoo and has not made serious attempts to cut carbon' emissions, has become one of the biggest boosters of the FTA. If the deal is passed, GM could potentially sue South Korea as a direct foreign investor should that country pass legislation regulating carbon emissions of automobiles manufactured domestically. The US government might find this position favorable, due to its historic purchase of 61% of GM during the financial crisis of 2008; however, it exposes unfair business practices, which subject some US car companies to emissions standards but not others. In a portentous article called, “Only GM Would Benefit From Proposed FTA Revisions” published in Automotives Insight, Industry News reports that the deal would benefit a long term strategy to reduce emissions requirements to 25% from the current course of 40% by 2016. In so doing, it would contravene and subvert the global climate goals set during last year's 16th annual Conference of Parties in Cancun, which accorded to reduce greenhouse emissions and maintain a rise in global temperature not in excess of 2°C above pre-industrial levels (in spite of warnings from the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the European Union that a 2°C increase remains dangerous, with potentially disastrous climatic effects). Even such an underachievement is impossible should the US continue to fall short of its own declared benchmarks, while encouraging other countries to do the same. The geopolitical underpinnings of this ecological-economic game are difficult to miss. Instead of using its partial ownership of GM to encourage efficiency and carbon emissions standards, the Obama Administration has used the once formidable car manufacturer as a pawn directed towards, in the words of the Congressional Research Alliance, “ensuring that the United States remains a strategic and economic counterbalance to China and Japan.” South Korea is considered by many analysts to be a financial powerhouse on equal footing with Brazil, Russia, India and China (BRIC), which together have created a political bloc that contends with US hegemony in critical global power games, such as the WTO and the COP. The BRIC countries have growing solar and wind power marketplaces, but they also have, for the most part, growing populations and run-away-train energy needs. The BRICs are playing the heavy, blocking stringent, binding global emissions standards, so the US does not feel compelled to meet its own carbon emissions goals on time. In using their big chip, GM, to bargain away its own meaningful climate legislation in hopes of obtaining negligible financial returns on their initial investment to the detriment of the rest of the US auto industry, the US wants to believe that it is cutting China off at the pass and staying competitive in a market race to boost industrial gains and gain economic allies. In reality, rather than bring one of the BRIC bloc countries over to its side, this deal will acquiesce to an international hegemonic situation that promotes the US's own economic stagnation through an increased trade deficit coupled with diminishing domestic job production. A similar issue arises from the implications of the Panama Free Trade Agreement, also being voted on next week. The US seeks a greater stake in the ownership of the Panama Canal, currently owned largely by China, and US corporations such as Caterpiller have come out in favor of the FTA due to their eagerness to become involved in a vast project to expand the canal. This undertaking would create a large amount of environmental damage, due to siltation, industrial pollutants, and deforestation, and as a result of expanding the Panama Canal, an increase in the shipments of nuclear material and oil would assail the perilous chokepoint, increasing the danger of spillage and environmental catastrophe. If the FTA were to pass, Caterpiller's status as a foreign investor would give them the right to sue Panama should the government successfully move to pass legislation to curb the expansion. Many groups also contend that Panama's status as the world's most notorious tax haven would make investor protections in the FTA into lucrative loopholes for corporations going into tax exile, but people in Panama have already spoken out against the FTA for another issue entirely — dolphin safety. The Panamanian shrimping industry is one of the largest sources of revenue in that country, and the FTA would expand it significantly by lowering health and sanitary standards while increasing foreign investment and reducing tariffs, putting a tremendous strain on coastal water-systems, and, in particular, Panama's mangrove forests. A haven for endangered and migratory species, these mangrove forests also provide a veritable fortress against hurricanes and storm surges. Their destruction, along with the expansion of the canal chokepoint and increased barge traffic, would wreak ecological havoc along the isthmus. The power play in Panama, where the US seems poised to loosen China's chokehold over the busiest trade corridor in the world, reveals another cavalier gesture to gain a shaky hegemonic foothold on the eroding grounds of global resource transportation rather than concentrate on cultivating local production and economic-ecological sustainability. Panama's neighbor, Colombia, has an equally negative environmental cost-benefit analysis with regards to the FTA package. Most people know that Colombia is currently embroiled in a hotly contested civil unrest, but what most people don't know is that the Colombian government is responsible for one of the greatest crises of internal displacement in the world, and what even fewer people know is that the peaceful Afro-colombian population has been extirpated from the western-most part of Colombia, El Chocó-Darien, by Colombian paramilitaries and the military, itself, as part of a strategy to eradicate the lush tropical rainforest for the production of African Palm plantations. Although scientists have deemed El Chocó one of the top ten global hot-spots, revealing its position among the world's most vital natural processing centers of greenhouse gases, the Colombian government seeks to replace it with a monocrop that has utterly decimated other parts of the world such as Indonesia. The ultimate ironic outcome of this disastrous project, which would advance the displacement of Afro-colombians to convert almost 10% of the country into a plantation that harvests a plant called African Palm, would be its final product: Palm Oil, which is increasingly used to power biofuel engines. Between the factory farm industry's glowing praise of free trade agreements, and Cargill's elation that toxic Bt corn will gain even greater international market access, it should not come as a surprise to anyone that the greatest “green” upshot of this trade package is that consumers will remain positive about progressive “green” market choices, as the Colombia FTA ensures that biofuel market access will expand, enabling upscale buyers to choose the apparently environmentally friendly option while remaining ignorant of the fact that its production comes at the cost of the earth's most valuable ecosystems. Suffice it to say that the massacre in Bagua, Peru, has already shown what becomes of indigenous rights and native forests as a result of the most recent FTAs. In the end, the rhetoric characterizing Obama's “geopolitical balancing act” of exploiting Bush-era FTAs appears more like the wild gesticulations of a person waving their hands in free fall. The administration's continuing propensity to hide behind the false promise of climate change legislation while enriching the coffers of State-held private interests at the expense of the working class has perpetuated the inequities of the Bush era up to this point. Soon, the US may be forced onto a coherent economic and environmental platform by moving away from the vain corporate posturing that is keeping the US's fossil-fuel based economy in the tar pits of history. The only question remaining is, who will be left standing?

KORUS can’t solve climate change- locks South Korea into Bush era emissions standards which are far too weak

Dodson and Ridihalgh 7-26 – Lynne, secretary-treasurer of the Washington State Labor Council; Kathleen, senior organizing manager of the Sierra Club in Washington and Oregon, SEATTLE TIMES, “Congress should reject proposed trade agreements and insist on better policies”, http://seattletimes.nwsource.com/html/opinion/2015736117\_guest27dodson.html

If ratified by Congress, the South Korea agreement would also trump most new measures designed to combat climate pollution. The Bush administration pressured South Korea to weaken its auto-emission standards as a prerequisite to any deal, and the agreement would lock in these weaker standards. This weakens U.S. standards by discouraging investment in cleaner technology and increasing support for lobbying efforts to drive down the standards where they want to do business.

KORUS Flawed

KORUS is too fundamentally flawed to solve- lack of focus on net exports, no job growth, no review mechanism

Hindery 7-12 – Leo, Chairman of the US Economy/Smart Globalization Initiative at the New America Foundation, “These Three Free Trade Agreements are Clunkers- and They Need Some Courage”, 2011, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/leo-hindery-jr/these-three-free-trade-ag\_b\_895503.html

So, with proper attribution to my friends named above, especially the Steelworkers, and as our own analysis shows, each of these proposed FTAs is deeply flawed. And by far the biggest flaw common to each -- and the most important -- is the failure to focus on "net exports." Sure, U.S. exports to each country will increase, albeit likely not nearly to the extent promised, but corresponding imports into the U.S. from these countries will in each case grow faster. Net exports will be negative, and thus on balance, even more American jobs will be lost overseas. No perspective on trade is more important than "net exports", yet no perspective has been more overlooked over the years, most recently by President Obama's misguided commitment to doubling "gross" (rather than "net") exports over the next five years and by these three FTAs. Specific problems with each proposed Agreement, most notably the one with Korea, include the following: The Korea-US (KORUS) Free Trade Agreement: • Notwithstanding KORUS, the Korean market will remain one of the toughest markets in the world for the U.S. to compete in because of tariffs and myriad non-tariff barriers. • In return for some relatively modest allowances associated with American grain and beef exports, KORUS will a-reciprocally increase our trade deficit in seven high-paying manufacturing sectors, according to our own International Trade Commission. The Economic Policy Institute estimates that KORUS will cause the loss of at least 159,000 jobs. • In 2009 (the latest year for which I have data, although 2010 is reported to be similar), the United States imported products valued at $39.2 billion from Korea while it exported $28.6 billion, an already obvious trade deficit for us of $10.6 billion. As a major part of this deficit, U.S. carmakers sold vehicles worth $161 million to Korea in 2009, while Korea's manufacturers, led by Hyundai Motor and its sister company, Kia Motors, earned a staggering $5.7 billion from their exports to America. In the first nine months of 2010, U.S. automobile manufacturers exported 10,162 vehicles to Korea, while Korean manufacturers exported an almost unbelievable 449,403 cars to us. Yet under the proposed FTA, the most that U.S. auto manufacturers could realistically ever hope to export to Korea is around 50,000 vehicles a year given the myriad barriers which Korea has set up to protect its domestic auto manufacturers. • The new European Union free-trade accord with Seoul that goes into effect this month has none of the fundamental flaws that make our proposed FTA bark like a dog. • KORUS allows for Korean dumped or subsidized components to be shipped to the U.S. from third countries, it does not address Korea's ongoing currency manipulation, and it fails to include a comprehensive annual review mechanism to ensure that its provisions are fully and faithfully enforced.

KORUS Flawed

KORUS fails to solve

Dodson and Ridihalgh 7-26 – Lynne, secretary-treasurer of the Washington State Labor Council; Kathleen, senior organizing manager of the Sierra Club in Washington and Oregon, SEATTLE TIMES, “Congress should reject proposed trade agreements and insist on better policies”, http://seattletimes.nwsource.com/html/opinion/2015736117\_guest27dodson.html

THE definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over and expecting a different outcome. This summer, insanity reigns over proposed U.S. trade agreements with South Korea, Colombia and Panama. For more than 20 years, "free" trade agreements have systematically undermined the American economy and the middle class. The growing disparity between the "haves" and "have nots" is turning the American dream into a nightmare. It is a direct result of our failed trade policy, and it needs to stop now. We need trade. We need trade that promotes enforceable labor rights, protection of natural resources, food security, self-determination and healthy, safe communities. Trade needs to work for people and our economy, not just for multinational corporations and investors. Historically, multinational corporations have written trade rules to suit their shareholders, increasing profit on the backs of workers and the environment. The investment chapters of the proposed free-trade agreements give foreign investors and corporations expansive rights to directly challenge public-interest laws and regulations for compensation before international tribunals, bypassing domestic courts. We have seen Mexico and Canada lose NAFTA challenges to environmental protection and the U.S. has spent millions defending itself against suits. The South Korea-U.S. Free Trade Agreement alone would increase our trade deficit by $16.7 billion and displace 159,000 U.S. jobs in the first 7 years, according to the Economic Policy Institute. In Washington state, the Washington Fair Trade Coalition estimates more than 59,000 jobs would be lost. The agreement also bans "Buy Local" preferences designed to boost the economy while allowing products made in sweatshops in North Korea and China to be labeled "Made in Korea" and sold in the U.S. at reduced or no tariffs. So while the U.S. has sanctions on trade with North Korea, the South Korea-U.S. agreement would cause U.S. consumers to unwittingly contribute to the coffers of a regime that continues to abuse its people and the environment, while investing in nuclear capability. The director of National Intelligence has called for an investigation into the security implications of the decline of American manufacturing, caused by off-shoring through U.S. trade deals. If ratified by Congress, the South Korea agreement would also trump most new measures designed to combat climate pollution. The Bush administration pressured South Korea to weaken its auto-emission standards as a prerequisite to any deal, and the agreement would lock in these weaker standards. This weakens U.S. standards by discouraging investment in cleaner technology and increasing support for lobbying efforts to drive down the standards where they want to do business. Ratifying a trade agreement with Colombia that does not include meaningful and enforceable labor standards is particularly reprehensible. Colombia is the most dangerous place in the world for trade unionists. In 2010, 51 labor leaders were killed in Colombia, more than in the rest of the world combined. So far in 2011, another 17 have been killed and 98 percent of these murders are unsolved. If 51 CEOs were murdered in Colombia last year, would we be pursuing this without any safeguards to protect lives? Trade agreements must promote domestic job growth, protect workers' rights and ensure that provisions do not put domestic policy at risk. We need to invest in education, work-force training, infrastructure, research and development, and commit to trade-law enforcement. These are the first trade agreements to come up for a vote since the global economic meltdown demonstrated that multinational corporations need oversight. It is time for the Washington congressional delegation to demand trade policies that reflect our values, build our economy, strengthen national sovereignty, and advance workers, the environment and civil society. It's not only fair. It's smart.