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### Notes

The argument is pretty straight forward:

Debt ceiling needs to pass but bipartisanship is necessary, education reform disrupts bipartisanship and creates delays, not raising the debt ceiling bad for \_\_\_\_ reason.
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# Neg

## 1NC

#### Debt ceiling is a Senate must pass before August recess is a must but bipartisan agreement is key

Bade and Everett 7/17/17 [Rachel, covers House leadership for POLITICO joined POLITICO in September 2012 as a tax reporter, covering the IRS tea party targeting scandal and Hill efforts to reform the tax code before moving to the Congress team in early 2015, Burgess, congressional reporter for POLITICO. He previously was a transportation reporter for POLITICO Pro, Web producer, helping run POLITICO’s Twitter and Facebook accounts, and a contributor to the On Media blog, “House Republicans weigh massive partisan spending bill”, <http://www.politico.com/story/2017/07/14/house-republicans-spending-bill-240565>, Accessed 7/17/17] SZhang

Either way, Senate Republicans have made clear they prefer raising the debt ceiling before leaving for recess the second week of August. “We’ll probably deal with that before we leave,” said Majority Whip John Cornyn of Texas, the No. 2 Senate Republican. The House has other plans. GOP leaders and staff have vowed for weeks to raise the debt ceiling before the “X date” of default but also downplayed the possibility that the date would fall before the summer break. The Congressional Budget Office’s recent announcement that the nation won’t bump up against the debt ceiling until early- to mid-October has only emboldened House Republicans to wait until September. If Senate Republicans insist on acting before recess, however, they would need to send a bill to the House in the next two weeks, before the lower chamber breaks for recess at the end of July. House Majority Leader Kevin McCarthy (R-Calif.) has told Republicans he will not keep them in town in August at all — unless the Senate sends them an Obamacare repeal bill. McCarthy said nothing about staying in session to address the debt ceiling. The reality is that striking a debt agreement will likely take much longer than two weeks. Republicans will need Democrats to carry the legislation because conservatives won’t vote for a debt ceiling increase without steep spending cuts — a proposition at which Democrats scoff. Senate Democrats have also suggested they may play hard to get, demanding policy changes for their support. That all but ensures a multiweek negotiation process. There’s also been talk about striking a bipartisan budget deal to raise federal spending caps along with a debt limit boost. In the House, more than 20 members of the moderate Tuesday Group — the very members House GOP leadership will lean on to help pass a debt ceiling bill — have asked for the two to go hand in hand. Negotiations on that front, however, have not even started.

#### Education hit a roadblock—dems won’t bite after DeVos confirmation without major GOP concessions

Camera, 2/9/17 [Lauren, education reporter at U.S. News & World Report. She’s covered education policy and politics for nearly a decade, “Bipartisan Education Politics a Thing of the Past”, https://www.usnews.com/news/education-news/articles/2017-02-09/bipartisan-education-politics-a-thing-of-the-past, Accessed 6/25/17] SZhang

“We have been able to work together well for the past two years, and it’s because we have worked in good faith and across party lines to make sure we have what we needed to proceed,” Sen. Patty Murray, D-Wash., the top Democrat on the Senate education committee, said prior to the committee vote that cleared billionaire school-choice advocate Betsy DeVos, now Secretary of Education, for consideration by the full Senate. Confirming DeVos in spite of staunch Democratic opposition, she warned committee Chairman Lamar Alexander, R-Tenn., was “a massive break with that strong bipartisan record, and it will dramatically impact our ability to work together in good faith going forward.” Alexander, for his part, accused Democrats of unfairly holding up DeVos' confirmation process. While DeVos' contentious confirmation garnered the lion’s share of media attention, across the Capitol and out of the spotlight House Republicans were moving on something just as noteworthy: They passed two, separate resolutions that would block the Department of Education from implementing rules set by the Obama administration. The first resolution, which comes as states begin implementing the bipartisan Every Student Succeeds Act, prevents the Department of Education from dictating prescriptive requirements for how they measure that achievement, using metrics such as school ratings, timelines for interventions for failing schools and student participation in state assessments. “By blocking implementation of the Obama administration’s accountability rule, we are giving states the certainty they need to move forward with their own efforts to implement the law,” said Rep. Todd Rokita, R-Ind., who authored the resolution.

**The plan causes partisan fights that bog down Congress and waste time**

**Doran 17**

Leo Doran (staff writer). “Education Policy Has Rarely Been This Politicized.” Inside Sources. February 6th, 2017. http://www.insidesources.com/education-policy-rarely-politicized/

Nonetheless, Republican strategists in the new administration may **consciously choose to allow some time to elapse before pushing major education reform.** Despite a recent House subcommittee hearing on “The Power of School Choice” and a pair of GOP bills aimed at rolling back Obama administration ESSA rules, Cross said he does not expect “an ‘in your face’” attempt by Republican leadership in the coming weeks to enact sweeping campaign promises, such as President Trump’s proposal to find $20 billion for school choice grants. While a major school choice bill may get out of the House, the Senate committee that oversees education is expected to be **busy in the coming months** with the large task of amending or replacing the Affordable Care Act. Michael Hansen, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution’s Brown Center on Education Policy, agrees with Cross that the confirmation fight is “larger than just Betsy DeVos.” Hansen also expressed the caveat, however, that DeVos’s signature issue—school choice and related voucher programs—is somewhat more controversial than the issues typically championed by prospective education secretaries. Unlike Cross, who sees the possibility for tensions to cool in the coming months, Hansen said that education policy “is shaping up to be a space where there are **a lot of partisan divides**.” He said the issue “is probably going to be political for a while.”

#### Failure to raise the debt ceiling causes an economic depression

**Swonk 6-14**

Diane Swonk (founder and CEO of DS Economics, an economic consulting firm. Prior to that, she spent more than 30 years in the financial services industry. As a well-known macroeconomist, she advises the Federal Reserve Board and its regional banks. She also served two terms on the economic advisory board to the Congressional Budget Office. She has been named a fellow by the National Association for Business Economics (NABE) for outstanding contributions to the field). “Congress again pushing US toward brink of financial calamity.” The Hill. June 14th, 2017. http://thehill.com/blogs/pundits-blog/economy-budget/337832-congress-again-pushing-us-toward-brink-of-financial

The standoff poses a real risk that we could once again find ourselves on the verge of a U.S. Treasury default. The showdown in 2011 unnerved financial markets and resulted in the first downgrade in our country’s credit in August 2011. Economic growth slowed to a standstill as uncertainty spiked. We ended up with across-the-board budget cuts, which eliminated fiscal stimulus at a critical time in the recovery. That shifted more of the burden of supporting the economy onto the Federal Reserve, which has few tools. Worse yet, those contractionary moves did nothing to rein in ballooning deficits over the medium term, which was the stated goal. The cuts did not address the elephant in the room: spending on Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid benefits, which are already rising at a faster pace as baby boomers age into retirement. The irony is that the debt ceiling was initially designed to facilitate rather than constrain the Treasury’s flexibility to issue debt. Congress gave President Woodrow Wilson the ability to issue bonds as needed to fund World War I. Though the debt ceiling has undergone many iterations, it remains critical to Treasury’s financing government commitments that have already been approved. It does not include new spending initiatives; thus, holding the debt ceiling hostage does nothing to align spending with revenues. Failing to raise the debt ceiling would force the Treasury to stop making interest payments on our debt, including all bonds and bills. That would mean breaking the contract with all holders of U.S. Treasuries, which would be akin to a large number of Americans defaulting on all of their debt obligations simultaneously. It would make the mortgage defaults during the housing crisis look small in comparison. Interest rates would spike as the world would lose faith in the U.S. as a safe haven. The value of the dollar would plummet. Government spending would contract, threatening retirees dependent on Social Security. A financial crisis would erupt and push the U.S. economy into recession or worse, a protracted depression.

**The impact is extinction**

**Kemp 10**

Geoffrey Kemp, Director of Regional Strategic Programs at The Nixon Center, served in the White House under Ronald Reagan, special assistant to the president for national security affairs and senior director for Near East and South Asian affairs on the National Security Council Staff, Former Director, Middle East Arms Control Project at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2010, “The East Moves West: India, China, and Asia’s Growing Presence in the Middle East”, p. 233-4

The second scenario, called Mayhem and Chaos, is the opposite of the first scenario; everything that can go wrong does go wrong. The world economic situation weakens rather than strengthens, and India, China, and Japan suffer a major reduction in their growth rates, further weakening the global economy. As a result, energy demand falls and the price of fossil fuels plummets, leading to a financial crisis for the energy-producing states, which are forced to cut back dramatically on expansion programs and social welfare. That in turn leads to political unrest: and nurtures different radical groups, including, but not limited to, Islamic extremists. The internal stability of some countries is challenged, and there are more “failed states.” Most serious is the collapse of the democratic government in Pakistan and its takeover by Muslim extremists, who then take possession of a large number of nuclear weapons. The **danger of war between India and Pakistan increases** significantly. Iran, always worried about an extremist Pakistan, expands and weaponizes its nuclear program. That further enhances nuclear proliferation in the Middle East, with Saudi Arabia, Turkey, and Egypt joining Israel and Iran as nuclear states. Under these circumstances, the potential for nuclear terrorism increases, and the possibility of a nuclear terrorist attack in either the Western world or in the oil-producing states may lead to a further devastating collapseof the world economic market, with a tsunami-like impact on stability. In this scenario, major disruptions can be expected**,** with dire consequences for two-thirds of **the planet’s population**.

## UQ:

### 2NC UQ

#### Debt ceiling MUST pass Senate but negotiation is key

Edgerton, 7/14/17 [Anna, Reporter for Bloomberg politics based in Washington DC, “GOP Leaders Plan for Senate to Vote First on Debt Limit, Sources Say”, <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2017-07-14/debt-limit-increase-bill-is-said-to-be-voted-on-first-by-senate>, Accessed 7/17/17] SZhang

Republican leaders plan for the Senate to move first in August to raise the U.S. debt limit, with the House to act later, two people who were briefed on the plan said Friday. Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell of Kentucky told reporters this week he wants to act on a debt limit increase before leaving Washington for the August recess. A leading option discussed by Senate leadership this week is to tie the debt limit legislation to an extension of a program letting veterans receive medical care outside of Veterans Affairs facilities, one of the people said. The House would put the debt limit package to a vote in September when members return from their planned five-week August break, according to the second person. While the Senate will stay in Washington for the first two weeks of August, the House would stick around -- or come back -- only if needed to vote on the Republican plan to replace Obamacare. White House officials have urged Congress not to wait until the last minute to increase the government’s authority to borrow money to pay its creditors. The Treasury can fund the government through early to mid-October under the current borrowing limit, the Congressional Budget Office said in late June. Many conservative lawmakers balk at raising the debt limit without conditions, but there is little appetite from congressional leaders to risk a default, and they are likely to seek a bipartisan solution. Attaching an unappealing vote like raising the debt ceiling to a more popular bill benefiting veterans would make it an easier pill to swallow for some Republicans. Members of the conservative House Freedom Caucus said this week that the chamber should also stay in session into August to address the debt limit, among other things. House Speaker Paul Ryan of Wisconsin hasn’t publicly expressed the same urgency, but he did promise that Congress would act before the debt ceiling is breached. “Can we assemble a package before August? Sure,” Ryan said last month regarding a debt limit deal. “Do we have to before August? No, we don’t have to assemble it before August. But that’s the kind of thing we’re having a good conversation with our members on.”

#### Debt Ceiling will pass before the August recess, but negotiations with Dems is key.

Carney 7/11 – (Jordain, “McConnell: 'Ideally' debt ceiling vote is before August recess,” <http://thehill.com/blogs/floor-action/senate/341505-mcconnell-ideally-debt-ceiling-vote-is-before-august-recess>, 7/11/17)//DD

Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) signaled on Tuesday that he wants a vote on raising the debt ceiling before lawmakers leave for the August recess. "Ideally we'll deal with the debt ceiling before the August recess," he told reporters. The timeline comes after Senate Republicans announced they would delay the start of the August recess by two weeks — moving the recess start date from July 31 to August 14. The move, McConnell suggested, could give lawmakers time to deal with a backlog of delayed legislation and work out an agreement to increase the debt ceiling before they leave Washington until early September. Treasury Secretary Steven Mnuchin has urged Congress to increase the debt ceiling before the August recess, but the Congressional Budget Office has estimated that the country will not run out of borrowing options until mid-October. Conservatives typically want the vote tied to entitlement reform or spending cuts — a move that would likely draw pushback from Democrats. McConnell sidestepped Tuesday on saying if the vote needed to be tied to spending cuts. "We'll see, but the debt ceiling must be raised," he said. The House Freedom Caucus outlined on Monday three possible options to raise the debt ceiling that could win their vote. One option would require the Treasury secretary to issue GDP-linked bonds to pay the country’s debt in the event that the debt ceiling is reached, and allow the president to authorize the sale of certain government assets to raise funds for the payments. The second option would tie the debt ceiling to a budget resolution and require $250 billion in mandatory spending cuts. The third option would tie the debt ceiling vote to an ObamaCare repeal effort in case Republicans split repeal and replace. Julia Lawless, a spokeswoman for Sen. Orrin Hatch (R-Utah), said the Senate Finance Committee chairman has started talking to the administration about when Congress should vote. "Chairman Hatch is working with the administration to get more details on what the appropriate time will be for Congress to act to raise the debt ceiling and is continuing to work with his colleagues in Congress to find a viable path forward to achieve this goal," she told The Hill late last week. Republicans are expected to need to negotiate with Democrats on how to raise the debt ceiling for the first time since a vote in 2014. Senate Minority Leader Charles Schumer (D-N.Y.) warned on Tuesday that would be "very hard" for Democrats to support the move if it was tied to tax cuts for high-income earners. "The burden of proof is on them to come up with a proposal," he said.

### AT ACA Thumper

#### No Obamacare repeal—too much GOP opposition

Haberkorn et al, [Jennifer, Senior health care reporter for POLITICO Pro. She’s covered the Affordable Care Act since it was being debated in Congress in 2009. Since then, she has written about the law from Capitol Hill, the federal agencies, the courts and outside the Beltway. Everett Burgess, congressional reporter for POLITICO. He previously was a transportation reporter for POLITICO Pro, Web producer, helping run POLITICO’s Twitter and Facebook accounts, and a contributor to the On Media blog. Seung Min, “Obamacare repeal bill plunges into new uncertainty”, <http://www.politico.com/story/2017/07/16/gop-health-care-bill-will-it-pass-240606>, Accessed 7/17/17] SZhang

A harsh reality is setting in among Senate Republicans: They're extremely unlikely to repeal Obamacare in the coming days. Republicans felt somewhat buoyed by Wednesday’s White House meeting and late-night senators-only gathering, which left them feeling as though they’re making progress and that nearly every GOP senator is trying to get to yes. But the math is increasingly working against them, with four Republican senators having announced opposition to starting debate — though the bill could further change — and more unannounced but likely no's. Key Senate Republicans were set to meet again on Thursday afternoon, said Sen. Dean Heller (R-Nev.), a critic of the GOP's latest approach. But Heller won't be there and said he'd send staff in his place. Sen. John McCain’s diagnosis of brain cancer also has the GOP one vote down, or at least leaves a huge question mark regarding whether the beloved Arizona Republican would be able to make the trip back to Washington. And Heller said at a GOP lunch on Thursday, there was no clarity from GOP leaders on what the party would even be voting to debate next week. "We didn't have a firm commitment at lunch today," Heller said. "We still can't figure out what the first amendment is going to be after the motion to proceed." That uncertainty is blunting the GOP's momentum as it heads into a weekend back home. So is President Donald Trump's Wednesday interview with the New York Times, which allies of GOP leaders said had stomped all over a productive Wednesday meeting on health care with Republican senators by criticizing Attorney General Jeff Sessions. "They had their first productive day on health care in two weeks, and by 6 o'clock, Trump had screwed it up with his AG story," said a Republican close to GOP leaders. **GOP leaders can lose only two Republicans and move forward. There could be as many as 10 GOP defections on the bill Tuesday if the current, informal tallies hold**, according to GOP sources. One persistent critic, Sen. Rand Paul (R-Ky.), said he might vote to proceed to the bill after saying he wouldn't for several weeks. "I've let leadership know I would vote to proceed if we can proceed to at least one of the choices being clean repeal. It's still very vague and nebulous and that's why it's hard to say whether you'll vote to proceed to something that you don't know you're proceeding to," Paul said.

#### McConnell delays ACA vote due to McCain absence and uncertain support—priorities have shifted

Everett and Kim, 7/16/17 [Burgess, congressional reporter for POLITICO. He previously was a transportation reporter for POLITICO Pro, Web producer, helping run POLITICO’s Twitter and Facebook accounts, and a contributor to the On Media blog. Seung Min, “Obamacare repeal bill plunges into new uncertainty”, <http://www.politico.com/story/2017/07/16/gop-health-care-bill-will-it-pass-240606>, Accessed 7/17/17] SZhang

Republicans’ long-held plans to repeal Obamacare are again in serious doubt, with no clear timetable for a Senate vote following the surprise news that John McCain will be out as he recovers from surgery. Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) shelved a vote planned for this week following the disclosure of McCain’s procedure, which leaves the GOP clearly short of support to advance the bill. McConnell’s office could give no new schedule for the vote, and most on Capitol Hill are waiting for a pathology report to assess how long it will be before McCain returns after undergoing surgery to remove a blood clot above his eye. Privately, Republicans said the delay could be as little as a week as McCain recovers in Arizona, though others worried it could stretch for several weeks and jeopardize the entire repeal effort. Clouding the timetable further, a new Congressional Budget Office estimate for the bill that was expected on Monday has also been delayed, Republicans said. It could come as early as Tuesday. Whether the bill would advance even if McCain were in Washington is another question altogether, as the Arizona senator is one of more than half a dozen undecided Republicans, any one of whom could tank the bill. The two GOP senators who publicly oppose the current draft of the legislation, conservative Rand Paul of Kentucky and centrist Susan Collins of Maine, appeared on several Sunday morning news shows to rain on the bill’s prospects. Both sounded doubtful that the bill would have advanced this week on a procedural vote even with McCain present. “It would be extremely close,” Collins said on ABC’s “This Week.” “I would estimate that there are about eight to 10 Republican senators who have deep concerns, but how this would all translate out I’m not certain. And I never underestimate Leader McConnell’s skills.” Asked on “Fox News Sunday” whether McConnell has the support of at least 50 Republicans, the number needed to begin debate on the bill, Paul answered bluntly: “I don’t think right now he does.” He said on CBS' "Face the Nation” that the longer the bill’s consideration drags on, the less conservatives will like it. If one more skeptical senator comes out against the bill, McCain's absence would be moot. The fatal blow could come later this week, depending on when CBO releases its analysis of Republicans’ latest plan. Several wavering GOP senators have said they are waiting to hear from the nonpartisan agency before announcing their position. McConnell revised the bill after intense negotiations last week in an attempt to win more votes. He included a divisive amendment from Sen. Ted Cruz (R-Texas) that would allow the sale of cheap health care plans that lacked Obamacare consumer protections as long as Obamacare-compliant plans were still sold by insurers. Some Republicans doubted that the CBO would have time to analyze the complex amendment before a vote this week; the delay may give the nonpartisan budget-crunchers time to figure out how the proposal would affect premiums and insurance coverage. The amendment also may have to be redrafted to clarify whether it would siphon money off the bill's insurance stability fund, which could further delay its CBO score. The CBO projected that 22 million fewer Americans would have health insurance over a decade and that premiums would initially rise sharply for some people under Senate Republicans’ previous plan. McConnell was forced to delay a vote on the bill last month after it was clear he lacked the votes to pass it. McConnell’s chief deputy, Majority Whip John Cornyn of Texas, suggested the vote’s timing would be based on McCain’s return. “As soon as we have a full contingent of senators, we’ll have that vote. It’s important we do so,” Cornyn said on NBC’s “Meet the Press.” “Health care is hard. And we know that. But we have no choice.” He said if the bill fails this summer, the GOP will “keep trying” on a solution but acknowledged the party may have to come up with a “different plan.” McConnell’s latest draft would also leave in place some of Obamacare’s tax increases, plow $70 billion more into lowering premiums, allow pre-tax dollars to pay for insurance premiums and deliver $45 billion to fight opioid addiction. The White House has been increasingly engaged in the whip process — and hasn’t given up on Collins and Paul either. Paul has spoken with President Donald Trump about health care recently, while Collins has heard from Trump’s chief of staff, Reince Priebus. The Trump administration’s top Medicaid official, Seema Verma, spent the weekend trying to persuade governors and senators that those changes will blunt the reductions in Medicaid spending and the phase-out of Obamacare’s Medicaid expansion under the “Better Care Reconciliation Act.” “BCRA includes the funding states need to provide healthcare freedom and choices for people whose only option under ACA was Medicaid,” Verma said in a statement Sunday. Yet those additions have not yet garnered the support of 50 votes to even start debate on the bill and have not convinced wavering GOP governors like Brian Sandoval of Nevada, who is advising Sen. Dean Heller (R-Nev.) on the bill. Heller is the most vulnerable GOP senator up for reelection next year, and his opposition to the previous version helped delay last month’s vote. “I am struggling to validate the numbers that are being presented to me by the administration versus what I’m hearing from independent [experts],” said Sandoval at a governors conference in Rhode Island. Cruz signed on to the latest version after his amendment was included, but a number of Republicans remain undecided on voting to advance the legislation, including Shelley Moore Capito of West Virginia, Rob Portman of Ohio, Mike Lee of Utah, Lisa Murkowski of Alaska, John Hoeven of North Dakota, Jeff Flake of Arizona, McCain and Heller. Moderate Republicans still worry about the Medicaid cuts, while conservatives complain that not enough of Obamacare would be dismantled. And any major changes to the bill to mollify critics could squeeze out votes on the right or in the center. In his weekend address, Trump insisted that things were moving his way: “We are very, very close to ending this health care nightmare. We are so close.” Paul and other conservatives — and occasionally the president himself — have suggested that the GOP should move back to a repeal of the health care law and then figure out the replacement later if McConnell’s latest draft falls flat. But such a plan almost certainly cannot pass the Senate, despite being supported by almost all GOP lawmakers just two years ago. "The Republican Party wasn't serious about repealing,” Needham said. While McConnell and his leadership team hunt for votes this week on health care, action on the floor will focus on other, potentially less controversial issues. The Senate may consider an extension of Food and Drug Administration user fees as well as lower level nominees while McCain is out, according to Republicans. The Senate may also try to raise the debt ceiling; Trump administration officials have urged Congress to extend the government’s borrowing limit by the end of this month. A massive defense policy bill is also possible, though the absence of McCain, the Senate Armed Services Committee chairman, makes that less likely. McConnell canceled two weeks of the August recess last week as GOP senators grew antsy at the swelling workload. That leaves the Kentucky Republican the option of bringing up the health care bill in August if McCain is able to return and they can find the votes to pass it.

### AT Russia Thumper

#### Russia bill is still in the house—no thumpers for you but even if you get a thumper—it’s going to pass

Marcos, 7/22/17 [Christina, Congressional reporter for the Hill, “House to vote on Russia sanctions deal next week”, <http://thehill.com/homenews/house/congress-deal-russia-sanctions-bill-defying-president-trump>, Accessed 7/22/17] SZhang

The House is slated to vote Tuesday on bipartisan legislation to limit the Trump administration's ability to lift sanctions on Russia. The White House had urged lawmakers to water down the provisions limiting its ability to lift sanctions. But the legislation is expected to head to President Trump's desk without the requested changes. Procedural hangups had stalled the legislation in the House for weeks after the Senate passed it by a vote of 98-2 last month but negotiators reached a deal that was unveiled on Saturday. The legislation will be considered under an expedited process that requires a two-thirds majority for passage. That also means it'll pass by a veto-proof majority. In addition to imposing new sanctions on Russia, the legislation allows lawmakers to vote to block the Trump administration from making changes to sanctions policy. Next week's vote on the sanctions legislation will come amid investigations of whether the Trump campaign colluded with Russian officials during the 2016 campaign. The sanctions package will be one of the last items on the House agenda before lawmakers are scheduled to leave for the month-long August recess at the end of next week. House Democrats had been objecting to a provision inserted by GOP leaders that allowed only the majority party to force a vote on a resolution approving or disapproving of the Trump administration's sanctions policy. Under the deal unveiled Saturday, either the House majority or minority leader can introduce such a resolution. "The legislation ensures that both the majority and minority are able to exercise our oversight role over the administration’s implementation of sanctions," said House Minority Whip Steny Hoyer (D-Md.), who pushed for the revision in talks with House Majority Leader Kevin McCarthy (R-Calif.). But some Democrats worry that the minority leader won't be guaranteed a vote on a resolution of disapproval even if it is introduced. The legislation includes sanctions on Iran as punishment for its ballistic missile development. Negotiators further added North Korea sanctions to the package in the latest version of the bill. House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (D-Calif.) expressed concern the addition of North Korea sanctions could add procedural delays in the Senate, even though she supports them. "It is essential that the addition of North Korea to this package does not prevent Congress from immediately enacting Russia sanctions legislation and sending it to the President's desk before the August recess," Pelosi said in a statement. The House had passed North Korea sanctions legislation earlier this spring by a vote of 419-1, which will now be included.

#### Nice try—this is a senate scenario but the Russia thumper is in the house—delay is over new NK sanctions amendment

Caygle et al. 7/14/2017 [HEATHER, Congress reporter for POLITICO was a congressional reporter for Bloomberg BNA, primarily covering transportation but also dabbling in Hill action on tax reform, agriculture, appropriations and the Postal Service, ELANA SCHOR Congressional reporter for POLITICO, covered politics for Environment & Energy Daily. She has more than a decade’s worth of Hill reporting experience, writing on congressional politics for The Guardian, Talking Points Memo, and The Hill, and serving as the first editor of the infrastructure news site Streetsblog Capitol Hill, JAKE LAHUT, POLITICO reporter, “Russia sanctions bill hits fresh roadblocks in the House”, <http://www.politico.com/story/2017/07/14/nancy-pelosi-democrats-russia-sanctions-bill-240559>, Accessed 7/17/17] SZhang

The Senate's bipartisan Russia sanctions bill ran into more trouble **in the House** on Friday, raising fresh questions about whether and when the chamber will be able to agree on forcing President Donald Trump to take a harder line against Moscow. The Russia bill's biggest Friday hiccup came from House Majority Leader Kevin McCarthy, who called for the addition of a North Korea sanctions bill that the Senate has yet to act on, to the frustration of his GOP. House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi also appeared to back down from Democratic demands that have held up quick movement of the Senate-passed bill. House Republicans and Democrats have sparred for days over who is to blame for the delay of the Senate-passed bill that sanctions Russia and Iran. One of the sticking points has been language, proposed by the House GOP and accepted unanimously by the Senate, that would eliminate House Democrats’ power to force a vote blocking Trump from easing sanctions on Russia. McCarthy's North Korea request is a new hurdle. Pelosi suggested at a press conference Friday that she would drop House Democrats’ insistence on restoring their power to force an anti-Trump vote. “I want to protect the prerogatives of the minority in the House, but weighing the equities, what was more important was passing the Russian-Iran sanctions bill, " Pelosi said. "So we are on board to just proceed." But parties involved on both sides say no deal has been reached and talks are continuing. House Minority Whip Steny Hoyer (D-Md.), during a Friday colloquy with McCarthy, gave no indication that Democrats are backing off their demand that the GOP restore their procedural power. Rep. Eliot Engel, the top Democrat on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, said during a Friday interview taped for C-SPAN's "Newsmakers" that he interpreted Pelosi's comments as a Democratic willingness to relent only if the Senate-passed sanctions bill could move ahead with minimal or no changes. In fact, House Republicans are weighing their own potentially significant alterations to the sanctions bill, which the Senate passed 98-2, in the face of quiet lobbying from the White House as well as K Street. Pelosi's comments risk undercutting her party's position in talks that have given Democrats a powerful bludgeon against the House GOP — which has been delaying the bill, a clawback of power from Trump, despite the growing scandal regarding Russian assistance to the Trump campaign. "I don't think the Republicans in the House are serious about passing this bill," Engel told reporters Friday. "From what I'm hearing, it's this change then that change," on the Republican end, Engel added. The latest proposed change, suggested by McCarthy on the House floor Friday, was adding a North Korea sanctions package, which the House passed in May, to the legislation punishing Russia and Iran. "I do believe that ... there's an addition that should be added, and that is North Korea. That [bill] came out of here 419-1,” McCarthy said on the floor Friday afternoon. McCarthy added that "it would be a very strong statement for all of America to get" a sanctions bill affecting Russia, Iran, and North Korea to the White House. Hoyer responded that he shared that view. Senate Foreign Relations Chairman Bob Corker (R-Tenn.), who played a leading role in negotiating the upper chamber's Russia sanctions deal and has expressed interest in a North Korea travel ban, said he is open to McCarthy's call for adding North Korea penalties to the sanctions bill. “There is no question that we need to apply more pressure to North Korea,” Corker said in a statement. House Foreign Affairs Chairman Ed Royce (R-Calif.) "and I have discussed the desire of some House members to add North Korea provisions to the Senate’s legislation to sanction Iran and Russia," Corker added, "and we would be more than glad to take a close look at it if this is the path they choose.” Asked for a response to Pelosi's remarks, AshLee Strong, a spokeswoman for Speaker Paul Ryan (R-Wis.), noted McCarthy and Hoyer’s conversation on the floor and added, "We continue to have productive conversations with our Democratic colleagues to find a bipartisan solution."

### AT Spending

#### Spending doesn’t thump—stop gap solves and debt ceiling is top of the docket

Collins, 7/23/17 [Michael, reporter for USA today, “Congress' next big battles: Passing spending bills, raising the debt limit”, <https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2017/07/23/congress-next-big-battles-spending-bills-debt-limit/497477001/>, Accessed 7/23/17] SZhang

WASHINGTON — The repeal of Obamacare may be taking up most of the oxygen in Congress for now, but two other big battles are on the horizon. Battle lines already forming as Congress gets ready to take on the task of passing spending legislation to keep the government open and raising the national debt ceiling. Deadlines for both are fast approaching. The new fiscal year begins Oct. 1, yet neither the House nor the Senate has passed any of the 12 spending bills that are needed to keep the federal government running. Budgets for the various federal agencies are divided among those 12 bills, so each receives special scrutiny from congressional committees before it is passed by Congress. But it has been more than a decade since Congress has adhered to the regular budgeting process, forcing lawmakers to cobble together comprehensive stop-gap spending bills like that one approved in May that covered the remainder of the current fiscal year. The House will attempt to show it is making some progress next week, when it is scheduled to vote on a package of four security-related appropriations bills. The other eight spending measures have cleared the House Appropriations Committee, yet no vote for them has been scheduled on the House floor. In the Senate, which has been stymied much of the summer over health care,three spending bills have been passed out of the Senate Appropriations Committee but have yet to be considered by the full chamber. Even if the two chambers were to pass spending measures, additional time will be needed for the House and Senate to resolve the differences between their bills, approve the final products and send them along to the president for his signature. **“We’ve got a train wreck coming,**” Sen. John McCain, R-Ariz., fumed recently on the Senate floor. Congress is scheduled to begin its summer recess next month, yet “we’ve got the debt limit, we’ve got no appropriations bill passed,” McCain said, pounding the lectern with his fist. “All of these things are piling up, and we’ve got about 30 days to do it in, and so far I have seen no plan, no plan to address these challenges.” What’s more, Republicans are looking to tackle a major overhaul of the federal tax code — a complicated, time-consuming task that threatens to further divide the GOP and could complicate efforts to pass appropriations legislation and raise the debt ceiling. Treasury Secretary Steven Mnuchin is urging Congress to raise the national debt ceiling before it goes on summer break so that the government can continue to pay its bills and avoid a **potentially devastating economic crisis.** The debt limit is the legal amount the Treasury can borrow to pay the government's bills, including Social Security and Medicare benefits, military salaries, tax refunds, interest on the national debt, and other obligations. The current debt limit of $19.8 trillion was seton March 16, but lawmakers gave the government no borrowing authority to surpass it. Exactly when the government will run out of money is unclear, but the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office has projected the Treasury would run out of cash in early to mid-October. Mnuchin said recently the government has enough money to get through September without raising the ceiling. Yet many congressional Republicans are reluctant to raise the limit unless it is accompanied by spending or regulatory reforms. “We’re going to see an increase in the debt limit — we have to,” predicted Marc Goldwein, head of policy and senior vice president for the non-partisan, non-profit Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget. It’s doubtful, however, that Congress will pass all 12 of the spending bills before the close of the current fiscal year on Sept. 30, Goldwein said. More than likely, he said, Congress will pass a resolution extending current spending levels to the end of the calendar year to buy more time for negotiations. It’s no way to budget, Goldwein said, but it has become common practice in Congress. The last time all 12 spending bills were passed by the Sept. 30 deadline was in 1995.

## Links:

### generic

#### Education hit a roadblock—dems won’t bite after DeVos confirmation without major GOP concessions

Camera, 2/9/17 [Lauren, education reporter at U.S. News & World Report. She’s covered education policy and politics for nearly a decade, “Bipartisan Education Politics a Thing of the Past”, https://www.usnews.com/news/education-news/articles/2017-02-09/bipartisan-education-politics-a-thing-of-the-past, Accessed 6/25/17] SZhang

“We have been able to work together well for the past two years, and it’s because we have worked in good faith and across party lines to make sure we have what we needed to proceed,” Sen. Patty Murray, D-Wash., the top Democrat on the Senate education committee, said prior to the committee vote that cleared billionaire school-choice advocate Betsy DeVos, now Secretary of Education, for consideration by the full Senate. Confirming DeVos in spite of staunch Democratic opposition, she warned committee Chairman Lamar Alexander, R-Tenn., was “a massive break with that strong bipartisan record, and it will dramatically impact our ability to work together in good faith going forward.” Alexander, for his part, accused Democrats of unfairly holding up DeVos' confirmation process. While DeVos' contentious confirmation garnered the lion’s share of media attention, across the Capitol and out of the spotlight House Republicans were moving on something just as noteworthy: They passed two, separate resolutions that would block the Department of Education from implementing rules set by the Obama administration. The first resolution, which comes as states begin implementing the bipartisan Every Student Succeeds Act, prevents the Department of Education from dictating prescriptive requirements for how they measure that achievement, using metrics such as school ratings, timelines for interventions for failing schools and student participation in state assessments. “By blocking implementation of the Obama administration’s accountability rule, we are giving states the certainty they need to move forward with their own efforts to implement the law,” said Rep. Todd Rokita, R-Ind., who authored the resolution.

#### DeVos confirmation and deregulation of the ED gutted any bipartisan sentiment—education policy has hit a real roadblock [long cut of the 1nc ev]

Camera, 2/9/17 [Lauren, education reporter at U.S. News & World Report. She’s covered education policy and politics for nearly a decade, “Bipartisan Education Politics a Thing of the Past”, https://www.usnews.com/news/education-news/articles/2017-02-09/bipartisan-education-politics-a-thing-of-the-past, Accessed 6/25/17] SZhang

“We have been able to work together well for the past two years, and it’s because we have worked in good faith and across party lines to make sure we have what we needed to proceed,” Sen. Patty Murray, D-Wash., the top Democrat on the Senate education committee, said prior to the committee vote that cleared billionaire school-choice advocate Betsy DeVos, now Secretary of Education, for consideration by the full Senate. Confirming DeVos in spite of staunch Democratic opposition, she warned committee Chairman Lamar Alexander, R-Tenn., was “a massive break with that strong bipartisan record, and it will dramatically impact our ability to work together in good faith going forward.” Alexander, for his part, accused Democrats of unfairly holding up DeVos' confirmation process. While DeVos' contentious confirmation garnered the lion’s share of media attention, across the Capitol and out of the spotlight House Republicans were moving on something just as noteworthy: They passed two, separate resolutions that would block the Department of Education from implementing rules set by the Obama administration. The first resolution, which comes as states begin implementing the bipartisan Every Student Succeeds Act, prevents the Department of Education from dictating prescriptive requirements for how they measure that achievement, using metrics such as school ratings, timelines for interventions for failing schools and student participation in state assessments. “By blocking implementation of the Obama administration’s accountability rule, we are giving states the certainty they need to move forward with their own efforts to implement the law,” said Rep. Todd Rokita, R-Ind., who authored the resolution. Citing similar concerns of federal overreach, the second resolution negates an Obama-era regulation that dictates specific requirements states must use to determine the effectiveness of teacher preparation programs. Democrats blasted the adoption of the resolutions, which passed the House on a party-line vote Tuesday afternoon. “This resolution will cripple the Department of Education, and it will leave states like Colorado blind on how to implement the Every Student Succeeds Act,” said Rep. Jared Polis, D-Colo. “After months of bipartisan work on a new education law, it’s both disappointing and appalling that Republicans have chosen to move swiftly to undo all the progress we have made.” Murray said the resolutions would deal a “devastating blow to students” and would “gut” the bipartisan law. “Senate Republicans just jammed through a new Secretary of Education with no experience in public education and with every Democrat and two Republicans opposing her,” she said in a statement. “So now is the time for us in Congress to get back to working together to build on our bipartisan Every Student Succeed Act and invest in our students and schools, not for Republicans to poison the well with a partisan vote to gut our bipartisan law, give even more authority to the Secretary of Education to implement her anti-public school agenda, and open the door to students and communities across the country falling through the cracks.” Despite the hand-wringing by Democrats, there isn’t much they can do able to do to block the resolutions. Alexander, who’s been resistant to tampering with any part the law in an effort to ensure it’s implemented the way Congress intended it, said this week that he supported the resolutions. In addition, the White House signaled President Donald Trump would sign them should they clear the Senate.

#### Congressional education reform repeal destroys bipartisanship—Dems won’t work

Camera, 2/9/17 [Lauren, education reporter at U.S. News & World Report. She’s covered education policy and politics for nearly a decade, “Bipartisan Education Politics a Thing of the Past”, https://www.usnews.com/news/education-news/articles/2017-02-09/bipartisan-education-politics-a-thing-of-the-past, Accessed 6/25/17] SZhang

Citing similar concerns of federal overreach, the second resolution negates an Obama-era regulation that dictates specific requirements states must use to determine the effectiveness of teacher preparation programs. Democrats blasted the adoption of the resolutions, which passed the House on a party-line vote Tuesday afternoon. “This resolution will cripple the Department of Education, and it will leave states like Colorado blind on how to implement the Every Student Succeeds Act,” said Rep. Jared Polis, D-Colo. “After months of bipartisan work on a new education law, it’s both disappointing and appalling that Republicans have chosen to move swiftly to undo all the progress we have made.” Murray said the resolutions would deal a “devastating blow to students” and would “gut” the bipartisan law. “Senate Republicans just jammed through a new Secretary of Education with no experience in public education and with every Democrat and two Republicans opposing her,” she said in a statement. “So now is the time for us in Congress to get back to working together to build on our bipartisan Every Student Succeed Act and invest in our students and schools, not for Republicans to poison the well with a partisan vote to gut our bipartisan law, give even more authority to the Secretary of Education to implement her anti-public school agenda, and open the door to students and communities across the country falling through the cracks.” Despite the hand-wringing by Democrats, there isn’t much they can do able to do to block the resolutions. Alexander, who’s been resistant to tampering with any part the law in an effort to ensure it’s implemented the way Congress intended it, said this week that he supported the resolutions. In addition, the White House signaled President Donald Trump would sign them should they clear the Senate.

### Civil Rights

#### GOP K-12 civil rights record means any legislation is going to get stuck

Peters 16 [Laurence, Adjunct Professor, Johns Hopkins School of Education, “What Will a New Trump Administration Mean For K-12 Education?”, <http://soetalk.com/2016/11/23/what-will-a-new-trump-administration-mean-for-k-12-education/>, Accessed 6/26/2017] SZhang

We are likely to see a new Trump Administration oversee a massive rollback on the federal role when it comes to preserving educational equity for all kinds of populations, not least African American, Hispanic and special-needs students. Currently there is a fight between the Obama Administration and Republican lawmakers over the intent of the ESSA language related to the need for Title One to supplement, not supplant, state dollars for special populations. The GOP wants to insist that states and locals can use their federal dollars however they want and so, **if they decide they do not want to spend the funds they were allocating to poor schools, they no longer have to because the federal dollars can make up the difference.** Todayit is much clearer that **poor schools under a Trump Administration will stand to lose hundreds of millions of dollars in potential funding.** So **we end up with a rather dismal picture for the federal role in education as we have known it**. It looks now like the recent battles in Congress that led to the long-awaited passage of the landmark Elementary and Secondary School Act, now renamed the Every Child Succeed Act, was a herald for a large retreat from the former federal role as the funds were virtually block-granted to the states with limited amounts of controls and oversight. Gary Orfield, the noted civil rights historian, claimed the new law stripped the federal funding of its “leverage for any national purpose.” Under a new Trump Administration, we can expect more of the same. But as one wise saw said who helped me survive the Reagan administration as a House Democratic staffer on the brunt end of his similar “drain-the-swamp” anti-Washington rhetoric, “there are no permanent defeats or permanent victories.” What we have in this country is a democracy still expressed in the three branches of government, as well as a free press and an active advocacy community.

### Common core elimination

#### Common core elimination requires massive push and attention from Trump [potential pc ev]

O’Neill et al, 16 [Kevin, co-chair of the Legislative practice group, helps clients understand and navigate federal legislative and executive complexities in order to further their business objectives, Amy Davenport, Senior Policy Analyst, works with clients to help them understand and navigate the complexities of the federal government to ensure that they achieve their public policy goals and objectives, Amy Budner Smith, Policy Advisor for public and non profit organizations, Dana Weekes provides strategic counsel to clients to advance their policy goals on Capitol Hill and within the Executive Branch on issues affecting various sectors including food and agriculture, energy, technology, education, appropriations, and federal grants, “Post-Election Analysis 2016: Education”, <https://www.apks.com/en/perspectives/publications/2016/11/pea-2016-education>, Accessed 6/22/17] SZhang

President-elect Trump has not produced a robust education policy agenda, but his education priorities started taking shape last month with public statements made during a campaign stop to Columbus, Ohio. Earlier in the campaign, much of his comments on education centered around school choice and eliminating the Department of Education and the Common Core State Standards. While **achieving these goals will prove to be difficult**, President-elect **Trump may spend significant resources working to defund signature Obama Administration education grant programs** or restructure them as block grants or "smart grants

### Private schools

#### Private school regulation controversial—funding increase is unpopular

Sargrad, 5/23/17 [Scott, managing director for K-12 education policy at the Center for American Progress, “An Attack on American Schools”, <https://www.usnews.com/opinion/knowledge-bank/articles/2017-05-23/donald-trump-and-betsy-devos-budget-would-destroy-public-schools>, Accessed 6/26/17] SZhang

As former Education Secretary Arne Duncan said whenever he talked about President Barack Obama's budget proposals, budgets reflect our values. And when it comes to education, the values of Trump and his education secretary Betsy DeVos couldn't be clearer – private schools deserve money, and public schools and vulnerable students don't. At a high level, the outlines of Trump and DeVos' education priorities became clear in March with the release of the administration's so-called "skinny budget." As a result, much of what is in today's full budget isn't surprising. The proposal would cut the Education Department's funding by more than 13 percent and slash overall funding by almost $11 billion, including eliminating $2.1 billion in funding for teacher professional development and support, which could pay the salaries of more than 35,000 teachers, and $1.2 billion for after-school programs, which support working families and serve 1.6 million students. At the same time, Trump and DeVos would push over $1 billion of new money for private school voucher schemes and other school choice programs. In essence, states and districts will have to enact DeVos' preferred school choice policies in order to recover some of the cuts to longstanding programs. But the details released in the Trump administration's official budget paint an even starker picture. **In addition to eliminating funding for teachers and after-school programs, the budget proposes dismantling 20 other critical programs – zeroing out funding for arts; foreign language; science, technology, engineering and math (STEM); literacy; history and civics; gifted programs; mental health; bullying prevention; and enrichment programs.** In a cruel twist, Trump would cut $12 million in funding for the Special Olympics – after he openly mocked a reporter with a disability on the campaign trail last year. Budgets are always an exercise in trade-offs and priorities and, if nothing else, Trump and DeVos should get credit for being crystal clear about their priorities. In addition to prioritizing private schools over public schools, the budget prioritizes ideology over evidence and choice over all else. In order to fund her private school voucher scheme, DeVos has proposed distorting the bipartisan Education Innovation and Research Program – the successor to the Investing in Innovation program – to create her own slush fund for private schools. The Education Innovation and Research Program was intended to provide more resources to ideas with a proven evidence base to build on existing research and create more evidence of effective programs. Instead of supporting the best ideas from states and districts to improve schools, DeVos would specifically funnel that money to private schools, including private religious schools. DeVos may claim she wants to build evidence, but when asked about recent studies showing that the Washington, D.C. voucher program actually had negative impacts on student achievement, she simply said, "We're not taking questions." Even when it comes to staffing the Department of Education, DeVos' priorities are stark. The budget requests millions more dollars for "additional security costs for the secretary" stemming from DeVos's unprecedented decision to have federal marshals guard her 24 hours a day, rather than simply trusting the department's own security staff. At the same time, DeVos would cut staff at the Office for Civil Rights by almost 10 percent despite a nearly threefold increase in complaints over the past decade, gutting the department's ability to protect students across the country. While it's tempting to think that the Trump-DeVos budget is so extreme that it has no chance of being enacted into law, that would be a mistake. This budget is simply a more draconian version of House Speaker Paul Ryan's conservative vision to dismantle the safety net. The values and priorities that it represents are deeply damaging to the country, and particularly to vulnerable students. The alternative vision is simple. Invest in education, don't dismantle it – and ensure that public money goes to public schools. Parents, teachers and advocates can't let Trump and DeVos off the hook for this attack on America's schools.

### School Choice

#### Federal school choice legislation unpopular—GOP split makes any passage rough

Reynolds and Mann, 2/21/17 [Molly, Governance studies at Brookings Institute, Elizabeth, Governance studies at Brown Center for Educational Policy, “Rifts among congressional, state Republicans over school choice”, <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/fixgov/2017/02/21/gop-rifts-over-school-choice/>, Accessed 6/23/17] SZhang

With Betsy DeVos confirmed as President Trump’s Secretary of Education, it may seem that Republicans in Congress and in statehouses will quickly enact school choice policies. However, the scope of change may be more limited than many expect. Recently, we looked at the Medicaid expansion component of the Affordable Care Act, discussing how the interests of Republican governors have put some of them at odds with a segment of their congressional counterparts, creating political divisions that could complicate repeal efforts. School choice policies are similar to Medicaid in that states play a large role in implementation, and recent developments have indicated important potential rifts within the Republican Party at both the state and federal levels. School choice issues—which include both charter schools and voucher programs—were front and center on Capitol Hill recently as the Senate considered the nomination of Betsy DeVos for Secretary of Education. The Senate confirmed DeVos last week, but not before Democrats engineered an all-night talk-a-thon against her nomination and two Republican senators defected, requiring an unprecedented tie-breaking vote from Vice President Mike Pence. This drama on the floor of the chamber accompanied significant off-the-floor activity as well, with senators noting extremely high levels of constituent contact opposing the nomination. Senator Lisa Murkowski (R-Alaska), who broke party lines to vote against DeVos, reported that numerous calls from concerned constituents influenced her decision to vote no, and other senators described high levels of constituent contact as well. The nomination was also the subject of protests in cities like Denver and Cleveland, reflecting a largely unprecedented level of popular opposition to a Secretary of Education nominee. Much of the resistance to DeVos was centered on school choice and charter school issues, in part because much of her education-related reputation was built on her advocacy and philanthropy in that area in her home state of Michigan. Unlike public opinion on many issues, including the Affordable Care Act, the politics of these issues do not tend to fall neatly along party lines. As our Brookings colleague Jon Valant recently discussed, charter schools are more popular with Republican voters than with Democratic ones, though majorities of both parties support them. On vouchers, meanwhile, Democratic respondents—somewhat puzzlingly—are more supportive than Republicans, with the policy becoming less popular among both groups in recent years. The reaction to the DeVos nomination suggests that an important part of public opinion on choice issues may be connected to geography, rather than to partisanship alone. Consider, for example, that the two Republican senators who voted against DeVos; Murkowski and Senator Susan Collins (R-ME) hail from rural states, where school choice options such as charters and vouchers are typically not considered feasible alternatives to underperforming schools, given the low population density. Even those who voted for her, such as Senator Mike Enzi (R-WY), inquired during her confirmation hearing what a school choice approach would mean for their constituents. Perhaps validating this skepticism, research suggests that while charter schools in urban areas tend to out-perform traditional public schools, charter schools outside urban areas “do no better and sometimes do worse than public schools.” These geographic patterns, moreover, may have important consequences for Republican efforts to reshape education policy even in the face of unified Republican control at the federal level. In Congress, major legislation is unlikely. Republicans are traditionally champions of state and local control when it comes to education, and this has never been truer than now. The new federal education law passed in 2015, the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), rolled back the federal role in education in a reversal from the No Child Left Behind era. In the year since the law passed, congressional Republicans have sought to restrict what they characterize as federal overreach by the Obama administration. Just last week, the House passed a resolution to revoke an ESSA regulation finalized in November. With this Republican-led trend in rolling back federal education authority not likely to reverse any time soon, it seems unlikely that either chamber will embrace a sweeping federal law that mandates state-level policy change. The $20 billion dollar school voucher program that President Trump proposed on the campaign trail and similar school-choice oriented bills that would convert federal aid into individual scholarships may seem attractive to Republicans eager to remove federal strings from federal education dollars, **but it seems unlikely that such a proposal would garner sufficient support in the Senate.** But let’s briefly consider the possibility that such a bill would gain some traction, particularly with such a prominent school choice advocate as Secretary of Education. Given the dynamics within the Republican Party when it comes to school choice, members of Congress representing rural districts or largely rural states would be hard-pressed to make the case for this type of federal intervention. As DeVos’s 50-50 confirmation vote illustrates and political scientist Mona Vakilifathi recently argued**, there are no guarantees that the Republican leadership could count on solid support from their rank-and-file members—and the moderate Democrats most likely to vote with Republicans hail from rural states and are unlikely to cross party lines on this issue.**

#### Trump supports charter schools—any funding cuts are unpopular

Maxwell, 3/16/17 [Lesli, assistant managing editor for Education Week, “School Choice a Big Winner in President Trump's Budget”, <http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/charterschoice/2017/03/school_choice_a_big_winner_in_president_trumps_budget.html>, Accessed 6/24/17] SZhang

President Donald Trump is calling for $1.4 billion in new federal investments in school choice, including vouchers for private schools, charter schools, and Title I funding that would follow students to the public schools of their choice. Even as he proposes to carve more than $9 billion from the federal education budget for fiscal 2018, the president made clear in his new federal budget blueprint that school choice is his agenda for K-12. During the campaign, he promised a $20 billion school choice initiative—and the new budget document pledges to eventually ramp up federal investments to that level. Trump is asking Congress to approve a new $250 million federal voucher program for families to use toward paying tuition at private schools, including religious schools. He's also calling for boosting the federal charter school grant program—currently funded at $333 million—by an additional $168 million. Those grants are directed at states and charter organizations for opening new charters and expanding existing ones, especially those operated by networks with a proven track record. Proponents of school choice were delighted with Trump's proposals. "Today, President Trump demonstrated that he is a strong supporter of charter public schools," said Nina Rees, the president and CEO of the National Alliance of Public Charter Schools, in a statement. "The charter school movement is grateful for the president's support, and we applaud his commitment to providing critically needed funding for the Charter Schools Program (CSP). This funding will allow more high-quality charter schools to open, expand, and replicate—and will help finance facilities for charter schools - so that more students have access to the great education they deserve." But there are some choice proponents concerned about Trump's broader cuts to K-12. "...[C]harter schools are part of—not a substitute for—a strong public education system," said Greg Richmond, the president and CEO of the National Association of Charter School Authorizers. "Charter schools cannot succeed without strong teachers and a seamless, affordable path to college for their graduates. Unfortunately, this proposed budget harms programs that are important for students, teachers, and public education. We look forward to working with Congress to finds ways to support both charter schools and all of public education." Other leaders in the K-12 sphere said the president's proposed deep cuts to programs such as teacher professional development and afterschool in favor of school choice programs will harm students. "The priorities Donald Trump outlined in his budget are reckless and wrong for students and families," said Lily Eskelsen García, the president of the National Education Association. "If enacted, the Trump budget will crush the dreams of students and deprive millions of opportunities." For a full explanation of the president's proposed budget for K-12, see Alyson Klein's take over at Politics K-12.

#### Funding unpopular—a long road ahead means that democrats can’t agree

Peters 16 [Laurence, Adjunct Professor, Johns Hopkins School of Education, “What Will a New Trump Administration Mean For K-12 Education?”, <http://soetalk.com/2016/11/23/what-will-a-new-trump-administration-mean-for-k-12-education/>, Accessed 6/26/2017] SZhang

Trump promises to boost charter schools goes along with his belief that both parties have been far too accepting of the status quo in the American big cities. The new billions will be reprioritizing existing federal dollars, which as mentioned above is likely to come out of the hide of the budget for the historically forgotten groups that attracted the federal interest in the first place. Politically this will be a much harder fight to overcome—first, because **Democrats remain split on the issue as to whether charter schools may well be the tonic needed to shake up hundreds, if not thousands, of underperforming schools whose monopolies continue to go unchallenged** and, second, because there may well be no need for new legislation. There are plenty of authorities in current legislation that would allow the reprogramming of these funds for charter schools, but there is every reason to believe that they would be able to pass even broader legislation in the first 100 days that would link this program to a broader anti-poverty initiative that would (as the campaign literature sets out) invite each state to “contribute another $110 billion of their own education budgets toward school choice, on top of the $20 billion in federal dollars” that someone in the Trump backroom works out to be “$12,000 in school-choice funds to every K-12 student who today lives in poverty.” No one at this point, though, can really say for sure how this initiative will end up looking once the various lobbying communities on both sides of the issue have had their say and then the bills get digested and eventually spat out by the relevant congressional committees.

### School Lunches-FUNDING

#### Increasing lunch funding unpopular—eligibility bar is rising

Jalonick, 16 [Mary Claire, Journalist at AP, “House bill would scale back number of free school meals”, <http://www.pbs.org/newshour/rundown/fewer-kids-could-receive-free-school-meals-under-house-bill/>, Accessed 6/22/17] SZhang

WASHINGTON — House Republicans on Wednesday weighed legislation that could lower the number of students receiving free and reduced-price meals at school. Legislation debated by the House Education and Workforce Committee aims to save money by scaling back the number of schools in which all students receive free or reduced meals. It would also help schools that say the Obama administration’s healthier meal rules are too restrictive and not appealing enough to students. A proposed Republican amendment to the bill would go even further, allowing a trial period of so-called block grants for school meals in three states. That would mean those states wouldn’t receive unlimited federal dollars for students who qualify for the free and reduced-price lunches. Hunger and nutrition advocates from the American Academy of Pediatrics to the American Heart Association have sharply criticized the legislation. “The bill would significantly weaken access to healthy, nutritious foods for our nation’s children,” said Dr. Benard Dreyer, president of the pediatrics group. The block grant provision, included in an amendment by Rep. Todd Rokita of Indiana, even prompted opposition from the School Nutrition Association, which has called for major changes in the school meal standards put in place in recent years and championed by first lady Michelle Obama. The group, which represents school nutrition directors and the companies that sell food to schools, called the block grant idea “reckless” and said it would be a first step toward eliminating the federal guarantee that all children have access to the nutrition they need at school. Republicans said the changes would help save money while ensuring that those with the highest need are still guaranteed meals. The committee was scheduled to vote on the amendment and the overall bill on Wednesday. Republicans, including Rokita and committee chairman John Kline of Minnesota, said the changes would help save money while ensuring that those with the highest need are still guaranteed meals. The bill would raise the threshold for a government program called community eligibility, in which schools in districts with high poverty rates can provide free meals to all students at the school. Republicans said it would better target taxpayer money by scaling back free meals for the some of the students that attend those high-poverty schools, but don’t qualify for free or reduced meals. They noted that the bill also provides an increase in federal reimbursements for school breakfasts. “This is hardly unreasonable and it’s hardly unfair,” said Rokita. The bill would allow a wider variety of foods to be sold in lunch lines, an attempt to provide flexibility to schools that have complained that the Obama administration’s standards are too strict.

### School Lunches-STANDARDS

#### Standards for school lunches decreasing—“make school meals great again”

Green and Davis 5/1/17 [Erica, Education reporter for NYT, Julie, White house reporter for NYT, “Trump Takes Aim at School Lunch Guidelines and a Girls’ Education Program”, <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/05/01/us/politics/nutrition-rules-school-lunches-michelle-obama.html>, Accessed 6/25/2017] SZhang

WASHINGTON — The Trump administration took aim Monday at two signature programs of the former first lady Michelle Obama, rolling back her efforts to promote healthy school lunches nationwide and potentially rebranding her program to educate adolescent girls abroad. Agriculture Secretary Sonny Perdue announced that school meals would no longer have to meet some requirements connected with Mrs. Obama’s initiative to combat childhood obesity by overhauling the nation’s school menus. The nutrition regulations were part of the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010 and were advocated by Mrs. Obama’s “Let’s Move” campaign. For the last five years, schools have been required to reduce the amount of calories, fat and sodium in their cafeterias and increase offerings of whole grains, fruits and vegetables, and nonfat milk to the roughly 32 million students who receive federally subsidized meals. Beginning next school year, schools can request an exemption from the whole grain requirements and delay the sodium mandate. They will also be able to serve 1 percent flavored milk instead of nonfat. Mr. Perdue said the Obama-era rules had resulted in increased costs for school districts and declining participation in the federal school lunch program. He said relaxing the rules was part of the administration’s effort to “make school meals great again.” “If kids aren’t eating the food, and it’s ending up in the trash, they aren’t getting any nutrition — thus undermining the intent of the program,” said Mr. Perdue, who announced the changes with a signed proclamation on Monday after having lunch with students at Catoctin Elementary School in Leesburg, Va. Mr. Perdue, a former governor of Georgia, was just confirmed last week. Nutrition advocates said the move by the Trump administration was shortsighted. “Just because children would rather eat heavily salted, processed foods at school doesn’t mean they should,” said Ken Cook, president of the Environmental Working Group. “The president’s fondness for Big Macs and KFC is well known, but we shouldn’t let Colonel Sanders and McDonald’s run the school cafeteria.” Since schools began complying with the nutrition standards in 2012, many have complained that they are too stringent and costly. The new rules were projected to cost $3.2 billion over five years, but Mr. Perdue said they had cost states an additional $1.22 billion in the 2015 fiscal year alone. Congress has allowed states to apply for waivers if they cannot meet certain standards. Nancy Brown, chief executive of the American Heart Association, said in a statement that schools were moving forward to meet the requirements. The organization denounced the Agriculture Department’s relaxation of the rules, noting that more sodium and sugar would increase students’ blood pressure and put them at greater risk of heart disease and strokes. Ms. Brown said her organization was “very disappointed that the U.S.D.A. has decided to put special interests back on the school menu,” and added, “We strongly urge the agency and Congress not to give politics priority over the health of our children.” Last month, Senator Pat Roberts, a Kansas Republican who leads the Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry, asked Mr. Perdue to have the Agriculture Department provide “immediate relief” from the regulations, some of which were to take effect July 1. On Monday, Mr. Roberts accompanied Mr. Perdue in his announcement, which coincided with the start of School Nutrition Employee Week. Representatives of the national School Nutrition Association cheered the regulatory rollback. “We have been wanting flexibility so that schools can serve meals that are both nutritious and palatable,” said the group’s chief executive, Patricia Montague. This flexibility will be welcomed in at least one part of the country, Mr. Perdue said. “A perfect example is in the South, where the schools want to serve grits,” he said. “But the whole grain variety has little black flakes in it, and the kids won’t eat it. The school is compliant with the whole grain requirements, but no one is eating the grits. That doesn’t make any sense.”

### STEM education

#### STEM funding unpopular—It’s on the chopping block for Trump’s budget

Camera, 5/25/17 [Lauren, education reporter at U.S. News & World Report. She’s covered education policy and politics for nearly a decade, “STEM Funding Uncertain in Trump White House”, <https://www.usnews.com/news/stem-solutions/articles/2017-05-25/funding-for-stem-programs-uncertain-in-trump-white-house>, Accessed 6/25/17] SZhang

When it comes to boosting science, technology, engineering and math, the news from Washington isn't good. While the Trump administration has showed some signs of prioritizing STEM, federal programs that support STEM initiatives are on the chopping block under the president's recent budget proposal for fiscal year 2018. Among other things, **the spending plan would eliminate entirely a $1.6 billion pool of money created under the new federal education law, the Every Student Succeeds Act, which state and local school districts can use for high-quality STEM courses, increased access to STEM for underserved populations, science fairs and specialty STEM schools, afterschool programs, among many other things.** The president's budget proposal would also ax federal spending on teacher preparation by $2.4 billion, money that school districts can use to recruit STEM educators and restructure pay scales for heard-to-fill jobs, which often include math and science teachers. "That all sounds great, but unfortunately [those programs] might not happen with the budget," said Lindsey Gardner, director of external relations for the STEM Education Coalition. "We like to say flat funding is the new up with domestic spending. If you have flat funding then you're doing really well, but the president proposed large cuts this week." Overall, the spending plan would slash more than $9 billion from the Department of Education, a decrease of 13.5 percent. [RELATED: 2017 U.S. News STEM Solutions Conference on Twitter] Notably, panelists said, the budget is nothing more than a funding proposal that signals the administration's priorities, and lawmakers in both the House and Senate have called it "dead on arrival." That doesn't mean, however, that there's appetite for an expanded federal role in education, even when it comes to STEM. If the recent reauthorization of the federal education law, which cleared Congress with overwhelming bipartisan support, is proof of anything, they said, it's that the federal government's footprint in education is only going to get smaller.

#### STEM education is unpopular

Alvarez, 2/9/17 [Edgar, Senior editor for Engadget, “The future of STEM education is cloudy under Betsy DeVos”, <https://www.engadget.com/2017/02/09/betsy-devos-future-of-stem-education/>, Acessed 6/25/17] SZhang

While DeVos has not specified how she plans to handle STEM (science, technology, engineering and math) education on a federal level, there's enough evidence to suggest religion may influence her decisions. In an interview from 2001, when asked about Christian schools relying on philanthropy, DeVos said, "There are not enough philanthropic dollars in America to fund what is currently the need in education ... Our desire is to confront the culture in ways that will continue to advance God's kingdom." If she takes that same approach in her new position, DeVos could create an environment where accepted scientific theories such as evolution could be taught alongside faith-based pseudoscience such as intelligent design. You also have to wonder if she'll continue Obama's efforts to teach kids how to code and other tech-forward skills. During his presidency, Obama created the Computer Science for All initiative, which included a $4 billion fund for states to develop K-12 curriculums with a hands-on approach to new technologies. President Trump, meanwhile, is planning to repurpose $20 billion from the federal education budget to expand voucher programs. Even though low-income families could benefit from this "school choice" proposal, the institutions on the receiving end would be private or affiliated with a religion. The proposal will likely hit some roadblocks, though, since it has to get approved by Congress and it's not certain that states are going to be interested in such grants. Still, there could be major consequences if it does go through. David E. Kirkland, an English and Urban Education professor at New York University, says DeVos and Trump could promote educational policies that support "alternative facts" and "fund programs aimed at discrediting longstanding scientific knowledge and traditions." The situation is magnified when you consider Trump also recently tapped Jerry Falwell Jr. to lead a task force that will suggest higher education reforms. He's the president of Liberty University, one of the country's most vocal Christians and a young Earth creationist. According to The Washington Post, faculty members at Liberty University take pride "in teaching evolution alongside biblical creationism." Sure, that doesn't mean DeVos and Falwell Jr. will enforce these views under the new administration, but it could raise their profile and reignite the debate over how things like intelligent design are presented. Kirkland says that if DeVos sees STEM education as promoting a liberal agenda, she (along with Falwell Jr.) could use the Department of Education to defund programs designed to educate students about topics such as global warming, climate change and pollution. Despite the influence of religion on her political views, though, a member of Trump's transition team recently told Mother Jones that DeVos does believe "in the legal doctrine of the separation of church and state."

### Title I

#### ESSA Title I funding distribution rules controversial—GOP disapproval means any push will be met with massive resistance

Klein, 17 [Alyson, covers federal policy for Education Week, tracking and analyzing the moves of Congress, the White House, and the U.S. Department of Education, “Education Department Withdraws Controversial ESSA Spending Proposal”, <http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/campaign-k-12/2017/01/essa_john_b_king_jr_withdraws_.html?_ga=2.94137941.978564361.1498157158-1909372027.1497847528>, Accessed 6/22/2017] SZhang

That big fight over spending rules for the Every Student Succeeds Act has ended not with a bang, but a whimper: U.S. Secretary of Education John B. King, Jr. is throwing in the towel, withdrawing a proposed regulation for a section of the law known as "supplement-not-supplant" that had strong backing in the civil rights community, but angered state chiefs, advocates for districts, and Republicans in Congress. **The proposal was all but certain to be tossed by a Republican-backed Congress and the Trump administration.** The department's draft rule, released in August, would have pushed for districts and states to make sure they were spending roughly same amount of money—including for teachers' salaries—in schools that serve a sizeable population of poor students and less-poor schools. Civil rights advocates applauded the secretary for trying to fix what they saw as a long-standing problem when it comes to making sure students in poverty get their fair share of resources. But advocates for districts and states said the regulation would have been nearly impossible to comply with and could have led to unintended consequences, including forced teacher transfers. **If the department had put through a final rule on the issue, it would very likely have been subject to the Congressional Review Act, a law that allows Congress to strike down new regulations that it disagrees with. Once lawmakers vote a particular regulation down, agencies are prohibited from crafting a similar rule until new legislation is passed.** Up until now, the "CRA" has only been used once. But now that Congress and the White House are in Republican hands, lawmakers have put a slew of Obama administration's regulations on their target list. In explaining the department's decision Wednesday, Dorie Nolt, a spokeswoman for the agency, didn't mention the looming threat of congressional elimination. The department simply ran out of time to write a strong regulation, she said. "While we worked tirelessly to put forward a regulation that implements that simple requirement and to incorporate the extensive feedback we received, we ultimately did not have time to publish a strong final regulation that lives up to the promise of the law. We urge supporters of public education across the country and the political spectrum to continue the fight for equitable access to resources both within and across school districts," Nolt said. The Council of Chief State School Officers, which vehemently opposed the department's proposal, is happy with the move. "We appreciate the U.S. Department of Education's recognition that the draft of the supplement-not-supplant provision would not draw resources to kids who need them the most," said Chris Minnich, the group's executive director in a statement. "State chiefs are focused on creating an equitable education system that provides opportunities to all kids. As states transition to the Every Student Succeeds Act, we need stability in the federal policy environment in order to create strong plans. We look forward to working with the new administration to create that stability." For her part, Liz King, the director of education policy for the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, said she was bummed that there wasn't enough time to finalize the regulation, but praised the Obama administration's record of standing up for disadvantaged kids. "The clock ran out here, but we're not done fighting to ensure robust enforcement of the nation's education and civil rights laws and justice for the nation's students," King said. Withdrawing the regulation now leaves the door open for a future president and education secretary to try to regulate on supplement-not-supplant. The provision has been in the underlying Elementary and Secondary Education Act for decades, and is aimed at making sure that federal Title I dollars for disadvantaged kids are an extra for schools that serve a significant chunk of students in poverty, and not a replacement for state and local funds. The rules over supplement-not-supplant aren't the only Obama ESSA regulations under threat from Republicans in Congress. Senate lawmakers have also targeted the Obama administration's accountability regulations, which were finalized late last year and have support from advocates for states and school districts, as well as civil rights advocates. At her confirmation hearing Tuesday, Betsy DeVos, President-elect Donald Trump's choice for education secretary, wouldn't commit to keeping those regulations on the books. The controversy over the spending rules ate up a ton of airtime during King's sole year on the job. King and his team first proposed a rule that would have closed a long-standing loophole during a negotiated rulemaking on the law. The committee of negotiators failed to agree on the proposal, so the department put forward a draft version in August. It gave states and districts additional flexibility to meet the department's goals, but was still seen as too rigid by state and district advocates and Republicans. King though, said recently he doesn't regret the fight. "For us, the work on supplement-not-supplant was a reflection of the commitment in the law to get Title I dollars to the students most in need and the national responsibility to address issues of resource equity," King told me in an exit interview last week. "Raising that issue was not just about this moment. It was about the broader responsibility." So what happens next? It's unclear if the Trump administration will want to come up with its own regulation for supplement-not-supplant. If it does, it will have to restart the cumbersome "negotiated rulemaking" process all over again, and convene a new group of educators and advocates to write a new rule.

### Title II

#### Title II funding is on the chopping block—questionable effectiveness makes it a prime target for Trump’s budget cuts

Camera, 4/21/17 [Lauren, education reporter at U.S. News & World Report, covered education policy and politics for nearly a decade and has written for Education Week, The Hechinger Report, Congressional Quarterly, Roll Call, and the Chronicle of Higher Education, “The Effectiveness Dilemma”, <https://www.usnews.com/news/the-report/articles/2017-04-21/trumps-proposed-cuts-to-title-ii-education-funding-draw-concern>, Accessed 6/22/17] SZhang

The Trump administration's fiscal 2018 budget proposal calls the program, known as Title II, Part A or the Supporting Effective Instruction grant program, "poorly targeted and spread thinly across thousands of districts with scant evidence of impact." Its axing is one of the biggest single-line items up for elimination in the president's sweeping $9 billion cut to federal education programs. As it turns out, the Trump administration isn't the first to take aim at the program, which was also a favorite punching bag of former Education Secretary Arne Duncan during the Obama era. "At the federal level, we spend $2.5 billion a year on professional development," Duncan said in 2012. "As I go out [and] talk to great teachers around the country, when I ask them how much is that money improving their job or development, they either laugh or they cry. They are not feeling it." To be sure, Duncan focused a majority of his efforts on increasing the effectiveness of teacher preparation by demanding more accountability from colleges of education, and never backed a wholesale elimination of the program. But the sentiment is the same: professional development has become a dirty word. "Everybody agrees that the quality of a teacher is the key element," says Eric Hanushek, a senior fellow at the Hoover Institution of Stanford University, where he develops economic analyses of education issues, particularly teacher effectiveness. "The problem with Title II is that it's not focused on teacher effectiveness," he says. "What it's focused on is various guesses at what might make for more effective teachers or provide improvement in teaching. But there's very little evidence that the funds have been used very well." That's largely because the federal government doesn't require states and school districts to assess the effectiveness of how their Title II dollars for teacher preparation are spent. Instead, they simply ask school districts to report what type of activity they use those dollars for – and that can be something as generic as "professional development." According to New America, a policy think-tank in Washington, 47 percent of Title II dollars went to professional development during the 2014-2015 school year, while 30 percent went to class-size reduction. The category "Other" accounted for 16 percent of Title II dollars, while 6 percent went to growth and quality teaching. Such broad buckets, policy experts explain, have made it difficult to understand what specific types of teacher preparation have had the most positive impacts on student achievement. And that, in turn, makes is difficult for states and school districts to replicate the most successful efforts. Case in point: A 2014 study from the Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences identified and screened 910 research studies for effectiveness of math professional development approaches. Of the 910 studies, 643 examined professional development approaches related to math in grades K-12. Of the 643 studies, only 32 focused primarily on math professional development provided to teachers and used a robust enough research design for examining effectiveness. Five of those met benchmarked evidence standards, and of those five, only two found positive effects on students' math proficiency. "Professional development is one of the sorry bits of education policy because it sounds good and everybody would like to be able to take our current teachers and make them better, but all of the evidence is pretty clear that we don't know how to provide professional development on a consistent broad scale," Hanushek says. "And in most districts professional development is kind of a joke." Many education policy experts agree that eliminating the funding wholesale is not the answer.

### Title IV

#### Attempts to approve title IV funding will not pass—controversial riders derail any bipartisan agreement

Maher, 16 [Kevin, Assistant Director of the American Library Association's Office of Government Relations (OGR), “Congress leaves town with funding bills unfinished”, <http://www.districtdispatch.org/2016/07/congress-leaves-town-funding-bills-unfinished/>, Accessed 6/22/17] SZhang

House Appropriations Bills include support for LSTA and Title IV, but defund IAL The twelve FY 2017 appropriations bills continued to progress slowly in the House and Senate as Congress leaves today for a lengthy summer recess. This past week, the House Appropriations Committee marked up (approved) its contentious FY2017 Labor, Health and Human Services, Labor, Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations bill (commonly called “LHHS”), approving the bill 31-19 with the vote splitting along party lines. The Senate approved its version of LHHS last month by a decidedly bipartisan vote of 29-1. Most important to ALA members, the LHHS funding bill in both chambers includes funding for several programs of significant importance to the library community: LSTA, IAL, and Title IV of the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). While the House Committee bill provides increased support for two of our priorities, it also eliminates funding for another. First, the good news. Both the House and Senate funding bills include increased funding for LSTA and its Grants to States program, rejecting the President’s disappointing proposal to cut funding for both. LSTA Grants to States would receive $155.9 million in the House bill: a slight increase over FY 2016 ($155.7 million), though $240,000 less than what the Senate requested in May ($156.1 million). The President had requested only $154.8 million. Overall LSTA funding would be boosted in the House bill to $183.0 million. That compares with $183.3 in the Senate, $182.4 in the President’s request, and $182.9 ultimately approved by Congress in FY 2016). ALA continues to oppose cuts to LSTA programs.Several piles of gold coins symbolizing government funding. The House also made slight upward adjustments to three other LSTA programs from FY2016 levels. Native American Library Services grants would receive $4.1 million ($3.8 in Senate and $4.0 in FY2016); the National Leadership: Libraries program received $13.1 million ($13.4 million in Senate and $13.0 in FY 2016); and the Laura Bush 21st Century Librarian program received level funding at $10 million. New this year is a block grant created with bipartisan support under Title IV of ESSA The “Student Support and Academic Enrichment Grants” (SSAEG will provide supplemental funding to help states and school districts underwrite a “well-rounded” educational experience for students, including STEM and arts programs. Best of all, libraries are expressly authorized to receive SSAEG funds. Although SSAEG was originally authorized in the ESSA at $1.65 billion, the President and Congress appear willing to fund the program at much lower levels. The President requested only $500 million while the Senate approved less at $300 million. The House approved a higher level of $1 billion but still below authorized levels for FY2017. Next, the decidedly bad news is that House appropriators have proposed to eliminate all funding for school libraries through the Innovative Approaches to Literacy (IAL) program.. According to the House Committee’s Report, “The Committee has chosen to focus resources on core formula-based education programs instead of narrowly-focused competitive grants such as this one.” IAL received $27 million in FY2016, which was also the funding level requested by the President and supported in the Senate bill. One half of IAL funding is reserved for school libraries with the remaining open to any national non-profit by application. **Likely limiting its chances of passage, however, the House LHHS bill included a number of divisive policy riders addressing issues including highly controversial issues like family planning**, NLRB joint employer standards, and “Obamacare”. The bill also includes education-related policy riders addressing the “gainful employment” rule aimed at for-profit colleges, forthcoming teacher preparation rules, and the federal definition of a credit hour. All of the amendments introduced at the full Committee mark up to strike these riders or to restore cuts in education funding failed along party lines.

#### Funding for Title IV is uncertain—house and senate disparities means any action stalls with no compromise

Stone, 3/1/17 [Adam, journalist with 20+ years' experience, covers education, technology, government and the military, along with diverse other topics, “What Will Trump’s Ed Tech Policies Look Like?”, <http://www.centerdigitaled.com/higher-ed/What-Will-Trumps-Ed-Tech-Policies-Look-Like.html>, Accessed 6/22/17] SZhang

Although Congress authorized $1.65 billion for Title IV, last year the House approved just $300 million in this area, while the Senate would have budgeted $1 billion. No compromise was reached, meaning ESSA funding will likely come up for consideration in 2017, and education advocates want to see Congress dole out the full authorized amount. ESSA does specifically address ed tech, and while it won’t give every kid a tablet, it could help teachers become more tech savvy. “It is not intended to be used to purchase devices or software. It’s meant to focus on professional development for teachers and administrators to effectively use technology for students,” said Tracy Weeks, executive director of the State Educational Technology Directors Association (SETDA), which supports the use of technology for teaching, learning and school operations. Congress’ lack of action has been problematic to some, especially for school districts trying to write budgets without a clear understanding of future funding streams. That could change, but much will depend on whether the new administration opts to take up the cause. “Now it becomes about the Trump administration’s priorities,” said Jon Bernstein, founder and president of Bernstein Strategy Group. “The only thing we have heard from them about education is that they are interested in a giant school choice block grant — charter schools, vouchers for private schools, magnet schools. All of that could take money away from this program.”

## I/L

### Econ low now

#### High risk of an internal link now—previous fallbacks have been left in ruins

Smith, 5/8/17 [Benjamin, editor at Lombardi Financial, specializing in politics, macroeconomics, and precious metals investing, “Debt Ceiling Crisis 2017: Profound Consequences If No Solution Found”, <https://www.lombardiletter.com/debt-ceiling-crisis-2017-profound-consequences-no-solution-found/9871/>, Accessed 7/17/17] SZhang

No matter how much statisticians try to massage the numbers, it looks ugly under the hood. Besides the cosmetics of “strong” employment figures, aided by the reclassification of who is deemed “unemployed,” very little is robust in the economy. It’s clear that the U.S. isn’t in a better economic position than the last time the S&P downgraded its rating. Yes, the U.S. dodged a bullet by remedying its housing crisis, but that was through massive stimulus spending, which has left a balance sheet in tatters. Many things have changed since then: the U.S. Federal Reserve has a huge Treasury securities portfolio that it’s trying to unwind; the Chinese are net sellers of U.S. Treasuries (and have their own brewing economic crisis); and the public mood in the United States is tired of corporate bailouts, which have seen government debt soar out of control.

### Econ i/l

#### Failure to raise the debt ceiling leads to econ decline

Masters, 13 [Johnathan, Deputy editor at Council for Foreign Relations, “U.S. Debt Ceiling: Costs and Consequences”, <https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/us-debt-ceiling-costs-and-consequences>, Accessed 7/17/17] SZhang

Most economists, including those in the White House and from former administrations, agree that the impact of an outright government default would be severe. Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke has said a U.S. default could be a "recovery-ending event" that would likely spark another financial crisis. Short of default, officials warn that legislative delays in raising the debt ceiling could also inflict significant harm on the economy. Many analysts say congressional gridlock over the debt limit will likely sow significant uncertainty in the bond markets and place upward pressure on interest rates. Rate increases would not only hike future borrowing costs of the federal government, but would also raise capital costs for struggling U.S. businesses and cash-strapped homebuyers. In addition, rising rates could divert future taxpayer money away from much-needed federal investments in such areas as infrastructure, education, and health care. The protracted and politically acrimonious debt limit showdown in the summer of 2011 prompted Standard and Poor’s to take the unprecedented step of downgrading the U.S. credit rating from its triple-A status, and analysts fear such brinksmanship in late 2013 could bring about similar moves from other rating agencies. "Failure to raise the federal debt ceiling in a timely manner (i.e., several days prior to when the Treasury will have exhausted extraordinary measures and cash reserves) will prompt a formal review of the U.S. sovereign ratings and likely lead to a downgrade," said Fitch Ratings, which maintains a "negative" outlook on the U.S. triple-A rating. A 2012 study by the nonpartisan Government Accountability Office estimated that delays in raising the debt ceiling in 2011 cost taxpayers approximately $1.3 billion for FY 2011. The stock market also was thrown into frenzy in the lead-up to and aftermath of the 2011 debt limit debate, with the Dow Jones Industrial Average plunging roughly 2,000 points from the final days of July through the first days of August. Indeed, the Dow recorded one of its worst single-day drops in history on August 8, the day after the S&P downgrade, tumbling 635 points. The United States failed to pass an annual spending measure by October 1, 2013, the start of the fiscal year, resulting in a partial shutdown of federal services that analysts say could eventually drag on economic growth, and even cause a recession if no action is taken in the short term. "If such projections prove accurate, the weaker than expected economic expansion would be even more susceptible to the adverse effects from a debt ceiling impasse than prior to the shutdown," said a brief from the Treasury Department [PDF].

#### Failure to raise the debt ceiling is a serious problem—doing it by August is key

**Washington Post 6-13**

The Washington Post Editorial Board. “It’s time to get realistic about the debt ceiling.” June 13th, 2017. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/its-time-to-get-realistic-about-the-debt-ceiling/2017/06/13/3d70b856-5050-11e7-be25-3a519335381c_story.html?utm_term=.ca347bc0a80f>

Yet just as often, members of Congress and the executive branch say and do things to suggest a willingness to trifle with that responsibility; Republicans on Capitol Hill did so repeatedly during the Obama administration, seeking to attach otherwise unpassable spending cuts to debt-limit increases. Last month, White House budget director Mick Mulvaney publicly floated a similar approach, and National Economic Council Director Gary Cohn echoed him. This created confusion at a moment when the debt limit had already been technically exceeded and the Treasury Department was resorting to “special measures” to keep all of the financial balls in the air. Fortunately, Treasury Secretary Steven Mnuchin has stepped forward to dispel any doubt. In congressional testimony Monday, he clarified two important points: First, a failure to increase the debt limit would not be a manageable nonevent but would “create a serious problem.” Second, though Treasury can indeed keep paying the bills through the summer, it would be far better to pass a bill well before August, and pass it cleanly — unencumbered by amendments. Mr. Mnuchin’s words carried extra weight because President Trump, to his credit, had publicly empowered the secretary to speak for the administration on this point. Adult in the room, with respect to government debt, is a role Mr. Mnuchin has played for Mr. Trump before, most memorably during the 2016 campaign, when Mr. Trump suggested that the United States might reduce its debt by making a deal, a la Greece or Argentina. At that point, Mr. Mnuchin reassured everyone that “the government has to honor its debts.” We’ll take Mr. Mnuchin’s apparent ascendance in the latest kerfuffle as a sign that the president is moving up the learning curve. The kerfuffle itself, though — repetitive and unnecessary as it is — reminds us that the system of adjusting the national credit-card limit is in need of reform. At the hearing, Mr. Mnuchin floated one idea, which would be for Congress to adopt additional borrowing authority in the same legislative act that calls for spending beyond the government’s means. “The debt ceiling should not be a Republican issue or a Democrat issue,” he said. “It should be an acknowledgment that we have spent the money and need to fund the government.” This is the same conclusion all of Mr. Mnuchin’s predecessors and all previous Congresses have eventually reached, once those who saw political advantage in pretending otherwise had had their fun. It’s simple realism: Wouldn’t it be nice if the country could just write simple realism into law?

**Timeframe is key—failure to raise the debt ceiling will destroy the global economy**

**Bryan 6-11**

Bob Bryan (staff writer). “Trump is starting to draw battle lines with Congress on an issue with huge implications for the global economy.” Business Insider. June 11th, 2017. <http://www.businessinsider.com/debt-ceiling-trump-mint-coin-2017-5>

The deadline that led to the night Barack Obama once called the "scariest moment" of his presidency is once again on the horizon in Washington. At its core, raising the debt ceiling is seemingly a simple function of Congress. But the battle over raising the cap on how much debt the US federal government can incur emphasizes divides not only in Congress but also within President Donald Trump's administration. Failing to reach a deal to raise the nation's borrowing limit, however, could be **disastrous for the global economy** and possibly undermine large swaths of the international financial system. "I want to emphasize that **the sooner they do it, the less uncertainty there is in the market**," Treasury Secretary Steven Mnuchin said of Congress on Friday. Sooner than expected The **time frame** for dealing with the debt ceiling has tightened amid recent developments. "I respectfully urge Congress to protect the full faith and credit of the United States by acting to increase the statutory debt limit as soon as possible," Mnuchin wrote in a public letter to House Speaker Paul Ryan when a temporary suspension of the limit expired in March. Since then, the Treasury has used what Mnuchin called "extraordinary measures" to extend the time frame on the debt ceiling by suspending some investments in federal retirement funds and slowing the pace of debt issuance. Originally, the Treasury and the Office of Management and Budget indicated that the ceiling would be hit sometime in the fall, though the exact timing is only a best estimate. Mnuchin said recently, however, that the pace of tax receipts the department generated was slower than expected over the past few months. "I think it's absolutely important that this is passed before the August recess, and the sooner the better," Mnuchin told the House Ways and Mean Committee in a hearing on May 24. On Friday, however, Mnuchin did seem a bit less alarmed, saying the Treasury had "backup plans" if the limit was not raised by August. He did not specify those plans. "We will be fine if they don't do it beforehand, but I want to emphasize that the sooner they do it, the less uncertainty there is in the market," Mnuchin told reporters at a meeting with Canada's finance minister, Bill Morneau.

#### Defaulting on the debt will wreck the global economy—the longer Congress waits, the worse it gets

**Loop 6-15**

Emma Loop (BuzzFeed News Reporter). “No One Really Knows When The Next Big Fiscal Crisis In Congress Is Going To Hit.” June 15th, 2017. https://www.buzzfeed.com/emmaloop/no-one-really-knows-when-the-next-big-fiscal-crisis-in?utm\_term=.nhVyJBggZj#.ayB1zoVVQx

Members of Congress will have to raise the debt ceiling in the next few months and failure to do so could be disastrous, potentially leading to a downgrade of the US's credit rating and shaking up world markets. But when, exactly, Congress will have to act, no one really seems to know. Treasury Secretary Steven Mnuchin had previously said that Congress must pass a debt limit increase by the end of July, before lawmakers leave Washington for a five-week August recess, concerned that Treasury would no longer be able to make the interest payments on the nation’s $19.9 trillion debt. But Mnuchin seemed to contradict himself this week, telling the Senate Budget Committee Tuesday that the US likely wouldn’t default on its loans until sometime in the fall. Treasury has backup plans if Congress doesn’t pass an increase before members leave for their August recess, he added. “I urge, given the importance of this, that we send a message to the rest of the world and the markets that we take our credit very seriously,” Mnuchin said. If Congress does wait, it could make for a turbulent September that could have major consequences for the country. Lawmakers are also facing a potential government shutdown at the end of the month, not long after they return from their recess at home.

#### Breaching the debt ceiling causes economic chaos

**Bryan 6-17**

Bob Bryan (staff writer). “The Trump administration still doesn't know how it's going to deal with the most pressing economic issue.” Business Insider. June 17th, 2017. <http://www.businessinsider.com/trump-debt-ceiling-policy-2017-6>

Amid all the issues on the administration's economic agenda — tax reform, healthcare reform, infrastructure, and keeping the government funded — raising the debt ceiling is the most consequential. A breach of the debt ceiling would be catastrophic for the short-term economic health of the global economy and the long-term standing of the US. Another credit downgrade — like one that came amid a debt-ceiling fight in 2011 — along with a serious increase in borrowing costs for the US and market chaos are all on the table if the debt ceiling is breached and there are no emergency measures to prevent a default. When asked again whether the administration had decided to advocate for a clean hike or spending cuts as part of it, the spokesperson pointed Business Insider to Mulvaney's comments.

### Dollar Heg I/L

#### Debt ceiling default leads to dollar heg decline

Amadeo, 4/22/17 [Kimberly, Writer for Economic and Business news, “U.S. Debt Default Causes and Consequences”, <https://www.thebalance.com/u-s-debt-default-3306295>, Accessed 7/17/17] SZhang

The United States of America has never defaulted on its debt. The consequences are unthinkably dire. However, this was the second time in two years that House Republicans resisted raising the debt ceiling. Therefore, the consequences of a debt default may become all too real in the very near future. There are two scenarios under which the United States would default on its debt. This first would happen if Congress didn't raise the debt ceiling. Former Treasury Secretary Tim Geithner, in a 2011 letter to Congress, outlined what would happen: Interest rates would rise, since "Treasuries represent the benchmark borrowing rate" for all other bonds. This means increased costs for corporations, state and local government, mortgages and consumer loans. The dollar would drop, as foreign investors fled the "safe-haven status" of Treasuries. The dollar would lose its status as a global world currency. This would have the most disastrous long-term effects. The U.S. government would not be able to pay salaries or benefits for federal or military personnel and retirees. Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid benefit payments would stop, as would student loan payments, tax refunds and payments to keep government facilities open. This would be far worse than a government shutdown, which only affects non-essential Discretionary programs The second scenario would occur if the U.S. Government simply decided that its debt was too high, and simply stopped paying interest on Treasury bills, notes and bonds. In that case, the value of Treasuries on the secondary market would plummet. Anyone trying to sell a Treasury would have to deeply discount it. The Federal Government could no longer sell Treasuries in its auctions, so the government would no longer be able to borrow to pay its bills. In other words, any default on Treasuries would have the same impact as one resulting from a debt ceiling crisis.

## Impact Modules

### Econ

#### Economic collapse causes global nuclear war

Mead 9 (Senior Fellow in US Foreign Policy Studies @ Council on Foreign Relations Walter Russell, Only Makes You Stronger, The New Republic, 2-4-09, http://www.tnr.com/politics/story.html?id=571cbbb9-2887-4d81-8542-92e83915f5f8&p=1)

The greatest danger both to U.S.-China relations and to American power itself is probably not that China will rise too far, too fast; it is that the current crisis might end China's growth miracle. In the worst-case scenario, the turmoil in the international economy will plunge China into a major economic downturn. The Chinese financial system will implode as loans to both state and private enterprises go bad. Millions or even tens of millions of Chinese will be unemployed in a country without an effective social safety net. The collapse of asset bubbles in the stock and property markets will wipe out the savings of a generation of the Chinese middle class. The political consequences could include dangerous unrest--and a bitter climate of anti-foreign feeling that blames others for China's woes. (Think of Weimar Germany, when both Nazi and communist politicians blamed the West for Germany's economic travails.) Worse, instability could lead to a vicious cycle, as nervous investors moved their money out of the country, further slowing growth and, in turn, fomenting ever-greater bitterness. Thanks to a generation of rapid economic growth, China has so far been able to manage the stresses and conflicts of modernization and change; nobody knows what will happen if the growth stops.India's future is also a question. Support for global integration is a fairly recent development in India, and many serious Indians remain skeptical of it. While India's 60-year-old democratic system has resisted many shocks, a deep economic recession in a country where mass poverty and even hunger are still major concerns could undermine political order, long-term growth, and India's attitude toward the United States and global economic integration. The violent Naxalite insurrection plaguing a significant swath of the country could get worse; religious extremism among both Hindus and Muslims could further polarize Indian politics; and India's economic miracle could be nipped in the bud. If current market turmoil seriously damaged the performance and prospects of India and China, the current crisis could join the Great Depression in the list of economic events that changed history, even if the recessions in the West are relatively short and mild. The United States should stand ready to assist Chinese and Indian financial authorities on an emergency basis--and work very hard to help both countries escape or at least weather any economic downturn. It may test the political will of the Obama administration, but the United States must avoid a protectionist response to the economic slowdown. U.S. moves to limit market access for Chinese and Indian producers could poison relations for years. For billions of people in nuclear-armed countries to emerge from this crisis believing either that the United States was indifferent to their well-being or that it had profited from their distress could damage U.S. foreign policy far more severely than any mistake made by George W. Bush. It's not just the great powers whose trajectories have been affected by the crash. Lesser powers like Saudi Arabia and Iran also face new constraints. The crisis has strengthened the U.S. position in the Middle East as falling oil prices reduce Iranian influence and increase the dependence of the oil sheikdoms on U.S. protection. Success in Iraq--however late, however undeserved, however limited--had already improved the Obama administration's prospects for addressing regional crises. Now, the collapse in oil prices has put the Iranian regime on the defensive. The annual inflation rate rose above 29 percent last September, up from about 17 percent in 2007, according to Iran's Bank Markazi. Economists forecast that Iran's real GDP growth will drop markedly in the coming months as stagnating oil revenues and the continued global economic downturn force the government to rein in its expansionary fiscal policy. All this has weakened Ahmadinejad at home and Iran abroad. Iranian officials must balance the relative merits of support for allies like Hamas, Hezbollah, and Syria against domestic needs, while international sanctions and other diplomatic sticks have been made more painful and Western carrots (like trade opportunities) have become more attractive. Meanwhile, Saudi Arabia and other oil states have become more dependent on the United States for protection against Iran, and they have fewer resources to fund religious extremism as they use diminished oil revenues to support basic domestic spending and development goals. None of this makes the Middle East an easy target for U.S. diplomacy, but thanks in part to the economic crisis, the incoming administration has the chance to try some new ideas and to enter negotiations with Iran (and Syria) from a position of enhanced strength. Every crisis is different, but there seem to be reasons why, over time, financial crises on balance reinforce rather than undermine the world position of the leading capitalist countries. Since capitalism first emerged in early modern Europe, the ability to exploit the advantages of rapid economic development has been a key factor in international competition. Countries that can encourage--or at least allow and sustain--the change, dislocation, upheaval, and pain that capitalism often involves, while providing their tumultuous market societies with appropriate regulatory and legal frameworks, grow swiftly. They produce cutting-edge technologies that translate into military and economic power. They are able to invest in education, making their workforces ever more productive. They typically develop liberal political institutions and cultural norms that value, or at least tolerate, dissent and that allow people of different political and religious viewpoints to collaborate on a vast social project of modernization--and to maintain political stability in the face of accelerating social and economic change. The vast productive capacity of leading capitalist powers gives them the ability to project influence around the world and, to some degree, to remake the world to suit their own interests and preferences. This is what the United Kingdom and the United States have done in past centuries, and what other capitalist powers like France, Germany, and Japan have done to a lesser extent. In these countries, the social forces that support the idea of a competitive market economy within an appropriately liberal legal and political framework are relatively strong. But, in many other countries where capitalism rubs people the wrong way, this is not the case. On either side of the Atlantic, for example, the Latin world is often drawn to anti-capitalist movements and rulers on both the right and the left. Russia, too, has never really taken to capitalism and liberal society--whether during the time of the czars, the commissars, or the post-cold war leaders who so signally failed to build a stable, open system of liberal democratic capitalism even as many former Warsaw Pact nations were making rapid transitions. Partly as a result of these internal cultural pressures, and partly because, in much of the world, capitalism has appeared as an unwelcome interloper, imposed by foreign forces and shaped to fit foreign rather than domestic interests and preferences, many countries are only half-heartedly capitalist. When crisis strikes, they are quick to decide that capitalism is a failure and look for alternatives. So far, such half-hearted experiments not only have failed to work; they have left the societies that have tried them in a progressively worse position, farther behind the front-runners as time goes by. Argentina has lost ground to Chile; Russian development has fallen farther behind that of the Baltic states and Central Europe. Frequently, the crisis has weakened the power of the merchants, industrialists, financiers, and professionals who want to develop a liberal capitalist society integrated into the world. Crisis can also strengthen the hand of religious extremists, populist radicals, or authoritarian traditionalists who are determined to resist liberal capitalist society for a variety of reasons. Meanwhile, the companies and banks based in these societies are often less established and more vulnerable to the consequences of a financial crisis than more established firms in wealthier societies. As a result, developing countries and countries where capitalism has relatively recent and shallow roots tend to suffer greater economic and political damage when crisis strikes--as, inevitably, it does. And, consequently, financial crises often reinforce rather than challenge the global distribution of power and wealth. This may be happening yet again. None of which means that we can just sit back and enjoy the recession. History may suggest that financial crises actually help capitalist great powers maintain their leads--but it has other, less reassuring messages as well. If financial crises have been a normal part of life during the 300-year rise of the liberal capitalist system under the Anglophone powers, so has war. The wars of the League of Augsburg and the Spanish Succession; the Seven Years War; the American Revolution; the Napoleonic Wars; the two World Wars; the cold war: The list of wars is almost as long as the list of financial crises. Bad economic times can breed wars. Europe was a pretty peaceful place in 1928, but the Depression poisoned German public opinion and helped bring Adolf Hitler to power. If the current crisis turns into a depression, what rough beasts might start slouching toward Moscow, Karachi, Beijing, or New Delhi? to be born? The United States may not, yet, decline, but, if we can't get the world economy back on track, we may still have to fight.

### Lashout

#### Trump makes military force use during econ decline more likely – leads to diversionary war

**Foster 16**, Virginia Military Institute international studies and political science professor, 12-19-16 (Dennis, “Would President Trump go to war to divert attention from problems at home?”, http://inhomelandsecurity.com/would-president-trump-go-to-war-to-divert-attention-from-problems-at-home/)

If the U.S. economy tanks, should we expect Donald Trump to engage in a diversionary war? Since the age of Machiavelli, analysts have expected world leaders to launch international conflicts to deflect popular attention away from problems at home. By stirring up feelings of patriotism, leaders might escape the political costs of scandal, unpopularity — or a poorly performing economy. One often-cited example of diversionary war in modern times is Argentina’s 1982 invasion of the Falklands, which several (though not all) political scientists attribute to the junta’s desire to divert the people’s attention from a disastrous economy. In a 2014 article, Jonathan Keller and I argued that whether U.S. presidents engage in diversionary conflicts depends in part on their **psychological traits** — how they frame the world, process information and develop plans of action. Certain traits predispose leaders to more belligerent behavior. Do words translate into foreign policy action? One way to identify these traits is content analyses of leaders’ rhetoric. The more leaders use certain types of verbal constructs, the more likely they are to possess traits that lead them to use military force. For one, conceptually simplistic leaders view the world in “black and white” terms; they develop unsophisticated solutions to problems and are largely insensitive to risks. Similarly, distrustful leaders tend to exaggerate threats and rely on aggression to deal with threats. Distrustful leaders typically favor military action and are confident in their ability to wield it effectively. **Thus, when faced with politically damaging problems that are hard to solve — such as a faltering economy — leaders who are both distrustful and simplistic are less likely to put together complex, direct responses. Instead, they develop simplistic but risky “solutions” that divert popular attention from the problem, utilizing the tools with which they are most comfortable and confident (military force).** Based on our analysis of the rhetoric of previous U.S. presidents, we found that presidents whose language appeared more simplistic and distrustful, such as Harry Truman, Dwight Eisenhower and George W. Bush, were more likely to use force abroad in times of rising inflation and unemployment. By contrast, John F. Kennedy and Bill Clinton, whose rhetoric pegged them as more complex and trusting, were less likely to do so. What about Donald Trump? Since Donald Trump’s election, many commentators have expressed concern about how he will react to new challenges and whether he might make quick recourse to military action. For example, the Guardian’s George Monbiot has argued that political realities will stymie Trump’s agenda, especially his promises regarding the economy. Then, rather than risk disappointing his base, Trump might try to rally public opinion to his side via military action. I sampled Trump’s campaign rhetoric, analyzing 71,446 words across 24 events from January 2015 to December 2016. Using a program for measuring leadership traits in rhetoric, I estimated what Trump’s words may tell us about his level of distrust and conceptual complexity. The graph below shows Trump’s level of distrust compared to previous presidents. **As a candidate, Trump also scored second-lowest among presidents in conceptual complexity.** Compared to earlier presidents, he used more words and phrases that indicate less willingness to see multiple dimensions or ambiguities in the decision-making environment. These include words and phrases like “absolutely,” “greatest” and “without a doubt.” A possible implication for military action I took these data on Trump and plugged them into the statistical model that we developed to predict major uses of force by the United States from 1953 to 2000. For a president of average distrust and conceptual complexity, an economic downturn only weakly predicts an increase in the use of force. **But the model would predict that a president with Trump’s numbers would respond to even a minor economic downturn with an increase in the use of force**. For example, were the misery index (aggregate inflation and unemployment) equal to 12 — about where it stood in October 2011 — the model predicts a president with Trump’s psychological traits would initiate more than one major conflict per quarter.

### Dollar Heg K2 every kind of power

#### Dollar heg controls power—power follows money

Halligan, 14 [Liam, Telegraph reporter reporting on economic issues, “The dollar's 70-year dominance is coming to an end”, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/finance/comment/liamhalligan/10978178/The-dollars-70-year-dominance-is-coming-to-an-end.html>, Accessed 7/23/17] SZhang

The advantages this system bestows on the US are enormous. “Reserve currency status” generates huge demand for dollars from governments and companies around the world, as they’re needed for reserves and trade. This has allowed successive American administrations to spend far more, year-in year-out, than is raised in tax and export revenue. By the early Seventies, US economic dominance was so assured that even after President Nixon reneged on the dollar’s previously unshakeable convertibility into gold, amounting to a massive default, dollar demand kept growing. So America doesn’t worry about balance of payments crises, as it can pay for imports in dollars the Federal Reserve can just print. And Washington keeps spending willy-nilly, as the world buys ever more Treasuries on the strength of regulatory imperative and the vast liquidity and size of the market for US sovereign debt. It is this “exorbitant privilege” – as French statesman Valéry Giscard d’Estaing once sourly observed – that has been the bedrock of America’s post-war hegemony. It is the status of the dollar, above all, that’s allowed Washington to get its way, putting the financial squeeze on recalcitrant countries via the IMF while funding foreign wars. To understand politics and power it pays to follow the money. And for the past 70 years, the dollar has ruled the roost.

### Dollar Heg K2 Heg

#### Dollar heg is key to military spending

Zoffer 12 [Josh, Staff Writer for Harvard International Review, “Future of Dollar Hegemony”, <http://hir.harvard.edu/article/?a=2951>, Accessed 7/17/17] SZhang

Whether or not you agree with US fiscal policy, it is indisputable that the ability to finance its debt has allowed the United States to provide its citizens with a high standard of living and fund its enormous military programs. Essentially, dollar hegemony has served as the backbone of US primacy. Domestically, the ability to run effectively unlimited budget deficits has allowed the United States to fund its massive entitlement programs and, more recently, afford sweeping bailouts at the height of the recession. The United States has used its unlimited allowance, afforded by dollar hegemony, to finance its high standard of living and maintain the prosperity required of a hegemon. More importantly, the United States has used the demand for American debt to fund its military apparatus. Each year, the United States spends over US $600 billion on its military, excluding spending on the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, constituting over forty percent of global military spending. Since the establishment of the post-World War II international order, the United States and its allies have relied on US military might to enforce their wishes upon the world and maintain the Western-dominated order. The ability to intervene militarily in any conflict that threatens US interests and maintain US geopolitical influence and hegemony is a direct result of dollar hegemony. For the past sixty-five years, the United States has relied on its excessive spending to fund its position of privilege and relied on the dollar’s position as the international reserve currency to fund this spending

#### Heg decline causes nuclear transition wars and turns every impact

**Keck 14**

Zachary Keck (was formerly Managing Editor of The Diplomat where he authored The Pacific Realist blog. Previously, he worked as Deputy Editor of e-International Relations and has interned at the Center for a New American Security and in the U.S. Congress, where he worked on defense issues). “America’s Relative Decline: Should We Panic?” The Diplomat. January 24th, 2014. http://thediplomat.com/2014/01/americas-relative-decline-should-we-panic/

1

Still, China’s relative rise and the United States’ relative decline carries significant risks, for the rest of the world probably more so than for Americans. Odds are, the world will be worse off if China and especially others reach parity with the U.S. in the coming years. This isn’t to say America is necessarily as benign a hegemon as some in the U.S. claim it to be. In the post-Cold War era, the U.S. has undoubtedly at times disregarded international laws or international opinions it disagreed with. It has also used military force with a frequency that would have been unthinkable during the Cold War or a multipolar era. Often this has been for humanitarian reasons, but even in some of these instances military action didn’t help. Most egregiously, the U.S. overrode the rest of the world’s veto in invading Iraq, only for its prewar claims to be proven false. Compounding the matter, it showed complete and utter negligence in planning for Iraq’s future, which allowed chaos to engulf the nation. Still, on balance, the U.S. has been a positive force in the world, especially for a unipolar power. Certainly, it’s hard to imagine many other countries acting as benignly if they possessed the amount of relative power America had at the end of the Cold War. Indeed, the British were not nearly as powerful as the U.S. in the 19th Century and they incorporated most of the globe in their colonial empire. Even when it had to contend with another superpower, Russia occupied half a continent by brutally suppressing its populace. Had the U.S. collapsed and the Soviet Union emerged as the Cold War victor, Western Europe would likely be speaking Russian by now. It’s difficult to imagine China defending a rule-based, open international order if it were a unipolar power, much less making an effort to uphold a minimum level of human rights in the world. Regardless of your opinion on U.S. global leadership over the last two decades, however, there is good reason to fear its relative decline compared with China and other emerging nations. To begin with, **hegemonic transition periods have historically been the most destabilizing eras in history.** This is not only because of the malign intentions of the rising and established power(s). Even if all the parties have benign, peaceful intentions, the rise of new global powers necessitates revisions to the “rules of the road.” This is nearly impossible to do in any organized fashion given the anarchic nature of the international system, where there is no central authority that can govern interactions between states. We are already starting to see the potential dangers of hegemonic transition periods in the Asia-Pacific (and arguably the Middle East). As China grows more economically and militarily powerful, it has unsurprisingly sought to expand its influence in East Asia. This necessarily has to come at the expense of other powers, which so far has primarily meant the U.S., Japan, Vietnam and the Philippines. Naturally, these powers have sought to resist Chinese encroachments on their territory and influence, and the situation grows more tense with each passing day. Should China eventually emerge as a global power, or should nations in other regions enjoy a similar rise as Kenny suggests, this situation will play itself out elsewhere in the years and decades ahead. All of this highlights some of the advantages of a unipolar system. Namely, although the U.S. has asserted military force quite frequently in the post-Cold War era, it has only fought weak powers and thus its wars have been fairly limited in terms of the number of casualties involved. At the same time, **America’s preponderance of power has prevented a great power war, and even restrained major regional powers from coming to blows**. For instance, the past 25 years haven’t seen any conflicts on par with the Israeli-Arab or Iran-Iraq wars of the Cold War. As the unipolar era comes to a close, the possibility of great power conflict and especially major regional wars rises dramatically. The world will also have to contend with conventionally inferior powers like Japan **acquiring nuclear weapons to protect their interests** against their newly empowered rivals. But even if the transitions caused by China’s and potentially other nations’ rises are managed successfully, there are still likely to be significant negative effects on international relations. In today’s “globalized” world, it is commonly asserted that many of the defining challenges of our era can only be solved through **multilateral cooperation**. Examples of this include **climate change, health pandemics, organized crime and terrorism, global financial crises, and the proliferation** of weapons of mass destruction, among many others. A unipolar system, for all its limitations, is uniquely suited for organizing effective global action on these transnational issues. This is because there is a clear global leader who can take the initiative and, to some degree, compel others to fall in line. In addition, the unipole’s preponderance of power lessens the intensity of competition among the global players involved. Thus, while there are no shortages of complaints about the limitations of global governance today, there is no question that global governance has been many times more effective in the last 25 years than it was during the Cold War.

### Dollar Heg k2 deter China

#### Dollar heg key to military readiness—any collapse makes US China war uniquely likely

Zoffer 12 [Josh, Staff Writer for Harvard International Review, “Future of Dollar Hegemony”, <http://hir.harvard.edu/article/?a=2951>, Accessed 7/17/17] SZhang

Despite the dollar’s long history as the international reserve currency, the past few years have seen a growing number of calls for the end of dollar hegemony. Countries as diverse as France, Russia, and China have decried the dollar’s monopoly in foreign exchange markets, while in 2009 reports of a shift away from dollar-based oil trading surfaced in the Middle East. Reported plans to move away from the dollar reflected international frustration at a system fueling the United States’ “exorbitant privilege,” as the French have called it, one that rests its stability on the financial conditions of a country mired in debt and facing a financial meltdown. The implications of a true end to dollar hegemony, a shift away from the dollar as a reserve currency and pricing standard for oil transactions, could be catastrophic for the United States. In the worst case scenario, a drastic drop in demand for dollar-denominated assets would cause the interest rates on Treasury Securities to skyrocket, sending ripples through the US economy as the value of the dollar plummets. What is certain, however, is that whatever decrease in demand for US debt occurs will constrain the federal government’s ability to spend and the ability of the United States to defend itself. The United States has built its foreign policy around its vast military capability; a sudden budgetary shock and drop in military spending would leave the United States vulnerable as it scrambles to regroup in a new security environment. The ability of the United States to respond to threats across the globe would be diminished, and enemies would be incentivized to take aggressive action to take advantage of this new weakness. In particular, a rapidly militarizing China might be emboldened by its partial decoupling from US economic fortunes to adopt a bolder stance in the South China Sea, threatening US allies and heightening tensions with the United States. While war with China is all but off the table in the status quo, an international system devoid of both US military might and Chinese dependence on US debt as a place to park excess liquidity might lead to the conflict feared on both sides of the Pacific.

**War goes nuclear--simply maintaining capabilities isn’t enough—readiness is key**

White, 15

(Hugh, Professor of strategic studies at the Australian National University in Canberra, “Red line in the South China Sea”, The Strait Times, <http://www.straitstimes.com/opinion/red-line-in-the-south-china-sea>)

Likewise, the idea that a more assertive US response to Beijing's actions in the South China Sea will deter China from persevering with them reflects a serious confusion about the concept of deterrence and the balance of advantage between the US and China today. Deterrence was, of course, a central factor in the Cold War. Even minor clashes between the US and then Soviet Union were avoided because both had not just the military capacity but also, critically, the will to fight a full-scale nuclear war to preserve the status quo between them. Both sides understood that the other saw the issues between them as so central to their national survival that they would accept the appalling costs of major war rather than surrender them. That meant that leaders on both sides knew that even a small clash would present them with the choice between a humiliating backdown and a terrifying escalation towards a nuclear exchange. Since the end of the Cold War, however, many people in Washington seem to have forgotten the essential role that evident will plays in deterrence. They now assume that simply having the capability to fight a major war will deter adversaries like China from taking steps that Washington does not like. But that is not so. America's armed strength will deter China from pursuing its assertive policies in the South China Sea only if Beijing is convinced that America has the will to actually go to war with China. Back in the 1990s, it was clear that America did indeed have that will. That was because the costs and risks of a US-China conflict to America were relatively low, both militarily and economically. But over the past few years, as China's military capabilities and economic weight have grown, the costs to America have grown very sharply. America's prosperity would now be as devastated as China's if a conflict disrupted economic flows between them. And America today would stand to lose major military assets like aircraft carriers which were once considered invulnerable, and the risks of escalation up to and across the nuclear threshold are much higher. Indeed, as the costs and risks to each side have equalised, China might today be better placed to deter the US than vice versa. It seems likely that China would be more willing than the US to allow a crisis in the South China Sea to escalate into a war. If so, America's assumption that China can be deterred from staking its claims to regional leadership in the South China Sea by minor infringements of its claimed air and sea space is a dangerous and outdated delusion.

# Aff

## Thumpers/UQ

### ACA Thumper

#### ACA Thumps – it needs to be decided before the debt ceiling.

Snell et al. 7/11 – staff writers at the Chicago Tribune (Kelsy with Sean Sullivan and Juliet Eilperin, “McConnell delays August recess to complete work on health care bill, other issues,” <http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/nationworld/ct-mcconnell-delays-recess-healthcare-bill-20170711-story.html>, 7/11/17)//DD

Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell announced Tuesday that he would cut the chamber's August recess in half, saying the GOP needed more time to achieve its legislative goals given the protracted negotiations over health-care legislation and continued opposition from Democrats on several fronts. "To provide more time to complete action on important legislative items and process nominees that have been stalled by a lack of cooperation from our friends across the aisle, the Senate will delay the start of the August recess until the third week of August," McConnell, R-Ky., said in a statement. In addition to health care and appointments, the Senate will also devote time to passing a defense authorization bill "and other important issues," McConnell said. The Senate will now remain at work through the week of Aug. 7. The fate of the Senate's health-care bill remained uncertain Tuesday, although McConnell told reporters he plans to release a revised bill by Thursday morning and hopes to receive a Congressional Budget Office analysis of the new version by the beginning of next week so the chamber can vote quickly. McConnell's announcement appeared designed to give Republicans time to move to other matters, such as raising the federal debt ceiling, after dispatching with a health-care vote. "The debt ceiling must be raised," McConnell told reporters.

### Spending Thumper

#### Budget thumps—already behind and key to advancing other priorities

Taylor, 7/14 [Andrew, Writer for AP, “Top House Republican says budget plan to move ahead”, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/congress/top-house-republican-says-budget-plan-to-move-ahead/2017/07/14/c47a83bc-68b6-11e7-94ab-5b1f0ff459df_story.html?utm_term=.a08db95442c3>, Accessed 7/17/17] SZhang

WASHINGTON — House Republicans are moving ahead with their long-overdue budget blueprint, even as divisions between moderates and conservatives over cutting programs like food stamps threaten passage of the measure. Passing the measure is a prerequisite to GOP efforts to overhaul the tax code, a top priority of President Donald Trump and congressional Republicans. Majority Leader Kevin McCarthy, R-Calif., said Friday the House Budget Committee will vote next week on the plan, which would spend far more money next year than Trump has proposed. Earlier divisions have been resolved between GOP defense hawks and the party’s tough-on-spending wing. The Pentagon emerged a big winner with a $30 billion increase over Trump’s budget, but divisions remain between tea party forces and Republican moderates. The current holdup involves whether to use Washington’s arcane budget process to force cuts to mandatory programs, such as food stamps or pension benefits for federal workers. Tea party lawmakers are demanding spending cuts from mandatory programs to make up for increased spending on the Pentagon. House Republicans expect Senate Democrats to press for increases in nondefense spending, and if those are factored in, the GOP’s current plan for savings looks pretty paltry. “Give me a break,” said Rep. Jim Jordan, R-Ohio. But moderates, some of whom cast dangerous votes for the GOP’s unpopular health measure, are uneasy about voting for further cuts. subscribe “If you throw in food stamps and other mandatory programs, then you set yourself up for the argument that you’re cutting taxes for businesses and wealthy people while you’re removing eligibility for people on food stamps,” said Rep. Charlie Dent, R-Pa. McCarthy also says GOP leaders are pondering a move to bundle a separate $1.2 trillion package of 12 spending bills into a single omnibus spending bill for a lengthy floor debate at the end of the month. Typically work on the spending bills follows passage of the budget measure. The budget, which was supposed to pass in April, is so far behind that the rival Appropriations Committee is almost finished with writing its 12 bills. But floor action on the spending measures will be tricky since Democrats are opposed to many of them. “We could go all 12,” McCarthy in a brief interview outside his Capitol office. Or, McCarthy said, the spending bills could be wrapped into several smaller bundles. “We’ll make that decision next week.”

## I/L

### I/L turn

#### Increased debt ceiling fails—only limiting debt solves

Boccia, 7/16 [Rebecca, research fellow in federal budgetary affairs and deputy director of the think tank’s Roe Institute for Economic Policy Studies, “Is America On the Verge of Another Debt Ceiling Crisis?”, <http://nationalinterest.org/feature/america-the-verge-another-debt-ceiling-crisis-21548?page=show>, Accessed 7/17/17] SZhang

The debt ceiling is both a signaling device, pointing toward a much greater challenge, and an action-oriented, fiscal tool to bring Washington’s unsustainable spending and borrowing under control. The U.S. national debt is already excessive. About $20 trillion, it exceeds what the U.S. economy is projected to produce in all measured goods and services (gross domestic product) this year. And the debt continues to grow out of control. **Excessive debt imposes high costs on the nation. It slows economic growth, reducing overall opportunity and wages for Americans. It contributes to policy uncertainty and a reduction in and delay of investments in the nation. And it increases the risk of a financial or national security crisis to which Congress and the president would have a lesser ability to react than if the debt were contained.** Most analysts will refer only to the U.S. debt held by the public, which comprises $14 trillion of the roughly $20 trillion national debt. They do so because public debt is borrowed in credit markets, whereas about $6 trillion of the national debt is held by government agencies, such as the Social Security Administration, which holds about $2.8 trillion of U.S. debt in its old-age and survivors and disability insurance trust funds. But government-held debt migrates. As debt held by government agencies comes due, it is converted to public debt. For example, bonds currently being held by the Social Security Administration will eventually be traded in for cash to pay for benefits due. Absent substantial tax increases, which would mostly fall on the middle class, paying those benefits would lead to additional borrowing from the public as one type of debt is traded in for another type of debt. The Congressional Budget Office explains as much in its Long-Term Budget Outlook. The agency projects that the combination of increased spending—especially on federal health care, old-age and disability entitlements—and the conversion from intragovernmental debt to public debt will drive the publicly held debt from 77 percent of GDP this year to 150 percent of GDP at the end of thirty years. Long-term projections are highly volatile to unexpected shocks. It’s important to note that these projections make no provisions for economic or other crises that could send U.S. debt skyrocketing much sooner and much higher. Few predicted the 2008 financial crisis or expected public debt to more than double as a result. Even without such shocks, all it takes are slightly higher interest rates than are currently anticipated. Solutions are readily available, yet little action has been taken to avoid this crisis. At the core lies an institutional framework that is inadequate to address the nation’s debt challenge. The key drivers of federal spending and debt are entitlement programs that operate largely without regular checks on their size and growth. Medicare, Social Security, Medicaid, food stamps and other benefits are part of what are called “mandatory” federal programs. Despite the term, Congress is not required to spend money on these programs indefinitely, nor is it barred from changing them. All the term really means is that, absent legislative correction, these programs grow on autopilot, subject mostly to eligibility criteria set in statute, sometimes decades ago. There is, however, a statutory spending limit on “discretionary” spending. This category governs defense programs and most domestic programs and agency spending not compassed under the “mandatory” label. These programs are also subject to appropriations as part of the annual appropriations cycle, which requires an active vote to continue spending the following fiscal year. Mandatory spending is bound by no such checks. This spending goes out the door without Congress having to lift a single finger. In fact, not lifting a finger to control this spending lies at the core of our fiscal challenges. The debt limit is the one action-oriented, fiscal tool that remains to address the key drivers of our spending and debt. Every major deficit-reduction deal over the past three decades was tied to the debt ceiling. As government approaches the debt ceiling, Congress always debates how to deal with it: Do we change nothing and just vote to raise the ceiling; or do we agree to raise the ceiling only if we agree to rein in current and projected spending? Given the nation’s perilous fiscal condition, lawmakers must leverage the enhanced focus on debt occasioned by the rapidly approaching ceiling to address the growing U.S. debt crisis in a meaningful way. This means, Congress and the president must adopt a substantial deficit-reduction package before increasing the debt limit again. One way to accomplish this is to set a firm limit on the growth of all federal spending and to put in place enforcement mechanisms that will automatically keep spending within that limit, should Congress and the president fail to adopt deliberate reforms that accomplish the same goal. Academic and empirical research shows that expenditure limits that target the source of the growth in debt, namely excessive spending, are the most successful in bringing about sustainable budget balance. President Trump and Congress must work together this summer to develop an expenditure limit that controls spending growth. The only way to effectively drain the swamp is to tighten the federal spending faucet. Doing so would grow the economy and bring about renewed prosperity, all while reducing waste, abuse and unfairness in federal activities. That’s a prospect the president and Congress should get behind.

### No Econ I/L

#### The debt ceiling doesn’t matter

**Dorfman 13**

Jeffrey Dorfman (economic analyst). “Don’t Believe The Debt Ceiling Hype: The Federal Government Can Survive Without An Increase.” Forbes. October 3rd, 2013. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/jeffreydorfman/2013/10/03/dont-believe-the-debt-ceiling-hype-the-federal-government-can-survive-without-an-increase/#325ab5091946>

Ignore what you hear and read in the news. The federal government actually reached the legal debt ceiling about four months ago. Since then, the government has been financing its monthly budget deficit by stealing/borrowing money from other government funds, like the federal government employees’ pension fund. In about two weeks, the government will run out of tricks to keep operating as if nothing has happened. If the debt ceiling is not raised by then, the government has to balance its budget. That’s right. As much as the politicians and news media have tried to convince you that the world will end without a debt ceiling increase, it is simply not true. The federal debt ceiling sets a legal limit for how much money the federal government can borrow. In other words, it places an upper limit on the national debt. It is like the credit limit on the government’s gold card. Reaching the debt ceiling does not mean that the government will default on the outstanding government debt. In fact, the U.S. Constitution forbids defaulting on the debt (14th Amendment, Section 4), so the government is not allowed to default even if it wanted to. In reality, if the debt ceiling is not raised in the next two weeks, the government will actually have to prioritize its expenses and keep its monthly, weekly, and daily spending under the revenue the government collects. In simple terms, the government would have to spend an amount less than or equal to what it earns. Just like ordinary Americans have to do in their everyday lives.

## Impact

### No Econ decline

#### US not key to the global economy – synchronized growth provides resiliency

**Argitis and Robinson 5/19/17** -- Theophilos Argitis and Blaise Robinson “Global Expansion Is in Sync, Even If Everything Else Is in Chaos” https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2017-05-19/the-global-economic-expansion-has-rarely-been-this-synchronized

Synchronized Growth

A synchronized expansion means the global economy doesn’t need to rely as much on the U.S. for growth. That limits the emergence of imbalances that could destabilize global growth, such as an abrupt change in the U.S. dollar that leaves emerging markets vulnerable.

And global economies have rarely been so in sync.

The variation of growth rates this year Group of 20 economies will be the lowest since at least 1980, according to Bloomberg calculations and IMF data. In fact, no G-20 economy is expected to post a decline in output this year, which would be the first time since 2010.

Growth rate differences are diminishing even as the global expansion accelerates, with G-20 growth forecast to average 2.4 percent in 2017, from 1.8 percent last year.

It’s the same trend -- more synchronization at a faster rate -- for inflation rates as well.

That’s led chief executives to strike an optimistic tone.

“We’re encouraged by signs of momentum in the global economy,” said Gregory Hayes, chief executive of United Technologies Corp., which builds everything from aircraft engines to elevators, on an April 26 earnings call. “We’ve seen really good strength here in the U.S. We’ve seen recovery in Europe. Even in China, we saw good economic growth in the first quarter.”

### No diversionary war

#### No Diversionary war

Drezner 12 – Daniel is a professor in the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts. (“The Irony of Global Economic Governance: The System Worked”, October 2012, http://www.globaleconomicgovernance.org/wp-content/uploads/IR-Colloquium-MT12-Week-5\_The-Irony-of-Global-Economic-Governance.pdf)

The final outcome addresses a dog that hasn’t barked: the effect of the Great Recession on cross-border conflict and violence. During the initial stages of the crisis, multiple analysts asserted that the financial crisis would lead states to increase their use of force as a tool for staying in power.37 Whether through greater internal repression, diversionary wars, arms races, or a ratcheting up of great power conflict, there were genuine concerns that the global economic downturn would lead to an increase in conflict. Violence in the Middle East, border disputes in the South China Sea, and even the disruptions of the Occupy movement fuel impressions of surge in global public disorder.

The aggregate data suggests otherwise, however. The Institute for Economics and Peace has constructed a “Global Peace Index” annually since 2007. A key conclusion they draw from the 2012 report is that “The average level of peacefulness in 2012 is approximately the same as it was in 2007.”38 Interstate violence in particular has declined since the start of the financial crisis – as have military expenditures in most sampled countries. Other studies confirm that the Great Recession has not triggered any increase in violent conflict; the secular decline in violence that started with the end of the Cold War has not been reversed.39 Rogers Brubaker concludes, “the crisis has not to date generated the surge in protectionist nationalism or ethnic exclusion that might have been expected.”40

None of these data suggest that the global economy is operating swimmingly. Growth remains unbalanced and fragile, and has clearly slowed in 2012. Transnational capital flows remain depressed compared to pre-crisis levels, primarily due to a drying up of cross-border interbank lending in Europe. Currency volatility remains an ongoing concern. Compared to the aftermath of other postwar recessions, growth in output, investment, and employment in the developed world have all lagged behind. But the Great Recession is not like other postwar recessions in either scope or kind; expecting a standard “V”-shaped recovery was unreasonable. One financial analyst characterized the post-2008 global economy as in a state of “contained depression.”41 The key word is “contained,” however. Given the severity, reach and depth of the 2008 financial crisis, the proper comparison is with Great Depression. And by that standard, the outcome variables look impressive. As Carmen Reinhart and Kenneth Rogoff concluded in This Time is Different: “that its macroeconomic outcome has been only the most severe global recession since World War II – and not even worse – must be regarded as fortunate.”42

### No Dollar heg impact

#### No impact to econ decline and dollar heg decline

ETM, 4/26/16 [economic and financial advisory firm with offices in the United States and South Africa, “The Winter of Our Financial Discontent”, <https://worldview.stratfor.com/article/winter-our-financial-discontent>, Accessed 7/17/17] SZhang

There is no doubt that the United States' dominant role in the global financial system gives it outsized influence. The dollar's status as the global reserve currency, U.S. influence on multilateral financial institutions like the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank, and New York's position as the financial capital of the world gives Washington strong leverage that it uses to influence the actions of other nations. As in the case of the recently lifted sanctions that isolated Iran, even if other countries do not align with U.S. positions, they would likely capitulate to U.S. wishes so as not to lose access to U.S. financial markets. The United States still needed support from Europe for those sanctions to have a significant effect, but even without that support, the sheer size of U.S. financial markets would have given unilateral sanctions significant weight. While ETM Analytics has taken the view that the U.S. role in the global financial system is supported largely by the hegemony of the dollar, Stratfor sees the dominant dollar is just one component of a much larger mosaic supporting the long-term stability and health of the U.S. economy. A gradual decline in the dollar's role as a global reserve currency does not undermine the rest of the United States' economic strengths. Those give the United States more flexibility in dealing with any economic challenge, and that is likely to continue underwriting the stability of the U.S. economy. While the U.S. economy, like every other, certainly remains subject to periodic downturns that will no doubt be painful at times, the United States has the ability to weather them more easily than any other large country. One point that the ETM series drives home is that regardless of its intent, the Fed's actions matter on a global scale, meaning it poses a risk to the rest of world. But to Stratfor, it is not a question of whether the dollar's role in international finance is an exorbitant privilege that other nations are driven to "abhor," but rather how well the Fed walks the thin line of balancing its own monetary policy requirements with the requirements of the global economy. The Fed's mandate is to safeguard the health of the U.S. economy. However, the United States remains isolated from other global economic problems, particularly in trade. This means that the potential of the Fed's monetary policy to disrupt the global economy is diluted by natural economic buffers in the United States against external shocks. This question lies at the heart of the monetary tightening cycle that the United States began late last year. Regardless, the U.S. struggles to balance its interests with those of the global economy and its relative economic insularity give the rest of the world incentive to find ways to protect itself. Both Stratfor and ETM Analytics agree that as it stands, no single entity could easily match U.S. financial dominance, and it does not appear that one is on the way.

### US China War Turn

#### US domination increases likelihood of war

Glaser 15 [John, International Security at George Mason University. “The Ugly Truth About Avoiding War With China, <http://nationalinterest.org/feature/the-ugly-truth-about-avoiding-war-china-14740?page=show>, Accessed 12/20/16] SZhang

Graham Allison argues persuasively that China’s rise portends a classic Thucydides Trap. His research shows that in twelve of the last sixteen cases over the past five hundred years, when a rising power challenged an established one, the result was war. John Mearsheimer, somewhat more bluntly, warns that “China cannot rise peacefully.” It’s an impending great power clash that makes the threat from ISIS look like child’s play. But China threatens the United States only insofar as America insists on being the dominant power in China’s backyard, a policy that actually contributes very little to U.S. security. If we abandon our strategy of primacy, the risk of a clash will shrink away. If we try to contain China’s rise, on the other hand, these predictions of doom may prove right. The current approach to China boils down to a kind of measured containment. It manifests in essentially in three ways: 1) maintaining and strengthening U.S. “treaty alliances with Japan, South Korea, Australia, the Philippines, and Thailand,” which “are the fulcrum for our strategic turn to the Asia-Pacific”; 2) increasing overall U.S. military presence in the region to develop “a geographically dispersed, politically sustainable force posture in the region”; and 3) further integrating U.S. economic engagement in the region in a way that marginalizes, and in some cases excludes, China. But containment is problematic: it carries the dubious presumption that China’s most likely reaction to U.S. expansion in the region is to become a docile power, eager to give up its regional ambitions. In reality, Washington’s determination to maintain dominance in East Asia is much more likely to generate an intense security dilemma. To understand why, we have to try to see the world through China’s strategic lens. According to Andrew Nathan and Andrew Scobell, China sees America as “the most intrusive outside actor in China’s internal affairs, the guarantor of the status quo in Taiwan, the largest naval presence in the East China and South China seas, [and] the formal or informal military ally of many of China’s neighbors.” The Chinese view the United States as “a revisionist power that seeks to curtail China's political influence and harm China's interests.” China’s feelings of encirclement are not unwarranted. America’s presence along China’s maritime periphery is highly militarized and provocative, with the U.S. Pacific Fleet conducting countless exercises and training events with dozens of countries in the region. Washington’s massive military presence on the Korean Peninsula, and just across the East China Sea on the southern tip of the Japanese archipelago, are perceived as substantive threats to Chinese security. America’s position as the largest naval presence in the East and South China Seas also stokes fear in China, particularly because roughly 40 percent of Chinese oil imports come by sea and pass through sea-lanes that are subject to interdiction by the United States. Currently, China’s “obvious orientation,” writes Lyle Goldstein “is defensive,” although “those tendencies could change if Beijing perceives that its strategic environment has substantially worsened.” So, what today might constitute a defensive Chinese foreign policy could in the future transform into a more aggressive stance if increased U.S. military presence in the region convinces Beijing that it is under threat. Fortunately, the United States can relinquish its outsized hegemonic role in East Asia without damaging its core interests. Nothing in China’s foreign policy indicates any intention to preemptively or preventively use force against America’s or its allies’ sovereign territory. Despite its naval buildup, China has not credibly threatened to cut off sea lines of communication or disrupt trade routes. The United States is arguably the most secure great power in history. With weak and pliant neighbors to its north and south, vast oceans to its east and west and a superior nuclear deterrent, it is remarkably insulated from external threats. Maintaining military predominance in East Asia simply doesn’t add much to our unusually secure position. But primacy does impose real costs. Promising to defend a host of China’s neighboring rivals, and maintaining tens of thousands of forward deployed troops and more than half of U.S. naval power in Asia entail enormous budgetary expenditures that could be kept in productive sectors of the economy. There are also the latent costs of being entrapped into unnecessary wars. Conflict over the sovereignty of Taiwan or uninhabited islands in the South China Sea risks entangling the United States in a regional war that serves the interests of other countries, not its own. Primacy could conceivably be justified if the United States derived commensurate benefits. That does not appear to be the case. As Robert Jervis has written, “the pursuit of primacy was what great power politics was all about in the past,” but in a world of nuclear weapons, with “low security threats and great common interests among the developed countries,” the game is not “worth the candle.” Charles Glaser similarly argues, “Unipolarity is much overrated.” It is not necessary to protect core national interests and in fact causes the U.S. to “lose track of how secure it is and consequently pursue policies that are designed to increase its security but turn out to be too costly and/or to have a high probability of backfiring.” Nor does U.S. dominance reap much in the way of tangible economic rewards. Daniel Drezner contends, “The economic benefits from military predominance alone seem, at a minimum, to have been exaggerated. . . . There is little evidence that military primacy yields appreciable geoeconomic gains” and therefore “an overreliance on military preponderance is badly misguided.” The struggle for primacy in East Asia is not fundamentally one for security or tangible economic benefits. What is at stake is largely status and prestige. As the scholar William Wohlforth explains, hegemonic power transitions throughout history actually see the rising power seeking “recognition and standing rather than specific alterations in the existing rules and practices that constituted the order of the day.” In Thucydides’ account of the Peloponnesian War, for example, “the rise of Athens posed unacceptable threats not to the security or welfare of Sparta but rather to its identity as leader of the Greek world.” Similarly, the power transition between a rising Germany and a dominant Great Britain in the lead up to World War I was characterized by an “absence of tangible conflicts of interests.” U.S. paranoia over the rise of China is less about protecting significant strategic and economic returns, which are marginal if not actually negative, and more about a threat to its status, prestige and reputation as the world’s sole superpower. In no way is that a just cause for war. In contrast to today’s foreign policy, in which the United States maintains a global military presence and routinely acts on behalf of peripheral interests, a more prudent approach would define U.S. interests more narrowly and reserve U.S. intervention for truly vital national interests. Joseph M. Parent and Paul K. MacDonald advocate retrenchment, which includes deep cuts to the defense budget and a gradual withdrawal of U.S. troops from Europe and Asia. “Faith in forward defenses is a holdover from the Cold War,” they argue, “rooted in visions of implacable adversaries and falling dominoes [that] is ill suited to contemporary world politics.” Barry Posen similarly argues the United States “should reduce, not increase, its military presence” in response to China’s rise. By narrowing U.S. commitments in the region, wealthy and capable allies can take responsibility for their own defense and balance against China. Meanwhile, the United States can extricate itself from potentially perilous entangling alliances. The United States pursued dominance in East Asia long before any concerns about a Chinese superpower, so continuing to justify primacy on those grounds is somewhat fishy. But even assuming China’s continued economic growth, the prospect of China achieving regional hegemony is no sure thing, an insight that should temper the inflated level of threat supposed by primacists. Regional hegemony requires China to develop uncontested dominance in its sphere, but China is surrounded by major powers that would resist such a gambit. India, which harbors great power ambitions of its own, is protected by the Himalayas and possesses nuclear weapons. Japan is protected by the stopping power of water and is wealthy enough to quickly build up its military and develop nuclear weapons if it feels threatened by China. Russia can check Chinese power in Central Asia and draw Beijing’s focus away from maritime dominance in the Pacific inward toward the Eurasian heartland. China’s serious demographic problems as well as its restive provinces like Xinjiang and Tibet remain top level concerns for Beijing and add to the difficulty of obtaining true regional hegemony. The United States can withdraw from East Asia and still “have ample warning and time to form alliances or regenerate forces before China realizes such vast ambitions.” There are several cogent reasons—economic interdependence, nuclear deterrence and the general obsolescence of great power war, among others—to be skeptical of warnings that conflict between the United States and China is inevitable, or even likely. Nevertheless, history shows that great power transitions are dangerous. **If outright war is not in the cards, a long, drawn-out, burdensome cold war is quite plausible.** **If Washington is tempted to maintain or expand its reach in East Asia to contain China’s rise, the chances of conflict increase**, as do the associated costs short of war, such as bigger defense budgets, strengthened security guarantees to allies and increased deployments.