## 1NC Shell - Embodiment

#### The 1AC is a performance of presumed accessibility and able body privilege - any attempt to separate the “content” of the 1AC from its “form” is a reason to vote negative – “what” they have “said” is just as important as “how” they have made it intelligible to themselves, us and you

Boys 2008 (Jos, “challenging the 'normal': towards new conceptual frameworks”, http://www.sowhatisnormal.co.uk/challenging)

This shifts the inquiry from representations (on the body, in the space) to relationships, processes and contexts. Any encounter is necessarily mediated by who is there, who is not, why they are there (or why not), what they bring to the situation and w hat they take away. Such events involve meanings-in-the-making through a process in space and over time. Importantly encounters are not just a space of sharing and recognition but also of conflict, differentiation and negotiation. They involve interpretations, talk, gestures, bodily relationships, and actions. So how do encounters work? In each case we now have two questions which allow the exploration of disability beyond being a stereotypical marker of identity or difference. What embodied knowledge and experience do we the participants bring to the encounter? What are the routine social and spatial practices which frame the encounter? Here, disabled and ‘non-disabled’ participants are not separated out; all have parity in the space of the encounter itself. But the impact of framing disabled people in ways not of their making remains central to the investigation. As Davis writes: Disability is not so much the lack of a sense or the presence of a physical or mental impairment as it is the reception and construction of that difference. Davis 2002 p50

#### The liberal subject constituted both **IN** and **BY** the 1AC is necessarily able bodied

Breckenridge and Volger 2001 (Carol Appadurai and Candace A, “The Critical Limits of Embodiment: Disability's Criticism”, Public Culture, Volume 13, Number 3, Fall 2011)

Disability studies teaches that an assumed able body is crucial to the smooth operation of traditional theories of democracy, citizenship, subjectivity, beauty, and capital. By assuming that the normative human is an able-bodied adult, for example, liberal theory can conflate political or economic interests with desires, political representation with having a voice in policy-making, social organization with voluntary association, and so on. Liberal theory naturalizes the political by making it personal. And the “person” at the center of the traditional liberal theory is not simply an individual locus of subjectivity (however psychologically fragmented, incoherent, or troubled). He is an able-bodied locus of subjectivity, one whose unskilled labor may be substituted freely for the labor of other such individuals, one who can imagine himself largely self-sufficient because almost everything conspires to help him take his enabling body for granted (even when he is scrambling for the means of subsistence). However, the mere possibility of a severely cognitively disabled adult citizen disrupts the liberal equations of representation and voice, desire and interest. Advocacy for the severely cognitively disabled is not a matter of voicing their demands. More generally, the intricate practical dialectics of dependence and independence in the lives of many disabled people unsettle ideals of social organization as freely chosen expressions of mutual desire.

#### Our argument is not just about physical access and disability identity – their forthcoming claims about education and fairness discount the benefit of disability consciousness by and for able bodied debaters

Breckenridge and Volger 2001 (Carol Appadurai and Candace A, “The Critical Limits of Embodiment: Disability's Criticism”, Public Culture, Volume 13, Number 3, Fall 2011)

No one is ever more than temporarily able-bodied. This fact frightens those of us who half-imagine ourselves as minds in a material context, who have learned to resent the publicness of race- or sex- or otherwise-marked bodies and to think theories of embodiment as theories about the subjectivity of able-bodied comportment and practice under conditions of systematic injustice. From this perspective, disability studies may be twice marginalized -- first, by able-bodied anxiety; second, by a tendency to treat disability as just another hindrance to social mobility, perhaps one best left to medical discourse or descriptive sociology. New work in disability studies, however, challenges established habits of thought about "having" a body. Disability studies dissolves deeply entrenched mind-and-body distinctions and further destabilizes the concept of the normal, whose charted internal ambiguities have themselves become too familiar. An ethics and a politics of disability are crucial to the work of the university -- pedagogically, theoretically, and institutionally. But reconfiguring knowledge in light of disability criticism is a project that is likely to take longer than making public space accessible.

#### The body is a stock issue – it’s the both the source and method of all knowledge and meaning

Creal 1999 (Lee Davis, “THE "DISABILITY OF THINKING"

THE "DISABLED" BODY”, Course Paper for Ambiguous Bodies: Studies in Contemporary Sexuality, York University, http://www.broadreachtraining.com/advocacy/artcreal.htm)

In "Lived Bodies: Phenomenology and the Flesh," Elizabeth Grosz cites the work of Merleau-Ponty in her discussion of corporeal phenomenology. Merleau-Ponty, she says, seeks to understand the relationship between consciousness and nature and between interiority and exteriority. He reorients the tradition of the question "how can there be a world for a subject?" by locating subjectivity not in mind or consciousness but in the body; he argues that the mind and body are not separate entities but interrelated and that the mind is based on corporeal and sensory relations. The body, according to Merleau-Ponty, is a phenomenon experienced by the one who lives in it and it (the body) is the location which places one in the world and makes possible relationships between oneself and other objects and subjects. We understand and know our body only by living in it. It is a subject and lived reality for oneself and an object for others but it is never simply object nor simply subject. Merleau-Ponty says the body is "sense-bestowing" and "form-giving," and is "my being-to-the-world and as such is the instrument by which all information and knowledge is received and meaning is generated" (Grosz: 87). This resonates with Lennard Davis who says the body is not only a physical object but is "a way of organizing through the realm of the senses the variations and modalities of physical existence as they are embodied into being through a larger social/political Matrix" (Davis: 14).

#### Even if you don’t believe that we have a link to the “topic” or “plan” – we definitely have a link to what is happening in this room right now

Berube 2003 (Michael, “Citizenship and Disability: Disability is a matter of civil rights, even if the Supreme Court doesn't seem to agree.”, http://www.alternet.org/story/15809/citizenship\_and\_disability)

Imagine a building in which political philosophers are debating, in the wake of the attacks of September 11, 2001, the value and the purpose of participatory parity over against forms of authoritarianism or theocracy. Now imagine that this building has no access ramps, no Braille or large-print publications, no American Sign Language interpreters, no elevators, no special-needs paraprofessionals, no in-class aides. Contradictory as such a state of affairs may sound, it's a reasonably accurate picture of what contemporary debate over the meaning of democracy actually looks like. How can we remedy this? Only when we have fostered equal participation in debates over the ends and means of democracy can we have a truly participatory debate over what "participatory parity" itself means. That debate will be interminable in principle, since our understandings of democracy and parity are infinitely revisable, but lest we think of deliberative democracy as a forensic society dedicated to empyreal reaches of abstraction, we should remember that debates over the meaning of participatory parity set the terms for more specific debates about the varieties of human embodiment. These include debates about prenatal screening, genetic discrimination, stem-cell research, euthanasia, and, with regard to physical access, ramps, curb cuts, kneeling buses, and buildings employing what is now known as universal design. Leftists and liberals, particularly those associated with university humanities departments, are commonly charged with being moral relativists, unable or unwilling to say (even after September 11) why one society might be "better" than another. So let me be especially clear on this final point. I think there's a very good reason to extend the franchise, to widen the conversation, to democratize our debates, and to make disability central to our theories of egalitarian social justice. The reason is this: a capacious and supple sense of what it is to be human is better than a narrow and partial sense of what it is to be human, and the more participants we as a society can incorporate into the deliberation of what it means to be human, the greater the chances that that deliberation will in fact be transformative in such a way as to enhance our collective capacities to recognize each other as humans entitled to human dignity. As Jamie reminds me daily, both deliberately and unwittingly, most Americans had no idea what people with Down syndrome could achieve until we'd passed and implemented and interpreted and reinterpreted a law entitling them all to a free appropriate public education in the least restrictive environment. I can say all this without appealing to any innate justification for human dignity and human rights, and I can also say this: Without a sufficient theoretical and practical account of disability, we can have no account of democracy worthy of the name. Perhaps some of our fellow citizens with developmental disabilities would not put the argument quite this way; even though Jamie has led me to think this way, he doesn't talk the way I do. But those of us who do participate in political debates, whether about school funding in a specific district or about the theory and practice of democracy at its most abstract, have the obligation to enhance the abilities of our children and our fellow citizens with disabilities to participate in the life of the United States as political and moral equals with their nondisabled peers-both for their own good, and for the good of democracy, which is to say, for the good of all of us.

#### Our alternative is not to take any specific action or reject any particular policy but rather **to tell a specific and particular story**, the story of disability in debate – this **self-narration of the embodied experience of disability** is a pre-requisite to accessible and meaningful debates

Creal 1999 (Lee Davis, “THE "DISABILITY OF THINKING"

THE "DISABLED" BODY”, Course Paper for Ambiguous Bodies: Studies in Contemporary Sexuality, York University, http://www.broadreachtraining.com/advocacy/artcreal.htm)

Lennard Davis' statement is provocative and a direct challenge to theorists to include the "much more transgressive and deviant" disabled body in their discourse. Disability, he says, is part of a historically constructed discourse, an ideology of thinking about the body under certain historical circumstances. At the same time, many academic disciplines are now recognizing the importance of narratives in the production of a more embodied understanding of ourselves and our world. Self-narration or life-writing is a cognitive site from which we can learn to take the texts of our own lives and world as seriously as we do "official narratives" about ourselves and our world.. Individually and collectively they can be read as resistance narratives that reveal discriminatory practices embedded in our culture. As Donna Haraway says, feminist scholars "need an earth-wide network of connections, including the ability to translate knowledges among very different--and power-differentiated--communities. We need the power of modern critical theories of how meanings and bodies get made, not in order to deny meaning and bodies, but in order to live in meanings and bodies that have a chance for the future." (Haraway, 1991: 187)

### PTX

#### Obama is pushing fast-track trade authority now – it’ll pass with bipartisan support.

Scott Flaherty 9/19/13 “'Fast-Track' Power Key To Finishing Trade Deals, Obama Says” http://www.law360.com/internationaltrade/articles/469554/-fast-track-power-key-to-finishing-trade-deals-obama-says

President Barack Obama said Thursday that it's critical for Congress to pass legislation granting his administration “fast-track” trade authority as the U.S. aims to complete negotiations for the Trans-Pacific Partnership and a trade pact with the European Union. Speaking at a meeting of the President's Export Council — a panel comprised of federal agency officials, members of Congress, business leaders and state and local government officials — Obama stressed the need for Congress to grant trade promotion authority to support the White House 's trade negotiation efforts with the 11 countries involved in the TPP talks, as well as the proposed Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership with the 28-member EU. The president said he was hopeful that a bill granting trade promotion authority, sometimes referred to as “fast-track” authority, would pick up bipartisan backing. Trade promotion authority, which expired in 2007, would allow the executive branch to negotiate trade agreements, and limit Congress to a yes-or-no vote on the proposed agreements without amendments. “We're going to need trade promotion authority through Congress,” said Obama. “This is an area … where we may be able to get some good bipartisan support to get that done.” The president also touted some of the progress that, he said, has been made under the administration's National Export Initiative, which was unveiled in the 2010 State of the Union address and seeks to double U.S. exports to about $3 trillion by the end of 2014. Obama said exports have been one of the major “bright spots” in the U.S. economy as it has recovered from the recent recession brought on by the financial crisis. “We're really focused on how do we keep that momentum going,” Obama said, adding that the TPP and TTIP are part of that effort. The president also said the TPP negotiations have advanced to a large degree. The administration has been pushing to wrap up the TPP talks by the end of the year. “We are very far along in trying to get that deal done,” he said. Obama's remarks came after several others on the export council, including U.S. Trade Representative Michael Froman and Secretary of Commerce Penny Pritzker, provided updates on actions they have taken that affect U.S. exports. Pritzker, for one, said there has been a “seismic shift in exporting” since 2009. “Given these facts it's no surprise that supporting U.S. exports will remain a priority for the Department of Commerce and for me as secretary,” she said. Pritzker also noted that Commerce planned to complete an assessment of how the National Export Initiative has worked so far, saying that she hoped the export council would provide input. Shortly before Obama arrived at Thursday's meeting, the export council approved a set of policy recommendations on issues ranging from intellectual property protections in the TPP to domestic efforts to reform export controls. One of the recommendations also supported the White House's push for a trade promotion authority bill. “We believe that new [trade promotion authority] legislation is critical to renew America’s trade leadership in the world and to provide important tools to negotiate, secure congressional approval of and implement pending and future agreements,” the council said in a draft version of the policy recommendation to Obama. Froman, whose appointment to the USTR position was approved in June , also made a case for the fast-track legislation during Thursday's export council meeting. After running through a list of ongoing negotiations, including for the TPP, TTIP and an agreement on trade in services that the U.S. is negotiating with dozens of other countries, Froman said, “None of this can happen without trade promotion authority.”

#### **Changes in drone policy cause fights between Congress and the White House.**

Plain Dealer 13

(The Plain Dealer staff and wire reports, “Battle brewing over Obama administration's use of deadly drones”, 2/6/13, http://www.cleveland.com/nation/index.ssf/2013/02/battle\_brewing\_over\_obama\_admi.html)

#### As some in Congress are looking to limit America's authority to kill suspected terrorists, the White House and Justice Department on Tuesday adamantly defended the administration's authority to use unmanned drones following the release of a controversial memo on the program.¶ Fox News reports that President Obama's advisers are also trying to tamp down concerns about the targeted killings ahead of the confirmation hearing Thursday for CIA director nominee John Brennan -- the counterterrorism adviser and drone-program supporter who has come under criticism from Democrats.¶ The furor is heating up after a white paper, leaked on Monday night and dating from 2011, justifies the killing of United States citizens who hold senior positions in al-Qaida and pose an "imminent threat of violent attack" against America. ¶ The white paper provides some detail of the legal framework under United States and international law for the drones policy, including that the United States is at war with al-Qaida. But it has come under criticism from human rights groups for making too broad a case for killing, rather than capturing, suspected American and foreign terrorists. ¶ The report was shown to senators several weeks ago, but failed to allay their concerns.

#### C. Internal Link - Obama’s capital is critical to passing Trade promotion authority.

Politi, 5/20/13 James. Financial Times [London (UK)] 20 May 2013 Financial Times US economics and trade correspondent “US business keen to promote 'fast track' trade deals: Political debate” Proquest

A campaign has been launched to 'educate' legislators on the benefits involved, writes, James Politi The first big political clash is looming over the US's planned trade deals with the EU and eleven Pacific nations, as lawmakers debate whether to grant President Barack Obama sweeping authority to pass the pacts swiftly through Congress. Members and staff of the Senate finance committee and the House ways and means committee have been discussing a bill that would for the first time since 2007 provide so-called "fast track" status to trade agreements reached by the White House. Such legislation, also known as Trade Promotion Authority (TPA) , prevents lawmakers from delaying or amending trade deals, setting them on course for an up-and-down vote in both the House and the Senate within a defined time period. This would be a particularly important win for Mr Obama as he presses ahead with his aggressive second-term trade agenda, which just this year has included launching talks with the EU and accepting Japan's entry into the Trans-Pacific Partnership negotiations. But securing TPA will not be easy - and the debate on Capitol Hill will be an early test of US political appetite for the EU-US and TPP deals themselves, as well as a sign of the popularity of Mr Obama's new push for trade liberalisation. One Senate aide familiar with the talks says staff and members have been meeting frequently on TPA recently and hope a bipartisan bill covering all trade deals "for as long as possible" can be introduced next month . "We haven't covered every single topic but we haven't come across too much that really divides us", the aide says. An aide to Max Baucus, chair of the Senate finance committee, says the talks have been "productive and cordial". But others are expecting a clash, as was the case when the last fast track bill was passed in the House with a very slim margin in 2002 under George W. Bush, allowing him to complete a slew of trade deals. US business groups which support "fast track" are preparing for a fight - and today will launch a new coalition to "educate" lawmakers and the US public about its benefits - most notably that it removes much of the uncertainty surrounding passage of trade deals through Congress. "We're gearing up for this," says Christopher Wenk, senior director of i nternational policy at the US Chamber of Commerce, the largest US business lobby group. "The reality is that there is a very ambitious trade agenda now taking shape but it will never be able to come to fruition if the president doesn't have this authority." David Thomas, vice-president of trade policy at the Business Roundtable , which represents the biggest US blue-chip companies, is another proponent. "It's not an end to itself but it's a tool to getting these trade deals done to support the US economy," he says. That view is shared by some on Capitol Hill. "I'm encouraged with the level of discussion that's going on", says Johnny Isakson of Georgia , the top Republican on the Senate finance trade subcommittee. "There are those who are more isolationists but there's a strong pro-trade element in both the House and the Senate and in the end they will prevail," he adds. But others, particularly members of Mr Obama's own Democratic party who are sceptical of further trade liberalisation, are likely to make demands that Republicans may find unpalatable, or that the White House worries would impose too many restrictions on its negotiators. Sherrod Brown, the Democratic senator from Ohio, says he has spoken to about half the members of the finance committee about the importance of attaching certain conditions to TPA to secure a "more balanced approach on trade", such as ways to protect the currency and workers. "We want to make sure that we practise trade according to our national interest, when in the past we've practised trade according to some economic textbook that is 20 years out of date," Mr Brown says. The big challenge in crafting TPA this year will be successfully reflecting the dramatic shift in the global economy since it was last passed in 2002. This means US lawmakers will have to decide how far they want to go in imposing "negotiating objectives" on Mr Obama with respect to the role of state-owned enterprises, cross-border data flows, intellectual property rights, and currency levels. "I would expect a lot of issues to get aired," says Scott Paul, president of the Alliance for American Manufacturing. "There is still general unhappiness with the administration's unwillingness to be aggressive with other countries on exchange rates," he says, which could affect the talks with Japan on the TPP. "It's going to take an extraordinary amount of political capital on the part of the administration to get this done. There are going to be a lot of battles," Mr Paul adds. Obama administration officials have so far said they are "ready to work" on TPA with Congress but have not presented their own legislation to jump-start the process, drawing criticism from Republicans who say it is a sign they are not fully committed to it. But others say the White House skittishness has been purely tactical - that officials simply want to wait for the most politically advantageous moment to step into the debate. The next clue on the administration's position is expected when Mike Froman, the nominee for US trade representative, appears before Congress for his confirmation hearing in the next few weeks. The more optimistic supporters of TPA in Washington argue that trade has actually bucked the trend of fierce political divisions and dysfunction in recent years, with the passage on a bipartisan basis of three trade agreements with Colombia, Panama and South Korea, as well as permanent normal trade relations with Russia. There also has not been a rush of opposition to the EU-US trade deal announcement, though TPP is more contentious especially after the announcement that Japan would accede.

#### D. – Impact Passing TPA is critical to the future viability of the WTO – which will collapse now.

Jeffrey Schott 6/14/13 Senior Fellow, Peterson Institute for International Economics Payoff from the World Trade Agenda

Peterson Institute for International Economics, Washington, DC

June 14, 2013 http://www.piie.com/publications/papers/transcript-20130614.pdf

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

#### E. The WTO is critical to prevent nuclear extinction.

Copley News Service 1999 [December 1, 1999, lexis]

For decades, many children in America and other countries went to bed fearing annihilation by nuclear war. The specter of nuclear winter freezing the life out of planet Earth seemed very real. Activists protesting the World Trade Organization's meeting in Seattle apparently have forgotten that threat. The truth is that nations join together in groups like the WTO not just to further their own prosperity, but also to forestall conflict with other nations. In a way, our planet has traded in the threat of a worldwide nuclear war for the benefit of cooperative global economics. Some Seattle protesters clearly fancy themselves to be in the mold of nuclear disarmament or anti-Vietnam War protesters of decades past. But they're not. They're special-interest activists, whether the cause is environmental, labor or paranoia about global government. Actually, most of the demonstrators in Seattle are very much unlike yesterday's peace activists, such as Beatle John Lennon or philosopher Bertrand Russell, the father of the nuclear disarmament movement, both of whom urged people and nations to work together rather than strive against each other. These and other war protesters would probably approve of 135 WTO nations sitting down peacefully to discuss economic issues that in the past might have been settled by bullets and bombs. As long as nations are trading peacefully, and their economies are built on exports to other countries, they have a major disincentive to wage war. That's why bringing China, a budding superpower, into the WTO is so important. As exports to the United States and the rest of the world feed Chinese prosperity, and that prosperity increases demand for the goods we produce, the threat of hostility diminishes.

### OLC CP

#### OLC can create and eliminate executive war powers

McGinnis 1993 (John, “CONSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BY THE EXECUTIVE IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND WAR POWERS: A CONSEQUENCE OF RATIONAL CHOICE IN THE SEPARATION OF POWERS”, http://scholarship.law.duke.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=4213&context=lcp)

This article proceeds in two parts. First, it offers a model of institutional rational choice to describe the actual practice of the separation of powers-a model in which governmental powers are often distributed by the branches themselves through bargains and accommodations that maximize their respective interests. Second, the article seeks to illuminate this model by examining the accommodation in the foreign policy and war powers area and the manner in which it reflects the balance of interests among the branches. Because this accommodation is derived from the interests of the branches rather than directly from the text of the Constitution, its legitimacy, like the legitimacy of any accommodation based on power, is always open to challenge or revision. This second part, therefore, also describes how the executive, acting through its constitutional lawyers, exercises its interpretative authority both to legitimize and entrench favorable accommodations and to trade its powers for other, higher- valued, concessions.