**[1:30 w/o impact calc/FW]**

**A. is the uniqueness – The Export-Import aka the Ex-Im Bank reauthorization will pass, maintaining Republican support is key.** Johnsson 15:

6/15/15 **(**Julie Johnsson, Bloomberg, "Boeing CEO Is ‘Confident’ Ex-Im Bank Will Survive Funding Vote," http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2015-06-15/boeing-ceo-is-confident-ex-im-bank-will-survive-funding-vote)

Boeing Co. Chief Executive Officer Jim McNerney said he’s “confident**” the** U.S. **Ex**port**-Im**port **bank will survive conservative** lawmakers’ **campaign[s] to cut** off **funding at the end of the month.** The odds for the bank, **whose credits support aircraft sales for the largest U.S. exporter,** appear better **after two-thirds of the** U.S. **Senate signaled support** for the export credit agency in a procedural vote last week, McNerney said. “That is a huge expression of interest in sustaining the viability of this bank,” McNerney told Bloomberg TV in an interview at the Paris Air Show. “There’s some gymnastics that have to happen to get that attached to another bill and voted on in both the Senate and House. That’s my source of confidence that it’s going to happen.” Boeing benefits because the bank provides backstop financing of its aircraft to overseas customers, helping them make purchases, valuable support when credit is squeezed during a global financial crisis**. Republicans, who control both houses** of Congress, **are divided on the bank’s future.** Democrats and Republicans from both chambers say there is enough support for the bank to reauthorize it. They just haven’t figured out a way to get it to the floor before June 30.

**B. is the link – Political Capital is key to winning reauthorization** Paletta 14:

(Damian covers economic policy for The Wall Street Journal's Washington bureau. “Export-Import Bank 101” Jun 24, 2014 http://blogs.wsj.com/washwire/2014/06/24/export-import-bank-101/)

Q: Who are **the** people worth watching as this unfolds?¶ A: Start with incoming House Majority Leader Kevin **McCarthy** (R., Calif.). He lit some business leaders’ hair on fire when he proclaimed this weekend that he wanted the bank to go out of business.¶ He voted to support the agency in 2012, and his **pivot helps the conservative wing of the party gain momentum to shut the place down**. Another key figure is Speaker of the House John Boehner (R., Ohio). A lot of business leaders who support the bank believe he’s their best shot for a Hail Mary pass as October approaches. The roles of President Barack **Obama** and Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D., Nev.) **will also be** pivotal**. Will [he]** they really **expend** political capital to fight for this agency?

**And the plan is extremely unpopular with Republicans due to its relation to contraceptive, abortion, and sexual education policy for teens, causing partisan strife and tanking Obama’s political capital. Healey 15:**

(Jenna Healey is a Ph.D. candidate in the Program for the History of Science and Medicine and an ISPS Policy Fellow., The Long and Polarizing History of the Parental Notification Debate http://isps.yale.edu/news/blog/2015/03/the-long-and-polarizing-history-of-the-parental-notification-debate#.Vd5w7PlVhBd , Monday, March 30, 2015)

In 2015, just as in 1982, the **debate over parental notification splits cleanly along partisan lines.** Meanwhile, the arguments presented on both sides of the debate remain remarkably unchanged. For Republicans, parental notification preserves parental rights while reducing the number of abortions performed on teenagers. For Democrats, parental notification tramples on the rights of adolescents while causing the teen birth rate to skyrocket. But why, thirty years later, are we still having the same debate? Why do **issues** of parental notification and teen pregnancy **continue to be** so **polarizing**? In theory, teenage pregnancy is the perfect bipartisan issue. AsPresident Obama quipped in this year’s State of the Union Address: "We still may not agree on a woman's right to choose, but surely we can agree it’s a good thing that teen pregnancies and abortions are nearing all-time lows." Undoubtedly, no lawmaker on either side of the aisle would argue that high teenage pregnancy and abortion rates are a good thing. And yet, lawmakers have historically found very little middle ground when it comes to issues of teenage pregnancy prevention. My research on the history of teenage pregnancy policy in the United States shows that **Republicans and Democrats began to diverge on** the question of **teen**age **pregnancy prevention during the late** 19**70s**, when national panic about rising teen pregnancy rates hit an all-time high. As social conservatives began to rally around issues such as abortion and sex education, it was inevitable that a high-profile issue such as teenage pregnancy would become a central piece of the New Right agenda. On the surface, the partisan split revolved around the question of prevention. While **Democrats advocated for sex education and** liberal **access to contraception, Republicans pushed** programs to encourage **abstinence and parental involvement** in matters of adolescent sexuality. In principle, this question should have been easy to resolve. Based on the available evidence, lawmakers could simply determine which of the suggested interventions was the most effective in reducing rates of teen pregnancy. The problem was, however, that Democrats and Republicans interpreted the available body of research in very different ways. In fact, both sides relied heavily on the same set of data to make their case. The study in question, conducted by the Alan Guttmacher Institute, suggested that 1 in 4 teenagers would stop attending a family planning clinic if a parental notification requirement was implemented. It also indicated, however, that two-thirds of these teenagers would switch to non-prescription contraceptives or stop having sex altogether in order to avoid pregnancy. Depending on what side you were on, the data could be used to either undermine or support the “squeal rule” regulation. Liberal opponents of the “squeal rule” were vocal about what they perceived to be Republican irrationality. With a level of vitriol that wouldn’t look out of place in today’s snarkiest twitter feed, angry citizens claimed the legislation "boggles the mind with its illogical conclusions” and accused the government of acting "without a shred of evidence." Liberal critics insisted that Republicans were anti-science, anti-expertise, and were willfully ignorant of "the facts." And yet, Republican policymakers were engaging with the very same facts, and coming to radically different conclusions. Ultimately, the "squeal rule" was struck down in federal court on statutory grounds. **The controversy,** however, **left a legacy of bitterness that is reignited** each time the Republicans try to mandate parental involvement **in issues of adolescent sexuality.** The rhetoric also remains remarkably the same: while Democrats hurl accusations of irrationality and ignorance, the Republicans extoll the superiority of their approach to teen pregnancy prevention.

**C. is the internal link – Reauthorization key to US economic leadership globally – that solves global war,** Jones 15:

(James, served as national security adviser to President Barack Obama, supreme allied commander Europe, and commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps, 5/19, "Keep the Export-Import bank: Column," http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:p4aLZda8-CwJ:www.usatoday.com/story/opinion/2015/05/19/export-import-bank-charter-trad-column/27540639/+&cd=1&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us)

Over two centuries ago John Adams observed that "facts are stubborn things." Whether they are resilient enough to prevail over ideological passions is being sorely tested in the current congressional debate whether to reauthorize the U.S. Export-Import Bank (Ex-Im), whose charter is set to expire on June 30. Despite the opposition's extreme rhetoric, the basic facts remain. Fact: America's prosperity and strength depends upon vigorous trade and market access abroad**. Fact: 95% of the world's customers live outside our national borders, where massive middle classes with huge purchasing power are emerging. Fact: America must compete fiercely** in these markets **with other countries** for sales, for investments, to develop supply **chains, and** to gain greater geopolitical influence**. Fact:** Export credit — the kind provided by the Ex-Im bank — remains a critical component of America's competitiveness toolkit**.** Since its founding during America's effort to emerge from the Great Depression, the Ex-Im bank has supported American jobs by financing our exports when credit is not commercially available or when U.S. companies face undue competition in foreign markets from competitors provided financing by their governments. **It levels the playing field for American businesses** so they can compete in foreign markets against foreign competitors. Many opponents of reauthorization base their arguments on a world that doesn't exist, where markets are untrammeled by state-supported export finance. The reality is that **throughout the world** approximately 60 export credit agencies are jockeying to offer enticing financing terms with a view to winning more and more sales for the companies domiciled in their respective nations, often at our expense. **China**, Europe, **Russia and even Canada have expanded** their **state-backed export support** even as Congress continues to deliberate on the future of Ex-Im. One of China's multiple export credit arms has authorized more financing in the last two years than Ex-Im has since its founding eight decades ago. Even some nations that are party to the OECD Arrangement on Officially Supported Export Credits that sets export financing limitations and guidelines for OECD member countries including the United States, often lend outside the framework, further disadvantaging American companies and our nation. Last year alone, Ex-Im backed U.S. exports valued at approximately $27.5 billion and supported 164,000 export-related U.S. jobs. Using the accounting method required by law, Ex-Im has sent to the Treasury $7 billion more than it has received in appropriations since 1990. Ex-Im's record of strengthening U.S. exports and competitiveness while generating revenue for the U.S. treasury explain its long history of bipartisan support from Republican and Democratic presidents and the U.S. Congress. It would be a bit naïve to suppose that foreign governments would suddenly about-face and dam their tidal waves of export credits if Congress were to shutter Ex-Im's doors. Competitors would welcome the United States unilaterally disarming and ending its export finance program. It would mean more business for their companies and a stronger geopolitical hand around the world for them. The reality is that **if the U**nited **S**tates **leaves the field** on export financing we place more at U.S. business abroad and jobs at home at risk; we would undermine American influence and economic leadership at a time when it's needed more than ever. As a former NATO commander, service chief and national security adviser, **I have witnessed firsthand the** geostrategic importance of American economic engagement. **Where the U.S.** private sector **is not present**, America's interests and values suffer. **The** result is a less stable and secure world. After serving over 40 years in uniform, I have a trained aversion to whatever **[that] threatens our nation.** The willful undermining of our national economic competitiveness counts among them. I would agree that a world without state-funded export credits is one to which we should aspire. However, unilaterally disarming by closing Ex-Im is not the answer. It would destroy the U.S. Treasury's leverage in negotiating reductions to state-backed export finance that would be observed by all — creating the level playing field we should all seek. As Americans, we hope and trust that despite the fractiousness of our political system, we can still overcome gridlock to do what's best for our nation. The stubborn fact is that reauthorizing **the Ex-Im bank** is good for America. It will help sell more American products abroad, support American jobs, expand U.S. global influence and do so without adding to our fiscal deficit. Whether slogans prove more stubborn than facts remains to be seen. For our country's sake, let's hope that John Adams was right and that the facts and our national interest prevail.

#### U.S. leadership prevents great power wars. Kagan ’12:

Kagan, Senior Fellow at Brookings, 3-14-’12 (Robert, “America has made the world freer, safer and wealthier” CNN, http://us.cnn.com/2012/03/14/opinion/kagan-world-america-made/index.html?hpt=hp\_c1)

We take a lot for granted about the way the world looks today -- the widespread freedom, the **unprecedented global prosperity** (even despite the current economic crisis), **and the absence of war among great powers.** In 1941 there were only a dozen democracies in the world. Today there are more than 100. For four centuries prior to 1950, global GDP rose by less than 1 percent a year. Since 1950 it has risen by an average of 4 percent a year, and billions of people have been lifted out of poverty. The first half of the 20th century saw the two most destructive wars in the history of mankind, and in prior centuries war among great powers was almost constant. But **for the past 60 years** no great powers have gone to war. **This is the world America made when it assumed global leadership** after World War II. Would this world order survive if America declined as a great power? Some American intellectuals insist that a "Post-American" world need not look very different from the American world and that all we need to do is "manage" American decline. But that is wishful thinking. **If the balance of power shifts** in the direction of other powers, **the world order will** inevitably **change** to suit their interests and preferences. Take the issue of democracy. For several decades, the balance of power in the world has favored democratic governments. In a genuinely post-American world, the balance would shift toward the great power autocracies. Both China and Russia already protect dictators like Syria's Bashar al-Assad. If they gain greater relative influence in the future, we will see fewer democratic transitions and more autocrats hanging on to power. What about the free market, free trade economic order? People assume China and other rising powers that have benefited so much from the present system would have a stake in preserving it. They wouldn't kill the goose that lays the golden eggs. But China's form of capitalism is heavily dominated by the state, with the ultimate goal being preservation of the ruling party. Although the Chinese have been beneficiaries of an open international economic order, they could end up undermining it simply because, as an autocratic society, their priority is to preserve the state's control of wealth and the power it brings. They might kill the goose because they can't figure out how to keep both it and themselves alive. Finally, what about the long peace that has held among the great powers for the better part of six decades? Many people imagine that American predominance will be replaced by some kind of multipolar harmony. But multipolar systems have historically been neither stable nor peaceful. War among the great powers was a common, if not constant, occurrence in the long periods of multipolarity in the 16th, 17th, and 18th centuries. The 19th century was notable for two stretches of great-power peace of roughly four decades each, punctuated, however, by major wars among great powers and culminating in World War I, the most destructive and deadly war mankind had known up to that point. The era of American predominance has shown that **there is no better recipe for great-power peace than certainty about who holds the upper hand.** Many people view the present international order as the inevitable result of human progress, a combination of advancing science and technology, an increasingly global economy, strengthening international institutions, evolving "norms" of international behavior, and the gradual but inevitable triumph of liberal democracy over other forms of government -- forces of change that transcend the actions of men and nations. But there was nothing inevitable about the world that was created after World War II. International order is not an evolution; it is an imposition. It is the domination of one vision over others -- in America's case, the domination of liberal free market principles of economics, democratic principles of politics, and a peaceful international system that supports these, over other visions that other nations and peoples may have. The present order will last only as long as those who favor it and benefit from it retain the will and capacity to defend it. If and when American power declines, the institutions and norms American power has supported will decline, too. Or they may collapse altogether as we transition into another kind of world order, or into disorder. We may discover then that the United States was essential to keeping the present world order together and that **the alternative to American power** was not peace and harmony but **[is] chaos and catastrophe** -- which was what the world looked like right before the American order came into being.

**D. is the impact – Global nuclear war causes extinction.** **Phillips 2000[[1]](#footnote-1)**,

“**Deaths from world-wide starvation after** the **war would be several times the number from direct effects of the bombs, and the surviving fraction of the human race** might then diminish and **vanish[es] after** a few generations of **hunger and disease, in a radioactive environment.**”

**Existential risk outweighs every other impact by orders of magnitude because of the lost potential for future generations. Bostrom[[2]](#footnote-2)**

**Even** if we use **the most conservative** of these **estimates** which entirely ignores the possibility of space colonization and software minds, we **find that the expected loss of an existential catastrophe is greater than** the value of **1018 human lives.  This implies that** the expected value of **reducing existential risk by a mere one millionth of one percentage point is at least ten** times the value of a **billion human lives.**  The more technologically comprehensive estimate of 1054 human-brain-emulation subjective life-years (or 1052 lives of ordinary length) makes the same point even more starkly.  Even if we give this allegedly lower bound on the cumulative output potential of a technologically mature civilization a mere 1% chance of being correct, we find that the expected value of reducing existential risk by a mere one billionth of one billionth of one percentage point is worth a hundred billion times as much as a billion human lives.

**Extinction comes first. 1. Because there’s uncertainty as to what ethical theory is true, we need to ensure humanity exists in order to determine in the future what theory is true. Bostrom[[3]](#footnote-3) [2]**Our present understanding of axiology might well be confused. **We may not now know**— at least not in concrete detail—**what outcomes [are moral]** would count as a big win for humanity; we might not even yet be able to imagine the best ends of our journey. If we are indeed profoundly uncertain about our ultimate aims, then we should recognize that **there** **is** a great *option* ***value*****in** **preserving**— and ideally improving—**our ability to recognize value and to steer the future [in] accord**ingly. **Ensuring** that there will be **a** **future** version of **humanity** with great powers and a propensity to use them wisely **is** plausibly **the best way available to us to increase the probability that the future will contain** a lot of **value**. To do this, we must prevent any existential catastrophe.

**2. If humans don’t exist, then there’s no moral value under any ethical theory because existence is a prerequisite for any moral good. Seeley[[4]](#footnote-4)**

In moral reasoning prediction of consequences is nearly always impossible. One balances the risks of an action against its benefits; one also considers what known damage the action would do. Thus a surgeon in deciding whether to perform an operation weighs the known effects (the loss of some nerve function, for example) and risks (death) against the benefits, and weighs also the risks and benefits of not performing surgery. Morally, however, **human extinction is unlike any other risk. No** conceivable **human good could be worth** the **extinction** of the race, **for** in order **to be a human good it must be experienced by human beings.** Thus extinction is one result we dare not-may not-risk. Though not conclusively established, the risk of **extinction is** real enough to make nuclear war utterly **impermissible under any** sane **moral code.**

**To will, any good end, you must will the means to that end. But any means entail existing at all first.**
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