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### 2ac separation of powers

#### Checks and self-restraint solve

Prakash and Ramsey ‘12 (Saikrishna B, David Lurton Massee, Jr. Professor of Law and Sullivan and Cromwell Professor of Law, University of Virginia School of Law and Michael D, Professor of Law, University of San Diego School of Law, review of The Executive Unbound, Texas Law Review (2012) 90:973, <http://www.texaslrev.com/wp-content/uploads/Prakash-Ramsey-90-TLR-973.pdf> YX)

Yet we doubt the book’s central claim that we live in a post-Madisonian republic. First, the U.S. Executive is very much bound—by the Constitution, Congress’s laws, and the courts. Though we cannot peer into the many minds populating the Executive Branch, we do not believe that executive officials regard themselves as above the law and the courts, answerable only to the people via elections and polls. The Executive Branch does not act this way, and most of its actions are consistent with its own sense of what the law requires and forbids (although, like most actors, it often reads the law to maximize its discretion). To be sure, the Executive Branch takes advantage of gaps and ambiguities in the law, as well as its speed, decisiveness, and access to information, all as The Executive Unbound describes.5 But the Executive does not systematically disregard orders from Congress or the courts nor does it usually exercise core powers that the Constitution assigns elsewhere; the Executive does not impose criminal punishments, spend money without authorization, or rule by decree. Second, while we agree with Posner and Vermeule that public opinion colors Executive Branch decision making, we also believe that the public favors an executive bound by the law. So long as the public expects the law to constrain the Executive, the Executive will take into account this expectation and the public’s sense of the law, even under Posner and Vermeule’s own light. In other words, the public has a taste for the rule of law, a taste that the Executive Branch ignores at its peril. We think the legal constraints on the modern Executive are so manifest that we wonder whether Posner and Vermeule’s real project is more aspirational than descriptive. Perhaps their ultimate objective is to persuade us that we should have an unbound executive, not that we already have one. We hedge here because the book seems of two minds. In keeping with the title, most of the book forcefully argues that the Executive faces no material legal constraints. For instance, Posner and Vermeule write that “the legally constrained executive is now a historical curiosity”6 and that the Madisonian separation of powers has “collapsed.”7 There is no equivocation here. Yet Chapter 6 argues that irrational fear of executive tyranny has prevented the Executive from obtaining powers needed to handle modern emergencies.8 Obviously this complaint assumes that there are constraints on the Executive. And the conclusion in particular appears to admit that the courts and Congress check the Executive—that the Executive is bound and that the Madisonian republic lives on.
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### 2ac gradualism da

#### Raul’s reforms fail now

Perez-Stable, 2011 (Marifeli, Professor of Sociology at Florida Internatonal University and non-resident senior fellow at the Inter-American Dialogue, The United States and Cuba “Policy in Place for 50 Years Hasn’t Worked”)

At the beginning of 2010, the Cuban government continued to move slowly on domestic matters. The disastrous 2008 hurricane season only served to heighten the leadership's indecisiveness on economic reforms, which in any case never lived up to the expectations raised by Raul Castro's earlier call for "structural changes." Still, throughout 2009, ordinary Cubans heard hints of change. There were calls to increase productivity and warnings that some subsidies would be reduced or eliminated. There was talk of doing away with the ration book, and there was a new slogan, /ahorro o muerte! (saving or death!), along with critiques of the "paternalistic state."96 The latter, of course, followed naturally from the revolution's socialist turn as well as the Comandante's aversion to decentraliza­tion and the market. In keeping with his emphasis on la institucionalidad, Raul Castro led a whirlwind of meetings in mid-2009: the National Defense Council, the1' Council of Ministers, the Cuban Communist Party's Central Committee (CC) and the National Assembly. The CC meeting postponed the Party Con­gress, which had been scheduled for the second half of 2009. In Castro's words,¶ "identifying our principal problems will take us some more time."97 Cuba's "principal problems," however, had long been identified. In 1970, Fidel Castro acknowledged them, and Granma reprinted an excerpt of his speech in Novem­ber 2009:¶ Lack of productivity is an abyss that threatens to swallow our human resources and the country's wealth. We have to become aware, the workers need to raise their conciencia about this problem. We need to overcome bottlenecks, be more organized, work diligendy every day with more discipline, rationality, common sense.98¶ From the mid-1970s to the mid-1980s the Cuban economy registered modest growth only after the government received large increases in Soviet subsidies and applied the post-Stalinist model of relative decentralization and material incentives. Unlike his brother, Raul Castro embraced market socialism and remained more open to economic reforms, except he favored a failed model over the model that has yielded economic success for China and Vietnam. More than three years after succeeding the Comandante, Raul had thwarted popular expectations that his government might create "a breathing space and perhaps a turning point in the nation's economic environment," and opted instead to prolong the status quo "in spite of its manifest inefficiency."99 As a result, the Cuban economy tottered, its fragility no doubt aggravated by the global finan­cial crisis. Still, in good or bad times, the regime never put forward an eco­nomic program that placed living standards and individual initiatives at the center. Instead, it preferred token measures such as allowing beauticians to take over Havana beauty shops by paying a $45 monthly tax or piloting a program that permitted taxi drivers to use their vehicles as their own if they assumed responsibility for maintenance. In the meantime, the state sector was bloated by at least a million excess workers.100¶ In part, Cuban leaders had failed to grapple with the country's economic woes due to their military mindset. At the Central Committee gathering in late July 2009, Raul Castro repeatedly mentioned the party's failure to replicate in the economy the strength it had achieved with its armed forces. Both, he added, were equally essential to national security.101 In the early 1990s, when he was defense minister, he had said something similar: "Beans are more important than cannons."102 Each sector, however, thrives on different principles: A strong mil­itary depends on an inviolable discipline down the chain of command; a strong economy needs entrepreneurship, innovation, competition and, yes, self-interest. At the CC meeting, Raul brought up "false unanimity," a pernicious practice that he said stifled "debate and a healthy discrepancy." His words harked back to the Llamamiento, the convocation of the 1992 party congress that . decried la doble moral—saying one thing in public while believing another—and called on the citizenry to speak out without el a/an de unanimidad, the zeal of¶ unanimity.103 A few years later, Raul said it differently: "We need to learn to disagree with those in charge. We don't say anything in meetings but we talk endlessly in hallways."104 Raul was, nonetheless, not inviting disagreements with the Comandante, himself or the PCC. How else but under constitutionally guaranteed civil liberties could citizens feel safe to freely express healthy discrepancies?

#### The AFF causes gradualism – loosening restrictions on travel has minimal immediate effect on democratic transition

AFP 11 (American Foreign Policy Magazine, Princeton Student Editorials on Global Politics. "Ending the Embargo Against Cuba: Why Obama’s Baby Steps Are Not Enough" March 16, 2011. afpprinceton.com/2011/03/ending-the-embargo-against-cuba-why-obama’s-baby-steps-are-not-enough/)

As the presidential election of 2012 approaches, more and more critics are deriding President Obama’s pre-election vision of hope and change, targeting what they consider to be Obama’s naivete in foreign policy. This January, however, the president announced one significant foreign policy reform that he hopes will counter such criticism. In a memorandum entitled “Reaching Out to the Cuban People,” he detailed foreign policy changes between the United States and Cuba that ease the fifty-year American embargo on Cuba. The three-part reform measure that has gone largely unnoticed attempts to create more contact with the citizens of Cuba, and the changes it implements are certainly admirable. As its failures over the past fifty years have shown, however, the embargo is a Cold War remnant of political tension that is hurting American industry, America’s reputation abroad, and most directly, the Cuban people. Analysis of the negative ramifications of the embargo reveals that President Obama should fully end the oppressive embargo and reconnect the United States with the Cuban citizenry.¶ The economic embargo was first enacted in 1960 as the swift answer to communist President Fidel Castro’s seizure of American property in Cuba. Since then, every American president has maintained the embargo in some form, with a conditional promise to lift it when Cuba adopts a democratic system of government.¶ Last year, President Obama ended restrictions on travel and cash remittances by family members of Cubans, but his newest move has forced politicians and citizens alike to reconsider the issue. Although Cuba is still not fully open to the public and businesses, the new policy aims “to enhance contact with the Cuban people and support civil society” by allowing approved licensed travelers for “purposeful travel.”¶ Following the changes, a variety of groups can visit the communist state: religious organizations are now able to travel for missionary purposes, academic institutions are able to sponsor study abroad programs, and cultural groups are encouraged to host conferences along with other forms of “educational exchange.” Additionally, reporters have been given more freedom to travel to Cuba for journalistic purposes. The new policy also allows remittances of $500 per quarter that can be sent by Americans to Cuban citizens (excluding senior Cuban government officials and members of the Communist Party). The final part of the memorandum affects charter flights to Cuba which had been previously restricted to Miami and a few other airports. Now, all international airports can apply for licenses allowing flights to Cuba for family members and others engaging in “purposeful travel.”¶ The loosening of restrictions continues a series of recent improvements in American-Cuban relations. Although Cuba is undoubtedly facing economic woes—500,000 government workers were laid off last September—citizens are slowly approaching true political freedom. In February 2008, Fidel Castro resigned from his position as president of Cuba due to health reasons, and Cuba’s National Assembly selected his relatively moderate brother, Raul, as his successor. When taking office, Raul Castro suggested that Cuba may be headed “toward a more democratic society,” and Cuba is indeed showing signs of change. In 2009 Raul Castro offered to speak with President Obama, saying, “We have sent word to the U.S. government in private and in public that we are willing to discuss everything, human rights, freedom of the press, political prisoners, everything.” Citizens in Cuba are now allowed to own cell phones, and farmers can till their own land. Most recently, Cuba has been releasing political prisoners, some of whom had been sentenced to decades of imprisonment.¶ The political buzz generated by the memorandum is to be expected, given that the embargo policy has been a part of American diplomacy for fifty years. Like most members of his party, Cornelius Mack (R-FL) had harsh feelings toward the president’s policy change, saying that the “dictatorship is one of the most brutal in the world. The U.S. economic embargo must remain in place until tyranny gives way to freedom and democracy.” In a statement that defied the Democratic party line, Cuban-American Senator Robert Menendez (D-NJ) echoed the sentiments, calling the loosening of the embargo a “gift to the Castro brothers [that] will provide the regime with the additional resources it needs to sustain its failing economy.”¶ Yet the changes are also receiving support from varied sources. Pepe Hernandez, head of the Cuban-American National Foundation, praised the shift for allowing impoverished Cubans to fight for economic independence from the Castro administration. Rev. Michael Kinnamon, speaking on behalf of the National Council of Churches, commended the move, saying, “We look forward to the day when the U. S. embargo of Cuba will be lifted completely.” Even some Republicans favor the change, including Senator Richard Lugar, who said last year that “the unilateral embargo on Cuba has failed to achieve its stated purpose of “bringing democracy to the Cuban people.”¶ Those who still favor the use of the embargo see it as a way to pressure the communist regime of Cuba. The idea was that, the embargo would inflict hunger and suffering among Cubans, weakening the regime and even spurring a revolt against the Castro regime. But Lugar is correct: the failed history of the embargo should disabuse us of this notion. Over the last five decades, American-Cuban relations have been characterized by stagnation and hostility. The country has certainly shown signs of hardship, but the Cuban people have not been able to organize and protest against the government. Instead, Fidel Castro was able to rule with an iron first, before handing the presidency to his brother. Fidel Castro continues issue regular tirades in the newspaper Granma, which serves as the mouthpiece for the Cuban Communist Party. Clearly, the outdated embargo has served to strengthen the Castro regime, rather than create extreme instability. Perhaps most tragic has been the fate of the Cuban people, who continue to suffer economically, politically, and even emotionally: the nation has one of the highest suicide rates in the world.¶ Although the president deserves praise for the diplomatic changes, they are not new. During the Carter and Clinton administrations, similar restrictions were lifted, but the changes were short-lived. Moreover, the embargo under the George W. Bush administration was very strictly enforced, effectively negating Clinton’s reforms. The recent changes loosen the restrictions, but the basic tenet of banned trade remains intact. American industries are still not permitted to engage in business with the communist nation. Although weakening the embargo is certainly a step in the right direction, the nation needs to take further steps to end the punitive policy.¶ Increasing contact with the Cuban people is certainly not equivalent to accepting communism. Rather, it exposes Cubans to the democratic principles espoused by the United States and the benefits of capitalism. At the present time, Cubans are inundated with anti-American propaganda spewed by state-run media sources. Even though funds from America may indeed benefit the Cuban economy, it is time to let diplomacy show American support for the Cuban people. By abandoning the Cuban people, the United States is leaving them at the mercy of a communist regime that continues to retain power. Forming economic, academic, and cultural connections will allow the United States to introduce American ideas to Cubans in a peaceful and effective way.¶ In addition to aiding the Cuban people, ending the embargo would strengthen America’s own economic interests and improve her reputation abroad. American businesses currently yearn for the untapped potential present in Cuba, and the opening of trade would help the United States assert dominance during a difficult economic time. Furthermore, the negative global consequences of the embargo would be curbed. Cuban Foreign Minister Bruno Rodriguez called the present embargo a “cruel and aggressive policy absolutely contrary to international law” and much of the international community agrees; in October 2010, the United Nations voted to end the U.S. embargo for the 19th consecutive year, with 187 members voting against the embargo and the only two votes supporting the embargo from the United States and Israel.¶ President Obama has taken a step in the right direction with his modification of the embargo against Cuba, but it is simply not enough. In the current, relatively moderate Cuban political environment, ending the fifty-year-old embargo would give the Cuban people the American economic and cultural connection they sorely need. If Obama limits his actions to the superficial changes of Carter and Clinton, both the president and his policies may be gone in 2012. Relations between the United States and Cuba cannot afford to wait another fifty years.

### 2ac cap

#### Perm – do the plan and deconstruct capitalism If the ALT is true, AFF facilitates their travel and diversification of resistance. Empirics prove – narrow easing in 09 and 11 was successful.

Wolfenstein 2k (PhD in politics from Princeton, professor of political science at UCLA, PhD in psychoanalysis, Victor, Inside/outside Nietzsche, p 235-6, AG)

As to the matter of political aims, we have no choice but to live with the disjunction between the potential for realizing the project of human emancipation and the recognition that this potential is not going to be realized any time soon. In the foreseeable future, we are not going to be able to go beyond capitalism. We cannot hope for the emergence of a society in which the free development of each individual is a condition for the free development of all. Capitalism is a system of structurally determined inequality; its normal and necessary operations preclude genuine social democracy. This is the sobering premise of contemporary emancipatory politics. Yet from its inception, capitalism has combined emancipatory and oppressive tendencies. We must resist the temptation of one-dimensionalizing it one way or the other. Putting the point **pragmatically**, we can hope and work for the realization of **progressive policy aims** so long as these do not (unduly?) inhibit the process of capital accumulation or **threaten the power relationships** that maintain them. This defines a **substantial field for political action**, one in which outcomes are contingent and not determinable in advance. It is an abnegation of political responsibility not to take advantage of these potentialities, even if social injustices and metabolic imbalances **cannot be altogether eliminated**. To carry the argument a bit further, the realization of progressive political aims depends on collective action, ultimately at national or even international levels. Local action, vital as it may be, **just is not enough**. We critical theorists—must be prepared for a war on two fronts: against the hegemonic power of capitalist ruling classes, on the one side, and against sometimes diffuse, sometimes organizationally embodied, ur-fascistic tendencies, on the other. The fissiparous tendency in leftist politics, sometimes celebrated in postmodern discourse, puts us at a **terrible strategic and tactical disadvantage**. The dangers of a dissent-stiffling leftist hegemony, although not a mere phantasy, are far less pressing than the risks of self-fragmentation and political incoherence. In this regard, the more things change, the more they stay the same: resistance politics must be both dialectically self-unifying and perspectivally self-differentiating.

2ac AFF true

#### Social psychology ensures backlash to the ALT – makes the system worse

Kuziemko 11 (Ilyana Kuziemko Assistant Professor of Economics and Public Affairs @ Princeton and Michael I. Norton Associate Professor of Business Administration in the Marketing Unit and Marvin Bower Fellow at the Harvard Business School, http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=occupy-wall-street-psychology 10-12-11

If ever Americans were up for a bit of class warfare, now would seem to be the time. The current financial downturn has led to a $700 billion tax-payer-financed bank bailout and an unemployment rate stuck stubbornly above nine percent. Onto this scene has stepped the Occupy Wall Street (OWS) movement, which seeks to bring together a disparate group of protesters united in their belief that the current income distribution is unfair. “The one thing we all have in common is that We are the 99% that will no longer tolerate the greed and corruption of the 1%,” says their website. In an era of bank bailouts and rising poverty – and where recent data show that the top 1 percent control as much as 35 percent of the total wealth in America – it would appear that the timing of this movement to reconsider the allocation of wealth could not be more perfect. Or, maybe not. Support for redistribution, surprisingly enough, has plummeted during the recession. For years, the General Social Survey has asked individuals whether “government should reduce income differences between the rich and the poor.” Agreement with this statement dropped dramatically between 2008 and 2010, the two most recent years of data available. Other surveys have shown similar results. What might explain this trend? First, the change is not driven by wealthy white Republicans reacting against President Obama’s agenda: the drop is if anything slightly larger among minorities, and Americans who self-identify as having below average income show the same decrease in support for redistribution as wealthier Americans. Our recent research suggests that, far from being surprised that many working-class individuals would oppose redistribution, we might actually expect their opposition to rise during times of turmoil – despite the fact that redistribution appears to be in their economic interest. Our work suggests that people exhibit a fundamental loathing for being near or in last place – what we call “last place aversion.” This fear can lead people near the bottom of the income distribution to oppose redistribution because it might allow people at the very bottom to catch up with them or even leapfrog past them. How does last-place aversion play out with regard to redistribution? In our surveys, we asked Americans whether they supported an increase to the minimum wage, currently $7.25 per hour. Those making $7.25 or below were very likely to support the increase – after all, they would be immediate beneficiaries. In addition, people making substantially more than $7.25 were also fairly positive towards the increase. Which group was the most opposed? Those making just above the minimum wage, between $7.26 and $8.25. We might expect people who make just below and just above $7.25 to have similar lifestyles and policy attitudes – but in this case, while those making below $7.25 would benefit if the minimum wage were raised to, say, $8.25, those making just above $7.25 would run the risk of falling into a tie for last place. We’ve also found evidence of last place aversion in laboratory experiments. In one, we created an artificial income distribution by endowing individuals with different sums of money and showing them their “rank”– with each rank separated by $1. We then gave them an additional $2, which they had to give to either the person directly below or directly above them in the distribution. In this income distribution, of course, giving $2 to the person below you means he will jump ahead of you in rank. In our experiments, most people still give to the person below them – after all, the alternative is to give $2 to a person who already has more money than you. People in second-to-last place, however, who would fall to last place when giving the money to the person below them, are the least likely to do so: so strong is their desire to avoid last place that they choose to give the money to a wealthier person (the person above them) nearly half the time. If Americans behave like people in our experiments, then it could be challenging to unite those in the bottom of the income distribution to support redistribution.

#### Extinction comes first – no other prior questions

Bostrom 12 – Professor of Philosophy at Oxford, directs Oxford's Future of Humanity Institute, Interview with Ross Andersen, correspondent at The Atlantic, 3/6, “We're Underestimating the Risk of Human Extinction”, http://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2012/03/were-underestimating-the-risk-of-human-extinction/253821/)

Bostrom, who directs Oxford's Future of Humanity Institute, has argued over the course of several papers that human extinction risks are poorly understood and, worse still, severely underestimated by society. Some of these existential risks are fairly well known, especially the natural ones. But others are obscure or even exotic. Most worrying to Bostrom is the subset of existential risks that arise from human technology, a subset that he expects to grow in number and potency over the next century.¶ Despite his concerns about the risks posed to humans by technological progress, Bostrom is no luddite. In fact, he is a longtime advocate of transhumanism---the effort to improve the human condition, and even human nature itself, through technological means. In the long run he sees technology as a bridge, a bridge we humans must cross with great care, in order to reach new and better modes of being. In his work, Bostrom uses the tools of philosophy and mathematics, in particular probability theory, to try and determine how we as a species might achieve this safe passage. What follows is my conversation with Bostrom about some of the most interesting and worrying existential risks that humanity might encounter in the decades and centuries to come, and about what we can do to make sure we outlast them.¶ Some have argued that we ought to be directing our resources toward humanity's existing problems, rather than future existential risks, because many of the latter are highly improbable. You have responded by suggesting that existential risk mitigation may in fact be a dominant moral priority over the alleviation of present suffering. Can you explain why? ¶ Bostrom: Well suppose you have a moral view that counts future people as being worth as much as present people. You might say that fundamentally it doesn't matter whether someone exists at the current time or at some future time, just as many people think that from a fundamental moral point of view, it doesn't matter where somebody is spatially---somebody isn't automatically worth less because you move them to the moon or to Africa or something. A human life is a human life. If you have that moral point of view that future generations matter in proportion to their population numbers, then you get this very stark implication that existential risk mitigation has a much higher utility than pretty much anything else that you could do. There are so many people that could come into existence in the future if humanity survives this critical period of time---we might live for billions of years, our descendants might colonize billions of solar systems, and there could be billions and billions times more people than exist currently. Therefore, even a very small reduction in the probability of realizing this enormous good will tend to outweigh even immense benefits like eliminating poverty or curing malaria, which would be tremendous under ordinary standards.

VTL subjective

#### Capitalism is inevitable – consensus of biological studies

Wilkinson 05 (Will; policy analyst for the Cato Institute and editor of Cato Unbound, and he cites Nobel Prize winning Scientists from multiple empirical fields and falsifiable experiments; CATO Policy Report; Capitalism and Human Nature; January-February 2005; http://object.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/serials/files/policy-report/2005/1/cpr-27n1-1.pdf//BDS)

In the spring of 1845 Karl Marx wrote: “The human essence is no abstraction inherent in each single individual. In its reality it is the ensemble of social relations.” Marx’s idea was that a change in the “ensemble of social relations” can change “the human essence.” ¶ In June 2004 the communist North Korean government issued a statement to its starving citizens recommending the consumption of pine needles. Pyongyang maintained that pine needle tea could effectively prevent and treat cancer, arteriosclerosis, diabetes, cerebral hemorrhage, and even turn gray hair black. ¶ Tragically, human nature isn’t at all as advertised, and neither is pine needle tea. According to the U.S. State Department, at least one million North Koreans have died of famine since 1995. ¶ Marx’s theory of human nature, like Kim Jong Il’s theory of pine needle tea, is a biological fantasy, and we have the corpses to prove it. Which may drive us to wonder: if communism is deadly because it is contrary to human nature, does that imply that capitalism, which is contrary to communism, is distinctively compatible with human nature? ¶ A growing scientific discipline called evolutionary psychology specializes in uncovering the truth about human nature, and it is already illuminating what we know about the possibilities of human social organization. How natural is capitalism? ¶ Evolutionary Psychology 101 ¶ Evolutionary psychology seeks to understand the unique nature of the human mind by applying the logic and methods of contemporary evolutionary biology and cognitive psychology. ¶ The main working assumption of evolutionary psychology is that the mind is a variegated toolkit of specialized functions (think of a Swiss Army knife) that has evolved through natural selection to solve specific problems faced by our forebears. Distinct mental functions (e.g., perception, reading other people’s intentions, responding emotionally to potential mates) are underwritten by different neurological “circuits” or “modules,” which can each be conceived as a mini computer program selected under environmental pressure to solve specific problems of survival and reproduction typical in the original setting of human evolution, the Envilronment of Evolutionary Adaptedness, or EEA. Strictly speaking, the EEA is a statistical composite of environmental pressures that account for the evolutionary selection of our distinctively human traits. Loosely, the EEA was the Pleistocene, during which humans lived as hunter-gatherers from about 1.6 million years ago up until the invention of agriculture about 10,000 years ago. ¶ CAPITALISM Continued from page 1 According to evolutionary psychologists, the basic constitution of the human mind hasn’t changed appreciably for about 50,000 years. Thus the evolutionary psychologist’s slogan: modern skulls house Stone Age minds. ¶ As pioneers of evolutionary psychology Leda Cosmides and John Tooby put it: ¶ The key to understanding how the modern mind works is to realize that its circuits were not designed to solve the day-to-day problems of a modern American—they were designed to solve the day-to-day problems of our hunter-gatherer ancestors. ¶ Understanding the problems faced by members of human hunter-gatherer bands in the EEA can therefore help us to understand a great deal about human nature and the prospects and pathologies of modern social systems. ¶ First, a word of caution: We cannot expect to draw any straightforward positive political lessons from evolutionary psychology. It can tell us something about the kind of society that will tend not to work, and why. But it cannot tell us which of the feasible forms of society we ought to aspire to. We cannot, it turns out, infer the naturalness of capitalism from the manifest failure of communism to accommodate human nature. Nor should we be tempted to infer that natural is better. Foraging half-naked for nuts and berries is natural, while the New York Stock Exchange and open-heart surgery would boggle our ancestors’ minds. ¶ What evolutionary psychology really helps us to appreciate is just what an unlikely achievement complex, liberal, market-based societies really are. It helps us to get a better grip on why relatively free and fabulously wealthy societies like ours are so rare and, possibly, so fragile. Evolutionary psychology helps us to understand that successful market-liberal societies require the cultivation of certain psychological tendencies that are weak in Stone Age minds and the suppression or sublimation of other tendencies that are strong. Free, capitalist societies, where they can be made to work, work with human nature. But it turns out that human ¶ nature is not easy material to work with. There is a rapidly expanding library of books that try to spell out the moral, political, and economic implications of evolutionary psychology. (The Origins of Virtue by Matt Ridley, Darwinian Politics by Paul Rubin, and The Company of Strangers by Paul Seabright are good ones.) Below is a short tour of just a few features of human nature emphasized by evolutionary psychologists that highlight the challenges of developing and sustaining a modern market-liberal order. ¶ We Are Coalitional ¶ The size of hunter-gatherer bands in the EEA ranged from 25 to about 150 people. The small size of those groups ensured that everyone would know everyone else; that social interactions would be conducted face-to-face; and that reputations for honesty, hard work, and reliability would be common knowledge. Even today, people’s address books usually contain no more than 150 names. And military squadrons generally contain about as many people as Pleistocene hunting expeditions. ¶ Experiments by psychologists Leda Cosmides and Robert Kurzban have shown that human beings have specialized abilities to track shifting alliances and coalitions and are eager to define others as inside or out- side their own groups. Coalitional categories can easily lead to violence and war between groups. Think of Hutus and Tutsis, Albanians and Serbs, Shiites and Sunnis, Crips and Bloods, and so on ad nauseam. However, coalitional categories are fairly fluid. Under the right circumstances, we can learn to care more about someone’s devotion to the Red Sox or Yankees than their skin color, religion, or social class. ¶ We cannot, however, consistently think of ourselves as members only of that one grand coalition: the Brotherhood of Mankind. Our disposition to think in terms of “us” versus “them” is [inevitable],irremediable and has unavoidable political implications. Populist and racialist political rhetoric encourages people to identify themselves as primarily rich or poor, black or white. It is important to avoid designing institutions, such as racial preference programs, that reinforce coalitional categories that have no basis in biology and may heighten some of the tensions they are meant to relax. A great deal of the animosity toward free trade, to take a different example, depends on economically and morally inappropriate coalitional distinctions between workers in Baltimore (us) and workers in Bangalore (them). Positively, free trade is laudable for the way it encourages us to see members of unfamiliar groups as partners, not enemies. ¶ We Are Hierarchical ¶ Like many animals and all primates, humans form hierarchies of dominance. It is easy to recognize social hierarchies in modern life. Corporations, governments, chess clubs, and churches all have formal hierarchical structures of officers. Informal structures of dominance and status may be the leading cause of tears in junior high students. ¶ The dynamics of dominance hierarchies in the EEA was complex. Hierarchies play an important role in guiding collective efforts and distributing scarce resources without having to resort to violence. Daily affairs run more smoothly if everyone knows what is expected of him. However, space at the top of the hierarchy is scarce and a source of conflict and competition. Those who command higher status in social hierarchies have better access to material resources and mating opportunities. Thus, evolution favors the psychology of males and females [those] who are able successfully to compete for positions of dominance. ¶ Living at the bottom of the dominance heap is a raw deal, and we are not built to take it lying down. There is evidence that lower-status males naturally form coalitions to check the power of more dominant males and to achieve relatively egalitarian distribution of resources. In his book Hierarchy in the Forest, anthropologist Christopher Boehm calls those coalitions against the powerful “reverse dominance hierarchies.” ¶ Emory professor of law Paul Rubin usefully distinguishes between “productive” and “allocative” hierarchies. Productive hierarchies are those that organize cooperative efforts to achieve otherwise unattainable mutually advantageous gains. Business organizations are a prime example.¶ Allocative hierarchies, on the other hand, exist mainly to transfer resources to the top. Aristocracies and dictatorships are extreme examples. Although the nation-state can perform productive functions, there is the constant risk that it may become dominated by allocative hierarchies. Rubin warns that our natural wariness of zero-sum allocative hierarchies, which helps us to guard against the concentration of power in too few hands, is often directed at modern positive-sum productive hierarchies, like corporations, thereby threatening the viability of enterprises that tend to make everyone better off.¶ There is no way to stop dominance-seeking behavior. We may hope only to channel it to nonharmful uses. A free society therefore requires that positions of dominance and status be widely available in a multitude of productive hierarchies, and that opportunities for greater status and dominance through predation be limited by the constant vigilance of “the people”—the ultimate reverse dominance hierarchy. A flourishing civil society permits almost everyone to be the leader of something, whether the local Star Trek fan club or the city council, thereby somewhat satisfying the human taste for hierarchical status, but to no one’s serious detriment. ¶ We Are Envious Zero-Sum Thinkers ¶ Perhaps the most depressing lesson of evolutionary psychology for politics is found in its account of the deep-seated human capacity for envy and of our related difficulty in understanding the idea of gains from trade and increases in productivity— the idea of an ever-expanding “pie” of wealth. ¶ There is evidence that greater skill and initiative could lead to higher status and bigger shares of resources for an individual in the EEA. But because of the social nature of hunting and gathering, the fact that food spoiled quickly, and the utter absence of privacy, the benefits of individual success in hunting or foraging could not be easily internalized by the individual and were expected to be shared. The EEA was for the most part a zero-sum world, where increases in total wealth through invention, investment, and extended economic exchange were totally unknown. More for you was less for me. Therefore, if anyone managed to acquire a great deal more than anyone else, that was pretty good evidence that his was a stash of ill-gotten gains, acquired by cheating, stealing, raw force, or, at best, sheer luck. Envy of the disproportionately wealthy may have helped to reinforce generally adaptive norms of sharing and to help those of lower status on the dominance hierarchy guard against further predation by those able to amass power. ¶ Our zero-sum mentality makes it hard for us to understand how trade, innovation, and investment can increase the amount of total wealth. We are thus ill-equipped to easily understand our own economic system. ¶ These features of human nature—that we are coalitional, hierarchical, and envious zero-sum thinkers—would seem to make liberal capitalism extremely unlikely. And it is. However, the benefits of a liberal market order can be seen in a few further features of the human mind and social organization in the EEA. ¶ Property Rights Are Natural ¶ The problem of distributing scarce resources can be handled in part by implicitly coercive allocative hierarchies. An alternative solution to the problem of distribution is the recognition and enforcement of property rights. Property rights are prefigured in nature by the way animals mark out territories for their exclusive use in foraging, hunting, and mating. Recognition of such rudimentary claims to control and exclude minimizes costly conflict, which by itself provides a strong evolutionary reason to look for innate tendencies to recognize and respect norms of property. ¶ New scientific research provides even stronger evidence for the existence of such property “instincts.” For example, recent experimental work by Oliver Goodenough, a legal theorist, and Christine Prehn, a neuroscientist, suggests that the human mind evolved specialized modules for making judgments about moral transgressions, and transgressions against property in particular. ¶ Evolutionary psychology can help us to understand that property rights are not created simply by strokes of the legislator’s pen. ¶ Mutually Beneficial Exchange Is Natural ¶ Trade and mutually beneficial exchange are human universals, as is the division of labor. In their groundbreaking paper, “Cognitive Adaptations for Social Exchange,” Cosmides and Tooby point out that, contrary to widespread belief, hunter-gatherer life is not “a kind of retro-utopia” of “indiscriminate, egalitarian cooperation and sharing.” The archeological and ethnographic evidence shows that hunter-gatherers were involved in numerous forms of trade and exchange. Some forms of hunter-gatherer trading can involve quite complex specialization and the interaction of supply and demand. ¶ Most impressive, Cosmides and Too- by have shown through a series of experiments that human beings are able easily to solve complex logical puzzles involving reciprocity, the accounting of costs and benefits, and the detection of people who have cheated on agreements. However, we are unable to solve formally identical puzzles that do not deal with questions of social exchange. That, they argue, points to the existence of “functionally specialized, content-dependent cognitive adaptations for social exchange.” ¶ In other words, the human mind is “built” to trade. ¶ Trust and Hayek’s Two Orders ¶ It is easy to see a kind of in vitro capitalism in the evolved human propensity to recognize property rights, specialize in productive endeavors, and engage in fairly complex forms of social exchange. However, the kind of freedom and wealth we enjoy in the United States remains a chimera to billions. Although our evolved capacities are the scaffolding upon which advanced liberal capitalism has been built, they are, quite plainly, not enough, as the hundreds of millions who live on less than a dollar a day can attest. The path from the EEA to laptops and lattes requires a great cultural leap. In recent work, Nobel Prize–winning economists Douglass North and Vernon Smith have stressed that the crucial juncture is the transition from personal to impersonal exchange. ¶ Economic life in the EEA was based on repeated face-to-face interactions with well- known members of the community. Agreements were policed mainly by public knowledge of reputation. If you cheated or shirked, your stock of reputation would decline, and so would your prospects. Our evolutionary endowment prepared us to navigate skillfully through that world of personal exchange. However, it did not prepare us to cooperate and trade with total strangers whom we had never met and might never see again. The road to prosperity must cross a chasm of uncertainty and mistrust. ¶ The transition to an extended, impersonal market order requires the emergence of “institutions that make human beings willing to treat strangers as honorary friends,” as Paul Seabright puts it. The exciting story of the way those institutions piggybacked on an evolved psychology designed to solve quite different ecological problems is the topic of Seabright’s book, The Company of Strangers, as well as an important part of forthcoming works by North and Smith. ¶ As he so often did, here, too, F. A. Hayek anticipated contemporary trends. He understood that our kind of economy and society, which he called an extended order, or “macro- cosmos,” is in many ways alien to our basic psychological constitution, which is geared to deal with life in small groups, the “micro- cosmos.” We live in two worlds, the face-to- face world of the tribe, family, school, and firm and the impersonal, anonymous world of huge cities, hyper-specialization, and transworld trade. Each world has its own set of rules, and we confuse them at our peril. As Hayek writes in The Fatal Conceit: ¶ If we were to apply the unmodified, uncurbed, rules of the micro-cosmos (i.e., of the small band or troop, or of, say, our families) to the macro-cosmos (our wider civilization), as our instincts and sentimental yearnings often make us wish to do, we would destroy it. Yet if we were always to apply the rules of the extended order to our more intimate groupings, we would crush them. So we must learn to live in two sorts of worlds at once. ¶ The balance is delicate. Once we appreciate the improbability and fragility of our wealth and freedom, it becomes clear just how much respect and gratitude we owe to the belief systems, social institutions, and personal virtues that allowed the emergence of our “wider civilization” and that allow us to move between our two worlds without destroying or crushing either. ¶ Evolutionary Psychology and Political Humility ¶ The key political lesson of evolutionary psychology is simply that there is a universal human nature. The human mind comprises many distinct, specialized functions and is not an all-purpose learning machine that can be reformatted at will to realize political dreams. The shape of society is constrained by our evolved nature. Remaking humanity through politics is a biological impossibility on the order of curing cancer with pine needle tea. We can, however, work with human nature—and we have. We have, through culture, enhanced those traits that facilitate trust and cooperation, channeled our coalitional and status-seeking instincts toward productive uses, and built upon our natural suspicion of power to preserve our freedom. We can, of course, do better. ¶ As Immanuel Kant famously remarked, “From the crooked timber of humanity no truly straight thing can be made.” But, in the words of philosopher Denis Dutton, ¶ It is not . . . that no beautiful carving or piece of furniture can be produced from twisted wood; it is rather that whatever is finally created will only endure if it takes into account the grain, texture, natural joints, knotholes, strengths and weaknesses of the original material. ¶ Evolutionary psychology, by helping us to better understand human nature, can aid us in cultivating social orders that do not foolishly attempt to cut against the grain of human nature. We can learn how best to work with the **material** of humanity to encourage and preserve societies, like our own, that are not only beautiful but will endure.

#### Our scholarship is best – it’s empirically valid and falsifiable – reject their isolated analysis

Weede 4 (professor of sociology at the University of Bonn, Germany, In Winter 1986-87, he was Visiting Professor of International Relations at the Bologna Center of The Johns Hopkins University. (Erich, “BALANCE OF POWER, GLOBALIZATION, AND THE CAPITALIST PEACE,” http://www.fnf.org.ph/downloadables/Balance%20of%20Power,%20Globalization%20and%20Capitalist%20Peace.pdf)

If one does research or su*m*marize the research of others – of course, most of the ideas, theories, and evidence discussed below have been produced by others – **one cannot avoid some epistemological commitments**. In the social sciences the fundamental choice is whether to pursue an ideographic or a nomothetic approach. Almost all historians choose the ideographic approach and focus on the description of structures or events, whereas most economists and psychologists choose the nomothetic approach and focus on the search for law-like general statements. Sociologists and political scientists are still divided – sometimes even by the Atlantic Ocean. In American political science the nomothetic approach dominates the flagship journal of the profession, the American Political Science Review, as well as more specialized journals, such as International Studies Quarterly, the Journal of Conflict Resolution, or World Politics. In German political science, however, the nomothetic approach has advanced little beyond electoral studies.¶ **My own approach is definitely nomothetic**. This is related to my training in psychology at one of the first German universities focusing on quantitative research methods in the early 1960s, the University of Hamburg. This epistemological orientation has been reinforced by graduate training in international politics at one of the first American universities emphasizing quantitative research in the late 1960s, Northwestern University, which is located in a suburb of Chicago.¶ **Nomothetic research focuses on hypothesizing, testing and establishing law-like general statements or nomological propositions**. **Examples of such propositions are:** The higher average incomes in a nation are, the more likely is democratic government. Or, **the more economic freedom in a nation prevails, the less frequently it is involved in war. One characteristic of such propositions is that they say something about observable reality**. Whenever you say something about reality, you risk that others find out that you are wrong. If we observed that most poor countries were democracies, but most rich countries were autocracies, then we should reject or, at least, modify the proposition about prosperity and democracy mentioned above.1 **Nomothetic researchers look for refutations. They try to falsify their propositions or theories** (Popper 1934/1959). If the empirical evidence is compatible with one's theory, then one keeps the hypothetical propositions and regards them as supported – until negative evidence turns up. **Although certitude about possession of the truth is beyond the capabilities of human inquiry, growth of knowledge is conceivable by the successive elimination of errors**.¶ This epistemological approach borrowed from Popper were easily applicable, if most of our propositions were deterministic, if they claimed to be valid without exceptions. Then, finding a single exception to a general statement – say, about prosperity and democracy – would suffice to falsify the proposition. Looking at poor India nevertheless being democratic, or at fairly rich Kuwait nevertheless being autocratic, would suffice to reject the theory.2 Unfortunately, **almost no theory in macroeconomics, macrosociology, or international relations delivers deterministic propositions. Instead we have only probabilistic statements of the type that** more prosperous countries are more likely to be democratic than others, or that **economically freer countries are more likely to avoid war involvement than others**. **Probabilistic assertions never can be falsified by pointing to single events which do not fit with theoretical expectations. Instead we have to look at relative frequencies, at correlations or regression coefficients**. **We need statistical tools to evaluate such propositions**. We typically ask the question whether a hypothesized relationship is so strong that it could only rarely occur because of random measurement or sampling error. Probabilistic propositions are regarded as supported only if they jump certain thresholds of significance which are ultimately defined by mere conventions. Researchers are interested in causal propositions, that is, in statements about causes and effects, or determinants and consequences. Such statements can be used for explanation, forecasting, or policy interventions. We need to know more than the mere existence of some association or correlation between, say, prosperity and democracy, or economic freedom and the avoidance of military conflict. We need to know whether prosperity promotes democracy, or whether democracy promotes growth, or whether, possibly, both statements might be defensible or, for the time being, taken for 'true'.¶ While a correlation between two variables, like prosperity and democracy, is equally compatible with the simple alternative causal propositions that prosperity causes democracy, and that democracy causes prosperity, this ambiguity no longer necessarily applies in more complex theoretical models. There, we tend to explain a single effect by a number of causes. For example, one may contend that democracy is promoted by prosperity as well as by a capitalist economic order (or economic freedom). We can take such a theoretical contention – which may be true or false, compatible with the data or not – as a starting point for specifying a regression equation.3 If both theoretical statements – about the democratizing effects of prosperity and capitalism – were true, then the regression coefficients of both variables should be positive and significant. If this is what we find in empirical research, then we regard the two propositions as provisionally supported. But final proofs remain impossible in empirical research. It is conceivable that some nonbeliever in the two propositions suggests a third measurable determinant of democracy. Before it actually is included in the regression equation, one never knows what its inclusion results in. Possibly, the previously significant and positive regression coefficients of prosperity and capitalism might be reduced to insignificance or even change signs. Then a previously supported causal proposition would have to be overturned and rejected.¶ The claim of causality implies more than observable association or correlation. It also implies temporal precedence of causes before effects. If one wants to test the causal proposition that prosperity contributes to democratic government, or that economic freedom contributes to the avoidance of military conflict, then one should measure prosperity or economic freedom before their hypothesized effects occur – certainly not later. If there is doubt about the direction of causality, as there frequently is, one might also look at the relationships between, say, earlier prosperity and later democracy as well as between earlier democracy and later prosperity. Although such investigations may become technically complicated, it might suffice here to keep the general principles in mind. From causal propositions we derive expectations about correlation or regression coefficients. But conclusions from correlations to causal propositions are not justified. One simply can never 'verify' causal statements by correlations. From causal propositions we also derive expectations about temporal precedence. As long as empirical evidence fits one's theoretical expectations, one regards the propositions or theory as provisionally supported and works with them. There is another complication. As illustrated by the debate about the effects of trade and economic interdependence on the avoidance of military conflict below, full accordance of empirical studies and verdicts with theories is the exception rather than the rule – if it ever happens at all. That is why some philosophers of science (for example, Kuhn 1962; Lakatos 1968-69) have been critical of the idea of falsification and warned against premature rejection of propositions. If 'anomalies' or 'falsification' are more or less ubiquitous, then our task is no longer so easy as to choose between theories which have been falsified and therefore deserve rejection and those which are compatible with the facts and therefore deserve to be accepted until negative evidence turns up. Then our task becomes to choose between competing theories, for example about the conflict reinforcing or pacifying impact of trade, and to pick those which fit the data relatively better than others. So, **the claim advanced in this review of the literature cannot be that the empirical evidence fits the capitalist peace idea perfectly, but merely that the evidence fits [the capital peace idea] much better than competing explanations of military conflict and notions about the negative impact of capitalism on the avoidance of conflict and war or the irrelevance of democracy do**. The epistemological discussion above could provide no more than a crude 'feel' for empirical research in the social sciences and its pitfalls. **Although certitude is beyond reach, it is better to rely on testable, tested and so far supported propositions than on a hodgepodge of ambiguous hunches, contradictory thinking, and unsystematically evaluated empirical evidence**.

#### Cap key to space colonization – commercial exchanges promote development

Shakouri, 13 has an LL.M. in international law and is based in Tehran (Babak Shakouri “Space settlements on the Moon and elsewhere will create new legal issues” 4/1/13 <http://www.thespacereview.com/article/2269/1>) //NG

Once human settlements on nearby celestial bodies are established, their commercial exchanges with Earth will become an issue. Space migrants who choose to leave Earth and settle in an uncomfortable concrete or metal base on the Moon or Mars must have very strong incentives to step forth for such breathtaking adventure. There seems to be no greater reward than the lucrative economic opportunities found in a settlement on an alien surface full of potential resources.¶ The positive economic exchange rate with the Earth may assure the continuation and even expansion of space settlements on celestial bodies. Otherwise, settlers either will depend on equipment and reinforcements from Earth or go bankrupt. This may shed light on the importance of adopting suitable legal regime for human space settlements that, on one hand, fuels the needed investments for establishment of space settlements and, on the other hand, helps the efforts of inhabitants those settlements flourish economically and leads ultimately to their self-sufficiency.¶ There is sufficient evidence to suggest that the legal framework of a free market economic system incredibly suits the requirements of human settlements in space, since freedom of business and market innovation, together with recognition of private property, are the key elements in making the humans the first known spacefaring intelligent species.¶ Finally, the matter of the administrative legal regime of space settlements is another noteworthy issue to be considered. This matter, which is mainly categorized within the realm of administrative law, has attracted less attention in comparison with other legal aspects of outer space activities, but in no way should its importance and impact on future space settlement be disregarded.

#### Extinction – we have to go to space

Garan, 10 – Astronaut (Ron, 3/30/10, Speech published in an article by Nancy Atkinson, “The Importance of Returning to the Moon,” http://www.universetoday.com/61256/astronaut-explains-why-we-should-return-to-the-moon/)

Resources and Other Benefits: Since we live in a world of finite resources and the global population continues to grow, at some point the human race must utilize resources from space in order to survive. We are already constrained by our limited resources, and the decisions we make today will have a profound affect on the future of humanity. Using resources and energy from space will enable continued growth and the spread of prosperity to the developing world without destroying our planet. Our minimal investment in space exploration (less than 1 percent of the U.S. budget) reaps tremendous intangible benefits in almost every aspect of society, from technology development to high-tech jobs. When we reach the point of sustainable space operations we will be able to transform the world from a place where nations quarrel over scarce resources to one where the basic needs of all people are met and we unite in the common adventure of exploration. The first step is a sustainable permanent human lunar settlement.

#### The value of a life is subjective and personal – removing autonomy to do so TURNS value to life

Schwartz, et al 2002 (Lisa, Lecturer in Philosophy of Medicine, Department of General Practice, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK; Paul Preece, Theme Coordinator of Medical Ethics, Dundee Medical School, Ninewells, Dundee, UK; and Rob Hendry, Medical Advisor, Medical & Dental Defense Union of Scotland, Mackintosh House, Glasgow, UK, Medical Ethics: A Case-Based Approach, p. 112, November)

The second assertion made by supporters of the quality of life as a criterion for decisionmaking is closely related to the first, but with an added dimension. This assertion suggests that **the determination of the value of the quality of a given life is a subjective determination to be made by the person experiencing that life.** The important addition here is that the decision is a personal one that, ideally, ought not to be made externally by another person but internally by the individual involved. Katherine Lewis made this decision for herself based on a comparison between two stages of her life. So did James Brady. **Without this element, decisions based on quality of life criteria lack salient information** and the patients concerned cannot give informed consent. **Patients must be given the opportunity to decide for themselves whether they think their lives are worth living or not. To ignore or overlook patients’ judgement in this matter is to violate** their autonomy and **their freedom to decide for themselves on the basis of relevant information about their future**, and comparative consideration of their past**. As the deontological position puts it** so well**, to do so is to violate the imperative that we must treat persons as rational and as ends in themselves.**

#### Modern democratic structures check their impacts

**Dickinson ‘4** (Edward Ross Dickinson, professor of modern history, University of Cincinnati, “Biopolitics, Fascism, Democracy”, Central European History, 37(1), 2004, ejournals)

In short, the **continuities between early twentieth-century biopolitical discourse and the practices of the welfare state in our own time** are unmistakable. Both are instances of the "disciplinary society" and of biopolitical, regulatory, social-engineering modernity, and they share that genealogy with more authoritarian states, including the National Socialist state, but also fascist Italy, for example. And it is certainly fruitful to view them from this very broad perspective. But that analysis **can easily become superficial and misleading, because it obfuscates the profoundly different** strategic and local **dynamics of power in the two kinds of regimes**. **Clearly the democratic welfare state is not only formally but also substantively quite different from totalitarianism**. Above all, again, **it has nowhere developed the** fateful, **radicalizing dynamic** that characterized National Socialism (or for that matter Stalinism), the psychotic logic **that leads from economistic population management to mass murder**. Again, there is always the potential for such a discursive regime to generate coercive policies. In those cases in which the regime of rights does not successfully produce "health," such a system can -- and historically does -- create compulsory programs to enforce it. But again, **there are political and policy** potentials and **constraints** in such a structuring of biopolitics that are very different from those of National Socialist Germany. **Democratic biopolitical regimes require, enable, and incite a degree of** self-direction and **participation that is functionally incompatible with** authoritarian or **totalitarian structures**. And **this pursuit of biopolitical ends through** a regime of **democratic citizenship** **does appear, historically, to have imposed increasingly narrow limits on coercive policies**, and to have generated a "logic" or imperative of increasing liberalization. Despite limitations imposed by political context and the slow pace of discursive change, I think this is the unmistakable message of the really very impressive waves of legislative and welfare reforms in the 1920s or the 1970s in Germany.(n90) Of course it is not yet clear whether this is an irreversible dynamic of such systems. Nevertheless, such regimes are characterized by sufficient degrees of autonomy (and of the potential for its expansion) for sufficient numbers of people that I think it becomes useful to conceive of them as productive of a strategic configuration of power relations that might fruitfully be analyzed as a condition of "liberty," just as much as they are productive of constraint, oppression, or manipulation. At the very least, **totalitarianism cannot be the sole orientation point for our understanding of biopolitics**, the only end point of the logic of social engineering. This notion is not at all at odds with the core of Foucauldian (and Peukertian) theory. Democratic welfare states are regimes of power/knowledge no less than early twentieth-century totalitarian states; these systems are not "opposites," in the sense that they are two alternative ways of organizing the same thing. But they are two very different ways of organizing it. The concept "power" should not be read as a universal stifling night of oppression, manipulation, and entrapment, in which all political and social orders are grey, are essentially or effectively "the same." Power is a set of social relations, in which individuals and groups have varying degrees of autonomy and effective subjectivity. And discourse is, as Foucault argued, "tactically polyvalent." Discursive elements (like the various elements of biopolitics) can be combined in different ways to form parts of quite different strategies (like totalitarianism or the democratic welfare state); they cannot be assigned to one place in a structure, but rather circulate. The varying possible constellations of power in modern societies create "multiple modernities," modern societies with quite radically differing potentials.(n91)

### 2ac coercion

#### Violates the 5th Amendment

CCR 10 – Nonprofit Legal Advocacy Organization in New York. Dedicated to Protecting US constitutional and international human rights [Vincent Warren Executive Director of the Center for Constitutional Rights, Open Letter to President Obama regarding Travel to Cuba, 8/26/10, http://ccrjustice.org/files/Cuba\_Travel\_Letter\_to\_Obama\_82610.pdf]

The Supreme Court has recognized that the United States Constitution's substantive due process guarantees include a limitation on the government's ability to restrict travel. Among other things, the Fifth Amendment requires that any restriction on a citizen's right to travel must be justified by a government interest important enough to outweigh that right. In the past, the Court has sided with the U.S. government and upheld Cuba travel restrictions based on the government's argument that "interests of national security" outweighed any right to travel to the island. However, since reimposing the travel restrictions in 1982, the U.S. government has consistently claimed that the restrictions on travel [to Cuba]-related transactions are intended to cut off the flow of hard currency to Cuba. 1 Whether such a governmental interest could withstand constitutional challengeunder even rational review, given the clear infringement of U.S. citizens' right to international travel, is highly dubious- particularly when considered against the $600 million to $1 billion sent to Cuba in recent years in the form of permissible remittances.2 While we support the Administration's changes concerning remittances last year as a matter of principle and policy, the reality remains that a portion of that multi-million dollar export to the island nation inevitably returns to the Cuban state. Thus, to limit currency flows to Cuba by strictly limiting travel-related transactions remains irrational and unlikely to achieve even the averred goal of causing regime change within the country.

#### **Protecting rights comes first – undermining them leads to chaos and tyranny**

Petro 74 – (Sylvester, 1974, University of Toledo Law Review, pg 4801 FG)

However, one may still insist, echoing Ernest Hemingway - "I believe in only one thing: liberty." And it is always well to bear in mind David Hume's observation: "It is seldom that liberty of any kind is lost all at once." Thus, it is unacceptable to say that the invasion of one aspect of freedom is of no import because there have been invasions of so many other aspects. That road leads to chaos, tyranny, despotism, and the end of all human aspiration. Ask Solzhenitsyn. Ask Milovan Djilas. In sum, if one believes in freedom as a supreme value and the Proper ordering; principle for any society aiming to maximize spiritual and material welfare, then every invasion of freedom must be emphatically identified and resisted with undying spirit.

### 2ac iran politics

#### Sanctions are delayed until after the current round – solves their impact evidence, which is specific to an interim deal – but are inevitable afterwards despite PC – turns their uniqueness

Foster 11-20 (Peter Foster, The Telegraph, “Republicans defy Barack Obama to table new Iran sanctions,” 11-20-2013, http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/northamerica/usa/10461546/Republicans-defy-Barack-Obama-to-table-new-Iran-sanctions.html)

Six Republican senators last night tabled an amendment to introduce new economic sanctions on Iran, only hours after Barack Obama had personally appealed to the Senate not to make any moves that could derail nuclear talks in Geneva. ¶ The Republicans say the new sanctions would give vital leverage to US negotiators as they try to close a comprehensive agreement with Tehran to end the decade-long impasse over its nuclear programme. ¶ Negotiators from Iran and the P5+1 grouping of world powers are due to resume talks this morning to seal an interim, first-step deal that would partially freeze Iran's nuclear programme and create a six-month window to clinch a final agreement. ¶ A source close to the six Republican senators said the new sanctions amendment is not expected to be debated until after the Thanksgiving holiday which this year falls on November 28. ¶ This would give time for negotiators to seal a first-step deal in Geneva this week, but could have serious impacts in the coming months as Iran and the US wrangle over a final deal. ¶ Earlier this week an Iranian parliamentary committee warned that Tehran would "abandon" the talks if Congress imposed further sanctions. ¶ The amendment, proposed by the Illinois Senator Mark Kirk who has been a vociferous opponent of the White House negotiating stance, even accusing the White House of "appeasement", would put a stranglehold on Iran's remaining foreign exchange reserves. ¶ A source close to the proposal said the sanctions were designed to cut off access to Iran's estimated $70bn in foreign exchange reserves and establish a chokehold on Iran's economy that would be loosened only in exchange for concrete nuclear concessions. ¶ "Sanctions remain the best way to avoid war and prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapons capability," said Sen. Kirk, "This proposal will give our diplomats the increased leverage they need to get a good deal at the negotiating table a deal that peacefully brings Iran into full compliance with its international obligations. ¶ According to a draft of the amendment seen by The Daily Telegraph, the sanctions would target any bank or financial institution that allowed Iran access to its overseas assets except for the purchase of agricultural commodities, food and medicine. ¶ It also demands that Iran stop enriching uranium during any interim deal and adheres to UN Security Resolution 1929 that was passed in 2010 – the terms of which are far tougher than those expected to be agreed to in Geneva this week. ¶ In a letter circulated to colleagues last night by Sen Kirk and two co-sponsors, Sen, Marco Rubio and Sen. John Cornyn, they argued that the White House strategy with Iran was "well-intentioned but deeply naïve" and "doomed to fail". ¶ Mr Obama's approach, they added, would create "a dangerous world with Iranian nuclear weapons and more nuclear weapons proliferation as Iran's neighbors seek their own capabilities. ¶ Writing that the final language of the bill could be tailored "to the circumstances" of the day, the senators made the case for rewarding Iran only in direct exchange for concrete steps by Tehran on its nuclear programme. ¶ "We should move forward on a "freeze for freeze" basis - that is, we should freeze new sanctions (in this case, sanctions targeting Iranian overseas assets and access to insurance) when Iran freezes its nuclear program," they wrote. ¶ The White House has argued strongly against this approach, with Mr Obama spending two hours of Tuesday afternoon trying to persuade a group of senior Republican and Democrat senators of the merits of the deal being negotiated in Geneva. ¶ A statement from the White House said Mr Obama had argued that the proposed sanctions relief for Iran – estimated at $10-$20 billion – would be "limited, temporary, and reversible", denying reports that would receive $40 or $50 billion in relief as "inaccurate". ¶ "He indicated that new sanctions should not be enacted during the current negotiations, but that they would be most effective as a robust response should negotiations fail," the statement concluded. ¶ Although none of the senators who attended the White House meeting sponsored the sanctions amendment, The Daily Telegraph understands that several who did attend, including Sen John McCain and Sen Bob Menendez, wrote to Mr Obama advocating a "freeze for freeze approach". ¶ The letter of October 11 2013 urges offers to suspend the proposed new round of sanctions if Iran took confidence building measures including "full cooperation with the International Atomic Energy Agency, fulfillment of its responsibilities under the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, and implementation of all Resolutions passed by the United Nations Security Council regarding Iran's nuclear weapons program, to include immediate suspension of all enrichment activity." The letter hints at the depth of bipartisan support for new sanctions with one senior Republican senate aide saying that they were confident that new sanctions would pass, even if a 60-vote majority was required.

#### Filibuster reform thumps

Berger 11-22 (Judson Berger, “Filibuster Fallout: Reid maneuver could send ‘wrecking ball’ through talks on key legislation,” Fox News, 11-22-2013, http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2013/11/22/filibuster-fallout-reid-maneuver-could-send-wrecking-ball-through-talks-on-key/)

Democrats who claimed victory -- including President Obama -- in stripping the Senate minority of its power to block nominations may have done so at the sacrifice of the president's legislative agenda. ¶ Before Thursday, trust on Capitol Hill was frayed yet there was tentative hope following the bruising fight over the partial shutdown that Republicans and Democrats could find some spectrum of common ground for the rest of Obama's term. Maybe pass a few budgets, maybe do something lasting about that pesky deficit. ¶ But the move to use a rare parliamentary tactic and overhaul Senate procedure making it easier for the majority party to approve presidential nominees has poisoned an already tainted well. Any prospect for compromise on items ranging from immigration legislation to a fiscal deal to tax reform is now that much fainter. ¶ "There's no question that the move by Harry Reid will make it much tougher to get anything done between now and 2014," GOP strategist and former long-time Senate aide John Ullyot told FoxNews.com. ¶ "In the short-term, it's a wrecking ball through any efforts that were underway previously to have both parties work together on key bills." ¶ Because of the rule change, non-Supreme Court judicial nominees and executive-office nominees can now be approved with just 51 votes, as opposed to 60. ¶ In the first test of Senate relations following the filibuster change, Republicans united to block a critical defense policy bill. The bill failed in a vote late Thursday, nine votes short of the number needed to advance. ¶ Republicans were angry over Democrats' move to limit amendments, but the vote could also reflect new tensions over Reid deploying what's known as the "nuclear option." ¶ The Senate is now adjourning for the Thanksgiving break, and lawmakers will have time to stew over what just happened. ¶ The docket, though, is not getting any thinner. Under the terms of the budget resolution in late October, a bipartisan committee is supposed to be hammering out a new deal to keep the government operating into early 2014. The committee is charged with coming up with a plan by Dec. 13, and Congress is facing a January deadline to approve it. Plus they're facing a Feb. 7 deadline to raise the debt ceiling. ¶ Several lawmakers had already indicated there will be no "grand bargain" this time around, but now the question is whether lawmakers can avoid another partial shutdown.

#### Current fights over Cuba engagement and travel thump

Sullivan 13 (Mark P. Sullivan, Specialist in Latin American Affairs, Congressional Research Service, “Cuba: U.S. Policy and Issues for the 113th Congress,” CRS Report for Congress R43024, 6-12-2013, http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R43024.pdf)

Legislative Activity¶ Strong interest on Cuba is expected to continue in the 113th Congress with attention focused on¶ economic and political developments, especially the human rights situation, and U.S. policy¶ toward the island nation. The continued imprisonment of Alan Gross remains a key concern for¶ many Members. Now that Congress has completed action on FY2013 appropriations, it will soon¶ be considering the Administration’s FY2014 request for the State Department and Foreign¶ Operations, which includes funding for Cuba democracy programs and Cuba broadcasting. For¶ many years, U.S. sanctions, particularly restrictions on travel, remittances, and agricultural¶ exports to Cuba, have been topics of congressional debate, and this could be possible again in the¶ 113th Congress.¶ To date in the 113th Congress, eight initiatives on Cuba have been introduced. Several would lift¶ or ease U.S. economic sanctions on Cuba: H.R. 214 and H.R. 872 (overall embargo); H.R. 871¶ (travel); and H.R. 873 (travel and agricultural exports). H.R. 215 would allow Cubans to play¶ organized professional baseball in the United States. H.R. 1917, among its provisions, would lift¶ the embargo and extend nondiscriminatory trade treatment to the products of Cuba after Cuba¶ releases Alan Gross from prison. Identical initiatives, H.R. 778/S. 647 would modify a 1998¶ trademark sanction; in contrast, H.R. 214, H.R. 872, H.R. 873, and H.R. 1917 each have a¶ provision that would repeal the trademark sanction. H.Res. 121 would honor the work of Cuban¶ blogger Yoani Sánchez in challenging the oppression of the Castro regime. In addition, in March¶ 2013, Congress completed action on full-year FY2013 appropriations with the approval of H.R.¶ 933 (P.L. 113-6), which continues to provide funding for Cuba democracy and human rights¶ projects and Cuba broadcasting (Radio and TV Martí).

#### No congressional action means ZERO PC required – AND, secrecy shields blame

Pascual, et al 9 (Carlos Pascual, State Department Special Envoy and Coordinator for International Energy Affairs, former Ambassador to Mexico, former Vice President and Director of Foreign Policy, Brookings Institution, M.P.P Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, B.A. Stanford University; and Vicki Huddleston, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Africa, former Ambassador to Mali, former Principal Officer of the U.S. Interests Section in Havana (equivalent of Ambassador to a state with no official diplomatic relations), former Visiting Fellow, Brookings Institution; Co-Directors, Brookings Project on U.S. Policy Toward a Cuba in Transition, “CUBA: A New Policy of Critical and Constructive Engagement,” Report of the Brookings Project on U.S. Policy Toward a Cuba in Transition, April 2009, http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/reports/2009/4/cuba/0413\_cuba.pdf)

Given the strong sentiments and expectations¶ that Cuba engenders, it would be preferable for¶ the Executive Branch to proceed discreetly. The¶ president might first announce the principles he¶ hopes to achieve in Cuba through a policy of en¶ -¶ gagement that promotes human rights, the well-¶ being of the Cuban people, and the growth of¶ civil society. To carry out the president’s vision,¶ the Secretary of the Treasury will then have the¶ responsibility to write and publish the changes¶ to the Cuban Assets Control Regulations by li¶ -¶ censing activities designed to achieve these ends.¶ The Secretary of State can quietly accomplish¶ many diplomatic initiatives on a reciprocal basis¶ without any need to publicize them. This quiet¶ diplomacy might be complemented by a refusal¶ to engage in what some refer to as megaphone¶ diplomacy, in which our governments trade in¶ -¶ sults across the Straits of Florida, and which only¶ contributes to making the United States appear¶ to be a bully.¶ The president’s leadership in carrying out a new¶ Cuba policy is essential because by law and prac¶ -¶ tice it is his responsibility to determine the over¶ -¶ all conduct of U.S. foreign policy.¶ In the case of¶ Cuba, he has ample executive authority to put¶ in place a policy of engagement. If he wishes,¶ he can expand bilateral diplomatic relations, re¶ -¶ move Cuba from the list of terrorist countries,¶ and rescind the current policy that grants im¶ -¶ mediate legal residency to Cubans who enter the¶ United States without visas. Should bilateral re¶ -¶ lations improve, he could choose to negotiate the¶ unresolved expropriated property claims of U.S.¶ citizens and review the status of Guantanamo¶ Bay Naval Base. ¶ Despite the myth that Congress must legislate¶ to change U.S. policy toward Cuba, history has¶ shown that presidents routinely take actions to¶ strengthen or loosen the embargo as they see fit.¶ Thus, like his predecessors,¶ p¶ resident Obama can¶ change regulations in order to modify the Cuban¶ embargo without the need for an act of Congress.¶ He will, however, ultimately require Congress to¶ legislate in order to remove the embargo and lift¶ all restrictions on travel.

#### No link – *empirics* and *vote counts* prove plan has sufficient support

Moura 9 (Fabiola Moura, Bloomberg, “Overturning Cuba Travel Ban May Pass House This Year, Farr Says,” 9-21-2009, http://www.bloomberg.com/apps/news?pid=email\_en&sid=a5R62TiRNi00)

Legislation to end a ban on Americans traveling to Cuba has enough support in the U.S. House of Representatives to win approval by year-end, said Representative Sam Farr, a California Democrat. ¶ The bill to let U.S. citizens resume travel to the Caribbean island except in times of war or cases in which they face imminent danger has 181 votes in the House and needs 218 to pass, said Farr, a co-sponsor of the legislation. The plan is backed by travel groups such as the United States Tour Operators Association and the National Tour Association and human rights groups such as the Washington Office on Latin America and has been helped by President Barack Obama’s election, he said. ¶ “It is believed we can get to this before the end of the year,” Farr, 68, said in an interview in New York. “We haven’t had a policy about Cuba. We’ve had policies about getting votes in Florida and Obama changed that by getting those votes.” ¶ The U.S. ended restrictions on Sept. 3 on Cuban-Americans travel and money transfers to relatives in Cuba. The new rules also allow U.S. telecommunications companies to provide service in Cuba for mobile telephone, satellite radio and television. Exceptions to the 1962 trade embargo on communist Cuba include $500 million per year in agricultural exports, Farr said. ¶ “If you are a potato, you can get to Cuba very easily,” he said. “But if you are a person, you can’t, and that is our problem.” ¶ Pressure ¶ Obama is under pressure from Latin American leaders to end the trade embargo to help improve relations in the region. Brazilian President Luiz Inacio Lula da Silva will ask Obama to end the embargo during the United Nations General Assembly this week, spokesman Marcelo Baumbach said Sept. 17. ¶ Obama announced in April he would lift travel limits for Cuban-Americans visiting family in Cuba. At the same time, Representatives Lincoln Diaz-Balart and Mario Diaz-Balart, both Florida Republicans, issued a statement that the president had made “unilateral concessions to the dictatorship” that would “embolden it to further isolate, imprison and brutalize pro-democracy activists.” ¶ Cuba’s former President Fidel Castro, who handed power to his brother Raul Castro last year, called on Obama to completely lift the trade embargo. ¶ White House officials have said there are no plans to lift the embargo. At the same time, the administration is undertaking a full review of policy toward Cuba with the goal of advancing “the cause of freedom” in the country less than 100 miles (160 kilometers) from the coast of Florida, Daniel Restrepo, a special assistant to Obama, said in April. ¶ March Proposal ¶ A group of House and Senate lawmakers proposed in March ending restrictions to allow all U.S. citizens and residents to travel to Cuba. Farr said the legislation, known as the “Freedom to Travel to Cuba Act,” also has enough votes to clear the Senate, where Senator Byron Dorgan, a North Dakota Democrat, and Republican Senator Michael Enzi of Wyoming introduced the legislation. ¶ “There’s a lot more openness in the Congress,” Geoff Thale, program director in the Washington Office on Latin America, said in an interview in New York. “Support is building. The travel industry and business community are not just formally in support but actively engaged. That’s why I think we’re going to see a difference.” ¶ Senator Robert Menendez, a New Jersey Democrat who is of Cuban descent and sits on the Foreign Relations Committee, has vowed to fight the easing of travel restrictions. ¶ Philip Peters, a vice president and Cuba expert at the Lexington Institute, a public policy research group in Arlington, Virginia, said proponents of the bill may succeed in winning congressional approval as public opinion grows among Americans that U.S. rules on Cuba aren’t in line with much of the country’s foreign policy. ¶ ‘Good Shot’ ¶ “They’ve got a good shot,” Peters said in an interview. “Certainly right now they’re in striking distance and they’ve got plenty of time left in the session.” ¶ Ending the travel ban may lead as many as 1 million Americans to visit the island every year, Lisa Simon, president of the National Tour Association, known as NTA, said in an interview. It would also help push forward talks on human rights issues, Thale said. ¶ “We’ve had a policy for 50 years of isolating Cuba and it hasn’t done anything about the human rights situation,” Thale said. “I don’t think there is some magic solution. I don’t think ending the travel ban will cause Fidel to say let’s have elections, let’s release all the political prisoners tomorrow. What it will do is open the process of dialogue.” ¶ Obama’s administration has been showing a “gradual relaxation and diplomatic opening” toward Cuba, Thale said. He cited the government’s decision to reinitiate talks on migration and direct mail, and also to put down the billboard operated by the U.S. government outside its special interests section in Havana, which he said often displayed anti-Cuba messages.

#### Winners win – fractures the Republican Party

Dickerson 1/18 (John, Slate, Go for the Throat!, www.slate.com/articles/news\_and\_politics/politics/2013/01/barack\_obama\_s\_second\_inaugural\_address\_the\_president\_should\_declare\_war.single.html)

On Monday, President Obama will preside over the grand reopening of his administration. It would be altogether fitting if he stepped to the microphone, looked down the mall, and let out a sigh: so many people expecting so much from a government that appears capable of so little. A second inaugural suggests new beginnings, but this one is being bookended by dead-end debates. Gridlock over the fiscal cliff preceded it and gridlock over the debt limit, sequester, and budget will follow. After the election, the same people are in power in all the branches of government and they don't get along. There's no indication that the president's clashes with House Republicans will end soon. Inaugural speeches are supposed to be huge and stirring. Presidents haul our heroes onstage, from George Washington to Martin Luther King Jr. George W. Bush brought the Liberty Bell. They use history to make greatness and achievements seem like something you can just take down from the shelf. Americans are not stuck in the rut of the day. But this might be too much for Obama’s second inaugural address: After the last four years, how do you call the nation and its elected representatives to common action while standing on the steps of a building where collective action goes to die? That bipartisan bag of tricks has been tried and it didn’t work. People don’t believe it. Congress' approval rating is 14 percent, the lowest in history. In a December Gallup poll, 77 percent of those asked said the way Washington works is doing “serious harm” to the country. The challenge for President Obama’s speech is the challenge of his second term: how to be great when the environment stinks. Enhancing the president’s legacy requires something more than simply the clever application of predictable stratagems. Washington’s partisan rancor, the size of the problems facing government, and the limited amount of time before Obama is a lame duck all point to a single conclusion: The president who came into office speaking in lofty terms about bipartisanship and cooperation can only cement his legacy if he destroys the GOP. If he wants to transform American politics, he must go for the throat. President Obama could, of course, resign himself to tending to the achievements of his first term. He'd make sure health care reform is implemented, nurse the economy back to health, and put the military on a new footing after two wars. But he's more ambitious than that. He ran for president as a one-term senator with no executive experience. In his first term, he pushed for the biggest overhaul of health care possible because, as he told his aides, he wanted to make history. He may already have made it. There's no question that he is already a president of consequence. But there's no sign he's content to ride out the second half of the game in the Barcalounger. He is approaching gun control, climate change, and immigration with wide and excited eyes. He's not going for caretaker. How should the president proceed then, if he wants to be bold? The Barack Obama of the first administration might have approached the task by finding some Republicans to deal with and then start agreeing to some of their demands in hope that he would win some of their votes. It's the traditional approach. Perhaps he could add a good deal more schmoozing with lawmakers, too. That's the old way. He has abandoned that. He doesn't think it will work and he doesn't have the time. As Obama explained in his last press conference, he thinks the Republicans are dead set on opposing him. They cannot be unchained by schmoozing. Even if Obama were wrong about Republican intransigence, other constraints will limit the chance for cooperation. Republican lawmakers worried about primary challenges in 2014 are not going to be willing partners. He probably has at most 18 months before people start dropping the lame-duck label in close proximity to his name. Obama’s only remaining option is to pulverize. Whether he succeeds in passing legislation or not, given his ambitions, his goal should be to delegitimize his opponents. Through a series of clarifying fights over controversial issues, he can force Republicans to either side with their coalition's most extreme elements or cause a rift in the party that will leave it, at least temporarily, in disarray.

### 2ac commissions cp

#### Perm – do the counterplan – it’s not severance – it just clarifies the starting point of the commission

Poucke and Buelens 02 (Dirk van Poucke and Marc Buelens, Vlerick Leuven Gent Management School, Ghent University, “Predicting the outcome of a two-party price negotiation: Contribution of reservation price, aspiration price and opening offer,” Journal of Economic Psychology #23, 67-76)//RDa

Participants negotiate after reading their confidential instructions. Before negotiating, they determine privately and individually their intended opening offer, their aspiration and their reservation price. Reservation price is defined as the ‘limit’ (i.e., ‘‘the lowest/highest price you as a seller/buyer are ready to sell/buy’’). Aspiration price is defined as the ‘target’ (i.e., ‘‘the price you would like to obtain; your best price’’). Intended opening offer is defined as the asking price/first offer (‘‘the price you are going to ask/give at the start of the negotiation; the first price you are going to mention’’). It is important to note that opening offer is not the first price actually mentioned, but the intented opening offer.

#### Perm – do the plan and <<>> - solves political perception – the plan is covert (XA if read on politics)

Pascual, et al 9 (Carlos Pascual, State Department Special Envoy and Coordinator for International Energy Affairs, former Ambassador to Mexico, former Vice President and Director of Foreign Policy, Brookings Institution, M.P.P Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, B.A. Stanford University; and Vicki Huddleston, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Africa, former Ambassador to Mali, former Principal Officer of the U.S. Interests Section in Havana (equivalent of Ambassador to a state with no official diplomatic relations), former Visiting Fellow, Brookings Institution; Co-Directors, Brookings Project on U.S. Policy Toward a Cuba in Transition, “CUBA: A New Policy of Critical and Constructive Engagement,” Report of the Brookings Project on U.S. Policy Toward a Cuba in Transition, April 2009, http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/reports/2009/4/cuba/0413\_cuba.pdf)

Given the strong sentiments and expectations¶ that Cuba engenders, it would be preferable for¶ the Executive Branch to proceed discreetly. The¶ president might first announce the principles he¶ hopes to achieve in Cuba through a policy of en¶ -¶ gagement that promotes human rights, the well-¶ being of the Cuban people, and the growth of¶ civil society. To carry out the president’s vision,¶ the Secretary of the Treasury will then have the¶ responsibility to write and publish the changes¶ to the Cuban Assets Control Regulations by li¶ -¶ censing activities designed to achieve these ends.¶ The Secretary of State can quietly accomplish¶ many diplomatic initiatives on a reciprocal basis¶ without any need to publicize them. This quiet¶ diplomacy might be complemented by a refusal¶ to engage in what some refer to as megaphone¶ diplomacy, in which our governments trade in¶ -¶ sults across the Straits of Florida, and which only¶ contributes to making the United States appear¶ to be a bully.¶ The president’s leadership in carrying out a new¶ Cuba policy is essential because by law and prac¶ -¶ tice it is his responsibility to determine the over¶ -¶ all conduct of U.S. foreign policy.¶ In the case of¶ Cuba, he has ample executive authority to put¶ in place a policy of engagement. If he wishes,¶ he can expand bilateral diplomatic relations, re¶ -¶ move Cuba from the list of terrorist countries,¶ and rescind the current policy that grants im¶ -¶ mediate legal residency to Cubans who enter the¶ United States without visas. Should bilateral re¶ -¶ lations improve, he could choose to negotiate the¶ unresolved expropriated property claims of U.S.¶ citizens and review the status of Guantanamo¶ Bay Naval Base. ¶ Despite the myth that Congress must legislate¶ to change U.S. policy toward Cuba, history has¶ shown that presidents routinely take actions to¶ strengthen or loosen the embargo as they see fit.¶ Thus, like his predecessors,¶ p¶ resident Obama can¶ change regulations in order to modify the Cuban¶ embargo without the need for an act of Congress.¶ He will, however, ultimately require Congress to¶ legislate in order to remove the embargo and lift¶ all restrictions on travel.

#### Links to politics – gets associated with prominent members

Straus and Glassman 13 (Matthew Eric Glassman, Analyst on the Congress, Jacob R. Straus, Analyst on the Congress, “Congressional Commissions: Overview, Structure, and Legislative Considerations,” January 22, 2013, CRS Reports, http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R40076.pdf)

By establishing a commission, Congress can often provide a highly visible forum for important issues that might otherwise receive scant attention from the public.38 Commissions often are composed of notable public figures, allowing personal prestige to be transferred to policy solutions.39 Meetings and press releases from a commission may receive significantly more attention in the media than corresponding information coming directly from members of congressional committees. Upon completion of a commission’s work product, public attention may be temporarily focused on a topic that otherwise would receive scant attention, thus increasing the probability of congressional action within the policy area.

#### Turns OFAC enforcement – Congressional interference

Ellen Creager¶ Detroit Free Press travel writer Michigan State University¶ BA, Journalism 8-24-2012 “Cuba US People to People Partnership”¶ <http://cubapeopletopeople.blogspot.com/2012/08/people-to-people-in-bureaucratic-danger.html>

Why it is happening, nobody is sure. But the Cuba "People to People" travel program touted so highly by President Obama in 2011 is coming to a screeching halt, drowning in paperwork and non-renewed licenses for travel organizations. ¶ Almost no organizations that got licenses from the U.S. Treasury Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC) last year to sponsor trips to Cuba have received renewals. Trips that were advertised have been scrapped. Organizations are left to wait without any updates or information.¶ “We work with about 30 different non-profit organizations that have programs to Cuba in next 12 months, and 100% of them have not received renewals of licenses,” said Jim Friedlander, president of Academic Arrangements Abroad in New York, a travel service provider, late Tuesday. ¶ He said that the practical effect of OFAC’s lack of activity is that it disrupts the entire People to People program. ¶ To me, this is contrary to the whole purpose of the president's 2011 loosening of travel for Americans to Cuba.¶ Because of the outdated U.S. embargo against Cuba that makes it illegal for Americans to travel there, most Americans have never been to Cuba unless on a family or religious visa. The People to People cultural travel program finally allowed thousands of regular travelers to visit last year and early this year, interacting with Cubans in a meaningful way.¶ But in May, the OFAC application for a license to operate trips to Cuba under People to People grew from 6 pages to essentially hundreds of pages. Organizations seeking renewal had to document every minute of every day for every single trip they had done in the past year to prove that they were doing “People to People” activities and not tourism.¶ Then, most of them heard nothing. Weeks and months passed. Licenses lapsed. Since OFAC is notoriously closed-mouth about its work and does not make public its list of licences, applicants have been able to get little information. But gradually they realized they were all in the same predicament.¶ The U.S. Treasury press office on Tuesday did email me a comment from Jeff Braunger, program manager for Cuba Travel Licensing: “We have issued approximately 140 people-to-people licenses. We are doing our best to process both first-time applications and requests to renew existing licenses. We receive numerous such requests which are being handled in turn. It is our goal to respond in a timely matter.’’ ¶ I think this is approximately one paragraph more information than all the organizations waiting for their renewals have gotten from his office.¶ The thing that alarms me most is that the groups I’ve talked to seem intimidated and scared. They are afraid of going public with their concern, worried that if they seem to be complaining about months of delays that have caused them to cancel trips, lose money and lay off staff, that OFAC will punish them by stowing their application on the bottom of a giant pile.¶ I don’t think that’s true, but the very fact that companies are so skittish concerns me greatly. These are not fly-by-night groups. Typical groups that have -- or had -- Cuba “People to People” licenses include Harvard Alumni, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, National Geographic, Insight Cuba and the National Trust for Historic Preservation, all reputable groups that ran ethical and very good culturally-rich trips.¶ Now, a look at their websites tells the story. Harvard has one trip planned for Dec. 27 but with this caveat: “Pending ‘People to People” license renewal.” The Met wiped Cuba off its itinerary for now. National Geographic, which has run 29 trips taking 703 people total in the past year, is taking only preliminary waiting-list reservations for fall trips with no deposit. (A deposit, according to OFAC rules, is engaging in financial transaction with Cuba and illegal if you have no license) Insight Cuba has suspended all trips for the past two months and is on hold, waiting for its renewal that expired in June. National Trust has 4 Cuba trips still on its 2012 itinerary, but with an asterisk: "Pending People to People License Renewal." ¶ Whether you are pro-Cuba travel or anti-Cuba travel, this whole thing should concern you a lot. There is something sinister to me about preventing citizens from traveling, then allowing them to do so, then throwing giant roadblocks to prevent them from going after all. ¶ So why is it happening?¶ It could be election year politics, with OFAC personnel covering their bases in case Democrats are out in November and Republicans take over.¶ It could be undue influence from the small but mighty faction of anti-Cuba types in Congress.¶ It could be the White House consciously deciding to slow down the program for political reasons in exchange for something it wants from Cuba.¶ Or it could just be bureaucratic overload, with hapless workers struggling under an avalanche of paperwork it thought it needed and no deadline, and meanwhile these worthy groups that have done so much work to run People to People trips to Cuba lose money, customers and confidence in their government.

#### Obama cred is *low* because of failure to make *unilateral* engagement decisions

Luxner 13 (Larry Luxner, citing Zbigniew Brzezinski, Senior Advisor to President Barack Obama on matters of National Security and Foreign Policy, former National Security Advisor to President Jimmy Carter, Senior Research Professor of International Relations, School of Advanced International Studies, Johns Hopkins University, Counselor, Trustee and Co-Chair of the Advisory Board, Center for Strategic and International Studies, member of the International Advisory Board, Atlantic Council, “Brzezinski: Obama Must ‘Regain’ Lost Ground in Foreign Policy,” Washington Diplomat, 1-31-2013, http://www.washdiplomat.com/index.php?option=com\_content&view=article&id=8841&Itemid=414)

Two days after the election that returned President Barack Obama to the White House for a second term, one of America's best-known former diplomats offered his take on the world — and the audience found his observations just as relevant as they were three decades ago.¶ Zbigniew Brzezinski, national security advisor under President Jimmy Carter from 1977 to 1981, didn't mince words when it came to Obama. "He has to undo the excessive reliance on speeches as he acts on the world scene — that is to say, the apparent assumption that a powerful speech on this or that subject is the same as effecting change," Brzezinski said. "The speeches all promised a great deal, but a great deal did not transpire. There was some marginal progress here and there, but by and large, his speeches remain speeches."¶ The Polish-American diplomat, 84, gave his own speech Nov. 8 at the Aspen Institute's Ambassadors' Security Roundtable luncheon at the Four Seasons hotel; moderating the discussion was CNN's Washington-based foreign affairs correspondent Jill Dougherty. In attendance were some 75 guests, including ambassadors representing a range of countries from Afghanistan to Zambia, as well as lobbyists, consultants and various State Department officials.¶ The event was part of the recent launch of the Ambassadors' Security Roundtable, a quarterly convening of ambassadors from around the world to promote greater international cooperation in the critical realm of security. The luncheon followed an off-the-record gathering of European envoys at the Aspen Institute's Wye River campus on Maryland's Eastern Shore in October.¶ Brzezinski, whom Dougherty introduced as a "living legend," said that in 2008, "at a lunch of this sort," he spoke of how impressed he was with the president-elect's "knowledge and understanding of the basic dynamics of this era."¶ Four years later, Brzezinski argued that Obama must reassert his credibility on the world stage through serious commitment and decisive action that will shape both his legacy and the country's trajectory.¶ "The management of our foreign policy and the protection of our national security are interwoven, and the president has no peer," Brzezinski said. "Congress is not a partner in the shaping of foreign policy. That is the special domain of the president, and he has to regain that territory."¶ It's territory Brzezinski has traversed for decades. During his time as Carter's national security advisor, Brzezinski oversaw the normalization of U.S. relations with China, the overthrow of the Shah in Iran, the rise of mujahideen fighters in Afghanistan, the growth of dissent in Soviet-influenced Eastern Europe, the signing of a treaty to relinquish U.S. control over the Panama Canal, and the brokering of the Camp David peace accords between Egypt and Israel.¶ The chairman of countless commissions, task forces and councils, Brzezinski has been in the foreign policy trenches since the 1960s. The elder statesman remains active today, teaching at universities such as Harvard, Columbia and Johns Hopkins and writing numerous widely regarded books, including his most recent: "Strategic Vision: America and the Crisis of Global Power."¶ In the 2012 book, Brzezinski argues that U.S. policymakers need to rethink the country's place in an interdependent world where America is no longer the sole superpower — adapting to shifting geopolitics while reasserting American influence in order to preserve global stability.¶ "Indeed, the ongoing changes in the distribution of global power and mounting global strife make it all the more imperative that America not retreat into an ignorant garrison-state mentality or wallow in self-righteous cultural hedonism. Such an America could cause the geopolitical prospects of an evolving world — in which the center of gravity is shifting from West to East — to become increasingly grave," he writes. "The world needs an America that is economically vital, socially appealing, responsibly powerful, strategically deliberate, internationally respected, and historically enlightened in its global engagement with the new East."

#### *Turns and Outweighs the Net Benefit* – means US influence *backfires* – and triggers *economic instability* AND multiple scenarios for *global conflict*

SCMP 2K (South China Morning Post, “Position of Weakness” December 11, 2000, Lexis Nexis)

A weak president with an unclear mandate is bad news for the rest of the world. For better or worse, the person who rules the United States influences events far beyond the shores of his own country. Both the global economy and international politics will feel the effect of political instability in the US. The first impact will be on American financial markets, which will have a ripple effect on markets and growth across the world. A weakened US presidency will also be felt in global hotspots across the world. The Middle East, the conflict between India and Pakistan, peace on the Korean peninsula, and even the way relations between China and Taiwan play out, will be influenced by the authority the next US president brings to his job. There are those who would welcome a weakening of US global influence. Many Palestinians, for example, feel they would benefit from a less interventionist American policy in the Middle East. Even within the Western alliance, there are those who would probably see opportunities in a weakened US presidency. France, for example, might feel that a less assertive US might force the European Union to be more outward looking. But the dangers of having a weak, insecure US presidency outweigh any benefits that it might bring. US global economic and military power cannot be wished away. A president with a shaky mandate will still command great power and influence, only he will be constrained by his domestic weakness and less certain about how to use his authority. This brings with it the risks of miscalculation and the use of US power in a way that heightens conflict. There are very few conflicts in the world today which can be solved without US influence. The rest of the world needs the United States to use its power deftly and decisively.
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#### Reps don’t come first – can’t explain empirics and produces un-actionable heuristics

Rodwell 5 (Jonathan Rodwell, Ph.D. from Manchester, “Trendy But Empty: A Response to Richard Jackson,” http://www.49thparallel.bham.ac.uk/back/issue15/rodwell1.htm)

In this response I wish to argue that the Post-Structural analysis put forward by Richard Jackson is inadequate when trying to understand American Politics and Foreign Policy. The key point is that this is an issue of methodology and theory. I do not wish to argue that language is not important, in the current political scene (or indeed any political era) that would be unrealistic. One cannot help but be convinced that the creation of identity, of defining ones self (or one nation, or societies self) in opposition to an ‘other’ does indeed take place. Masses of written and aural evidence collated by Jackson clearly demonstrates that there is a discursive pattern surrounding post 9/11 U.S. politics and society. [i] Moreover as expressed at the start of this paper it is a political pattern and logic that this language is useful for politicians, especially when able to marginalise other perspectives. Nothing illustrates this clearer than the fact George W. Bush won re-election, for whatever the reasons he did win, it is undeniable that at the very least the war in Iraq, though arguable far from a success, at the absolute minimum did not damage his campaign. Additionally it is surely not stretching credibility to argue Bush performance and rhetoric during the immediate aftermath of the 9/11 attacks also strengthened his position. However, having said that, the problem is Jackson’s own theoretical underpinning, his own justification for the importance of language. If he was merely proposing that the understanding of language as one of many causal factors is important that would be fine. But he is not. The epistemological and theoretical framework of his argument means the ONLY thing we should look at is language and this is the problem.[ii] Rather than being a fairly simple, but nonetheless valid, argument, because of the theoretical justification it actually becomes an almost nonsensical. My response is roughly laid out in four parts. Firstly I will argue that such methodology, in isolation, is fundamentally reductionist with a theoretical underpinning that does not conceal this simplicity. Secondly, that a strict use of post-structural discourse analysis results in an epistemological cul-de-sac in which the writer cannot actually say anything. Moreover the reader has no reason to accept anything that has been written. The result is at best an explanation that remains as equally valid as any other possible interpretation and at worse a work that retains no critical force whatsoever. Thirdly, possible arguments in response to this charge; that such approaches provide a more acceptable explanation than others are, in effect, both a tacit acceptance of the poverty of force within the approach and of the complete lack of understanding of the identifiable effects of the real world around us; thus highlighting the contradictions within post-structural claims to be moving beyond traditional causality, re-affirming that rather than pursuing a post-structural approach we should continue to employ the traditional methodologies within History, Politics and International Relations. Finally as a consequence of these limitations I will argue that the post-structural call for ‘intertextuals’ must be practiced rather than merely preached and that an understanding and utilisation of all possible theoretical approaches must be maintained if academic writing is to remain useful rather than self-contained and narrative. Ultimately I conclude that whilst undeniably of some value post-structural approaches are at best a footnote in our understanding . The first major problem then is that historiographically discourse analysis is so capacious as to be largely of little use. The process of inscription identity, of discourse development is not given any political or historical context, it is argued that it just works, is simply a universal phenomenon. It is history that explains everything and therefore actually explains nothing. To be specific if the U.S. and every other nation is continually reproducing identities through ‘othering’ it is a constant and universal phenomenon that fails to help us understand at all why one result of the othering turned out one way and differently at another time. For example, how could one explain how the process resulted in the 2003 invasion of Iraq but [did not] produce a similar invasion of Afghanistan in 1979 when that country (and by the logic of the Regan administrations discourse) the West was threatened by the ‘Evil Empire’. By the logical of discourse analysis in both cases these policies were the result of politicians being able to discipline and control the political agenda to produce the outcomes. So why were the outcomes not the same? To reiterate the point how do we explain that the language of the War on Terror actually managed to result in the eventual Afghan invasion in 2002? Surely it is impossible to explain how George W. Bush was able to convince his people (and incidentally the U.N and Nato) to support a war in Afghanistan without referring to a simple fact outside of the discourse; the fact that a known terrorist in Afghanistan actually admitted to the murder of thousands of people on the 11h of Sepetember 2001. The point is that if the discursive ‘othering’ of an ‘alien’ people or group is what really gave the U.S. the opportunity to persue the war in Afghanistan one must surly wonder why Afghanistan. Why not North Korea? Or Scotland? If the discourse is so powerfully useful in it’s own right why could it not have happened anywhere at any time and more often? Why could the British government not have been able to justify an armed invasion and regime change in Northern Ireland throughout the terrorist violence of the 1980’s? Surely they could have just employed the same discursive trickery as George W. Bush? Jackson is absolutely right when he points out that the actuall threat posed by Afghanistan or Iraq today may have been thoroughly misguided and conflated and that there must be more to explain why those wars were enacted at that time. Unfortunately that explanation cannot simply come from the result of inscripting identity and discourse. On top of this there is the clear problem that the consequences of the discursive othering are not necessarily what Jackson would seem to identify. This is a problem consistent through David Campbell’s original work on which Jackson’s approach is based[iii]. David Campbell argued for a linguistic process that ‘always results in an other being marginalized’ or has the potential for ‘demonisation’[iv]. At the same time Jackson, building upon this, maintains without qualification that the systematic and institutionalised abuse of Iraqi prisoners first exposed in April 2004 “is a direct consequence of the language used by senior administration officials: conceiving of terrorist suspects as ‘evil’, ‘inhuman’ and ‘faceless enemies of freedom creates an atmosphere where abuses become normalised and tolerated”[v]. The only problem is that the process of differentiation does not actually necessarily produce dislike or antagonism. In the 1940’s and 50’s even subjected to the language of the ‘Red Scare’ it’s obvious not all Americans came to see the Soviets as an ‘other’ of their nightmares. And in Iraq the abuses of Iraqi prisoners are isolated cases, it is not the case that the U.S. militarily summarily abuses prisoners as a result of language. Surely the massive protest against the war, even in the U.S. itself, is also a self evident example that the language of ‘evil’ and ‘inhumanity’ does not necessarily produce an outcome that marginalises or demonises an ‘other’. Indeed one of the points of discourse is that we are continually differentiating ourselves from all others around us without this necessarily leading us to hate fear or abuse anyone.[vi] Consequently, the clear fear of the Soviet Union during the height of the Cold War, and the abuses at Abu Ghirab are unusual cases. To understand what is going on we must ask how far can the process of inscripting identity really go towards explaining them? As a result at best all discourse analysis provides us with is a set of universals and a heuristic model.

### 1ar a2 root cause

#### Cap’s not a root cause

Larrivee 10 (PF ECONOMICS AT MOUNT ST MARY’S UNIVERSITY – MASTERS FROM THE HARVARD KENNEDY SCHOOL AND PHD IN ECONOMICS FROM WISCONSIN, 10 [JOHN, A FRAMEWORK FOR THE MORAL ANALYSIS OF MARKETS, 10/1, <http://www.teacheconomicfreedom.org/files/larrivee-paper-1.pdf>])

The Second Focal Point: Moral, Social, and Cultural Issues of Capitalism Logical errors abound in critical commentary on capitalism. Some critics observe a problem and conclude: “I see X in our society. We have a capitalist economy. Therefore capitalism causes X.” They draw their conclusion by looking at a phenomenon as it appears only in one system. Others merely follow a host of popular theories according to which capitalism is particularly bad. 6 The solution to such flawed reasoning is to be comprehensive, to look at the good and bad, in market and non-market systems. Thus the following section considers a number of issues—greed, selfishness and human relationships, honesty and truth, alienation and work satisfaction, moral decay, and religious participation—that have often been associated with capitalism, but have also been problematic in other systems and usually in more extreme form. I conclude with some evidence for the view that markets foster (at least some) virtues rather than undermining them. My purpose is not to smear communism or to make the simplistic argument that “capitalism isn’t so bad because other systems have problems too.” The critical point is that certain people thought various social ills resulted from capitalism, and on this basis they took action to establish alternative economic systems to solve the problems they had identified. That they failed to solve the problems, and in fact exacerbated them while also creating new problems, implies that capitalism itself wasn’t the cause of the problems in the first place, at least not to the degree theorized.

## CP

### 1ar perm do cp

#### A2 should = immediate

Dictionary.com – Copyright © 2010 – http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/should

should    /ʃʊd/ Show Spelled[shood] Show IPA –auxiliary verb 1. pt. of shall. 2. (used to express condition): Were he to arrive, I should be pleased. 3. must; ought (used to indicate duty, propriety, or expediency): You should not do that. 4. would (used to make a statement less direct or blunt): I should think you would apologize. Use should in a Sentence See images of should Search should on the Web Origin: ME sholde, OE sc ( e ) olde; see shall —Can be confused:  could, should, would (see usage note at this entry ). —Synonyms 3. See must1 . —Usage note Rules similar to those for choosing between shall and will have long been advanced for should and would, but again the rules have had little effect on usage. In most constructions, would is the auxiliary chosen regardless of the person of the subject: If our allies would support the move, we would abandon any claim to sovereignty. You would be surprised at the complexity of the directions. Because the main function of should in modern American English is to express duty, necessity, etc. ( You should get your flu shot before winter comes ), its use for other purposes, as to form a subjunctive, can produce ambiguity, at least initially: I should get my flu shot if I were you. Furthermore, should seems an affectation to many Americans when used in certain constructions quite common in British English: Had I been informed, I should (American would ) have called immediately. I should (American would ) really prefer a different arrangement. As with shall and will, most educated native speakers of American English do not follow the textbook rule in making a choice between should and would. See also shall. Shall –auxiliary verb, present singular 1st person shall, 2nd shall or ( Archaic ) shalt, 3rd shall, present plural shall; past singular 1st person should, 2nd should or ( Archaic ) shouldst or should·est, 3rd should, past plural should; imperative, infinitive, and participles lacking. 1. plan to, ***intend*** to, or expect to: I shall go later.

### 1ar xo shield

### 1ar n/l – exec shield

#### Megotiations allow the president to claim credit or shift the blame *claim credit* but *shift blame* – leaks and backlash are only possible if he does so inentionally

Moravcsik 94 (Andrew Moravcsik, Department of Government, Harvard University, “Why the European Union Strengthens the State: Domestic Politics and International Cooperation,” Center for European Studies, Harvard University, Working Paper Series #52, paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, 9-1-1994, http://www.princeton.edu/~amoravcs/library/strengthen.pdf)

A third way in which international cooperation can strengthen executives is by creating ¶ domestic informational asymmetries in their favor. The provision of information is a vital element ¶ in modern theories of international cooperation. Functional theories of regimes instruct us that ¶ international institutions, whether formal or informal, enhance transgovernmental information ¶ flows by providing fora for regularized exchange of information and by establishing secretariats ¶ that coordinate its production. International negotiations serve the same function.22 International ¶ negotiations and institutions afford governments privileged access to two types of information. ¶ The first is technical information about the consequences of alternative policies. Without the ¶ exchange and generation of information induced by international negotiations and regimes, ¶ governments might remain ignorant of policy problems and their potential solutions. The second ¶ is information about the liti constraints imposed by the preferences and power of other ¶ governments or supranational actors. International bargaining and ongoing participation in ¶ regimes provide governments with precise information about the preferences and power of ¶ foreign governments, the range of possible bargains, and the institutional limitations on national ¶ policy. ¶ The assumption of a unitary rational state, which underlies not only functional regime ¶ theory but also most theories of negotiation, tends to obscure the fact that the information generated by international negotiations and institutions is often asymmetrically distributed, favoring ¶ those domestic actors, most notably executives, who participate directly. Privileged access to a ¶ steady stream of reliable technical and political information as a side-effect of normal diplomatic ¶ activities increases the domestic influence of executives. Opposition groups, by contrast, must ¶ often incur high costs to collect and analyze such information. Executives may be better able to ¶ hide both their actions and the information necessary to assess those actions properly, thereby ¶ introducing greater slack in the domestic principal-agent relationship. ¶ Informational asymmetries increase the fixed costs of effective opposition and create ¶ opportunities and incentives for executives to manipulate domestic perceptions. Opposition¶ groups may find it particularly costly to distinguish viable alternatives, convince potential supporters of their desirability, bargain internationally over new terms, and draft precise legal language. Moreover, the greater the informational asymmetry between governments and potential ¶ domestic opponents, the greater the opportunity for governments to manipulate or mobilize elite ¶ or public opinion by selectively releasing vital information.¶ Three aspects of the domestic perception of international agreements are critical in ¶ determining the costs of opposition to executive preferences: their salience, consequences and ¶ causality. The simplest form of executive control involves manipulation of the salience of an ¶ issue. Executives can depoliticize issues by keeping citizens ignorant or mobilize groups through ¶ publicity.23 Groups that are favorable to the executive's position are informed of forthcoming ¶ moves early; opponents hear at the last minute.24 By manipulating information about the technical ¶ and political consequences of an agreement, executives may reshape domestic consensus. By ¶ releasing such information selectively, governments mobilize bias, influencing the coalitions that ¶ form around issues. Controversial elements of agreements may be left vague, while popular ¶ elements are elaborated in detail. Perhaps the most important category is causality. By shifting ¶ domestic perceptions about the technical and political constraints under which states act, ¶ executives shift domestic expectations about responsibility for and alternatives to government policy. ¶ By manipulating the perception that a policy is "necessary," executives can shift blame and credit. Credit ¶ claiming, the practice of alleging responsibility for outcomes beyond the executive's control, is common. ¶ Equally common is the practice of blaming unpopular policies on international constraints, whether real or ¶ imaginary: the intransigence of certain other governments, the vagaries of majority voting, the nature of ¶ institutional rules, ambitious supranational executives, international economic constraints.25