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### Neolib

#### Movements against neoliberalism are growing in Latin America and spill over -- the plans reifies neoliberalism --- ethics require we de-link to preserve the environment and indigenous culture.

Harris 8 (Richard L Harris: Professor of Global Studies at California State University, Monterey Bay; Managing Editor of the Journal of Developing Societies (SAGE India); and Coordi­ nating Editor of Latin American Perspectives (SAGE USA). “Latin America’s Response to Neoliberalism and Globalization,” http://www.nuso.org/upload/articulos/3506\_2.pdf)

The economic, political and social development of the Latin American and Caribbean countries is obstructed by the power relations and international structures that regulate the world capitalist system. The structures of this system provide a hierarchical political and economic exoskeleton that constrains all national efforts to pursue any significant degree of self-directed, inward-oriented, balanced and environmentally sustainable development. Indeed, the geopolitical power structures that preserve and support the world capitalist system have made it almost impossible for the governments of the core as well as the peripheral countries in this system to pursue a path of inward-oriented, equitable, democratically controlled and environmentally sustainable development (Amin 2001b:20). Since the 1980s, inter-American relations and the economic, political and social development of the Latin American and Caribbean states have been shaped by these geo­ political structures and the neoliberal strategic agenda put forward by the government of the United States of America (USA), the major transnational corporations and the three major international financial institutions (IFIs) that operate in the Latin American and Caribbean region (Harris and Nef, 2008). This later group of IFIs includes the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank, and the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB). The policies of these IFIs based in Washington generally follow the dictates of the government of the USA due to the controlling influence that it exercises over these institutions. Their agenda for the Latin American and Caribbean region gives priority to promoting and protecting the interests of the major investors and transnational corporations that are largely based in the USA and operate in the region. It also serves to maintain and strengthen the geopolitical hegemony of the USA over the Western Hemisphere (Harris and Nef). But conditions are changing. Washington’s neoliberal agenda for controlling the capi­ talist development of the Western Hemisphere and maintaining US hegemony over the region is increasingly threatened by a progressive alternative agenda for the regio­ nal integration of the Latin American and Caribbean countries that has begun to gain widespread support in the region. This alternative agenda for the region calls for the autonomous economic development of the region free of the hegemonic control and influence of the USA and the IFIs based in Washington. Not only does this type of development pose a fundamental threat to the hegemony of the USA in the region, it threatens the dominance of transnational capital throughout the Americas. Moreover, it also poses a significant threat to the global expansion and integration of the world capitalist system in general and to the global hegemonic coalition led by the government and transnational corporations of the USA. Today, political and economic strategies are being developed for moving from the prevailing export-oriented neoliberal model of economic development to new in­ ward-oriented models of sustainable development, tailored to the diverse conditions, economic capacities, political structures, natural endowments and cultural values of the societies involved. Moreover, a growing number of international and regional civil society organizations have emerged in recent years to create such alternatives. What the forums, networks, programs, and activities of these various types of organizations reveal is that there is a growing international network of organizations and social movements committed to promoting new, more equitable forms of international cooperation and regulation that support inward-oriented and sustainable development as well as genuine democracy at the regional and national levels. At the same time, these organizations argue that the present global trading regime that has been erected under the WTO should and can be replaced by a new global trading system that replaces the present system of so-called free but in fact unfair trade, with a sys­ tem that ensures «fair trade» and promotes South-South economic exchange and coo­ peration. Most of the progressive alternatives advocated by these organizations and the new left-leaning governments that have been elected to office in the region give priority to aligning the external relations of the countries in the region to the internal needs of the majority of the population. That is to say, decisions about what to export and what to import should be aligned with the needs of the population rather than the interests of transnational capitalists and transnational corporations or the hegemonic interests of the USA. Some of these alternative strategies involve what Walden Bello (2002) has referred to as «deglobalization.» That is to say, they involve unlinking the economies of these peripheral capitalist societies from the advanced capitalist centers of the world economy, particularly in the USA. They also involve throwing off the constraints that have been imposed upon the economic policies and structures of the­ se countries by the IFIs (IMF, World Bank, and IDB), the WTO and the other agents and regulatory regimes that regulate the world capitalist system. In fact, there appears to be growing interest throughout Latin America in revivifying the Pan-American ideal of unification, currently perhaps best expressed in Hugo Chávez’ Bolivarian dream of turning South America into a regional economic hegemon (DeLong, 2005). The governments of Bolivia, Cuba, Ecuador, Nicaragua and Uruguay have indicated they want to join the government of Venezuela in creating a regional union. It has been proposed that this coalescing continental confederation should shift the region’s extra-continental trade towards Europe, Asia and South Africa and away from North America. The prospect of this happening appears to have alarmed Washington more than the increasing number of electoral triumphs of leftist politicians in the region (Delong). There has also been considerable talk in the region about creating a single currency for the South American countries that would be modeled on and perhaps tied to the Euro rather than the US Dollar. This discussion is symptomatic of what appears to be an emerging desire to create an integrated economic and political community that is strikingly different from the type of hemispheric economic integration scheme being pursued by the Washington and its allies in the region (DeLong). Moreover, there is an increasing tendency in the region to find alternatives to trading with the USA. In particular, several Latin American nations (Brazil, Cuba, Venezuela and Chile) have been strengthening their economic relations with Asia, particularly with China. But the widespread popular opposition to neoliberalism and so-called globalization, and the shift to the Left in the region’s politics, represent much more than a serious challenge to US hegemony, they also represent a serious threat to the existing pattern of capitalist development in the region. Central to Washington’s strategy for the hemisphere has been the imposition of a neoliberal model of capitalist development on the region which involves the increasing integration of the region’s economies into a hemispheric ‘free trade’ area or rather a trade bloc that is dominated by the USA. This project is itself an essential part of the strategy of the USA for the domination of the global economy by its transnational corporations. The restructuring of the economies of the region under the mantra of neoliberalism and the banner of globalization has been aimed at giving the USA-based transnational corporations and investors free reign within the region and a strong hemispheric base from which to dominate the world economy In opposition to the neoliberal, polyarchical and globalizing model of development that has been imposed by the government of the USA and its allies in the region, the growing movement for an alternative form of development that is both genuinely democratic, equitable and environmentally sustainable appears to be gaining ground in various parts of Latin America and the Caribbean. This alternative model of development requires the reorganization and realignment of the existing economies in the region. It also requires the replacement of the existing political regimes, which serve the interests of the transnational bloc of social forces that are behind the integration of the region into the new global circuits of accumulation and production that the major trans­ national corporations and the IFIs have been constructing since the 1970s. In addition to fundamental economic changes, most of the existing pseudo-democratic political regimes in the region need to be thoroughly democratized so that they are responsive to and capable of serving the needs and interests of the majority of the people rather than the ruling polyarchies and the transnational corporations operating in the region. An essential requirement for realigning the region’s economies so that they produce people-centered and environmentally sustainable development is the integration of these economies into a regional economic and political union that has the resources, structures and the power to operate independently of the government of the USA and the transnational corporations based in the USA as well as in the European Union and Japan. If this type of regional integration takes place, it will enable the Latin American and Caribbean states to break free of the hegemonic influence of the USA, and reverse the denationalization (‘globalization’) of the Latin American and Caribbean economies. Instead of the corporate-driven hemispheric integration of the region under the hegemony of the USA, a new system of regional economic cooperation and both equitable as well as environmentally sustainable development is desperately needed to improve the lives of the vast majority of the people living in Latin America and the Caribbean. This type of regional, equitable and sustainable development can only be success­ fully carried out by truly democratically elected political leaders with broad-based popular support who are sincerely committed to achieving this alternative rather than the elitist neoliberal model. It probably will also require democratic socialist political institutions and structures of production and distribution. Regionalism has been the dream of the democratic left for some time. The European Union has its origins in the French socialist dream of ending Franco-German enmity through unifying Europe, and African regionalism was the vision of African socialists such as Julius Nyerere of Tanzania who saw regional integration as the only means to progress beyond tribalism and colonialism and create a united and democratic Africa (Faux, 2001:4). Viewed from the perspective of those who want to create a people-cen­ tered, democratic, equitable and environmentally sustainable social order in the Ame­ ricas, the corporate-dominated process of capitalist pseudo-globalization taking place in the region and around the world urgently needs to be replaced by what Samir Amin has referred to as a new system of «pluricentric regulated globalization» (Amin, 2001a). This alternative form of globalization requires the development of regional economic and political unions in Africa, Asia, Latin America, the Caribbean, the Middle East and elsewhere, which collaboratively promote people-centered, democratic and envi­ ronmentally sustainable forms of development on a regional basis. According to Amin, these regional unions of states are needed to collaborate as partners in collecti­ vely regulating the global restructuring of the world economy for the benefit of the vast majority of humanity rather than the transnational corporations and the northern centers of the world capitalist system in the USA, Europe and Japan. This type of regional-based regulative order is needed to regulate and redirect inter­ national economic, social, and political relations so that these relations serve the inte­ rests and needs of the vast majority of the world’s population. The present power structures and regulatory regime of the world capitalist system support the transna­ tional corporate-driven restructuring and denationalization of the economies of both the societies at the core and in the periphery of this system. The Latin American and Caribbean countries need to ‘de-link’ step-by-step from this exploitative and inequitable system. They need to redirect and restructure their eco­ nomies so that they serve the needs of the majority of their people while also protec­ ting their natural resources and ecosystems. The alternative policies of economic, poli­ tical and social development proposed and in some cases adopted by the new leftist leaders, the progressive civil society organizations and their supporters, combined with the project of regional integration associated with the new Unión de Naciones Suramericanas (UNASUR), are significant indications of unprecedented and pro­ found transformation unfolding in the Americas. A growing number of civil society organizations and social movements throughout the Americas are pressuring the governments of the region to follow what the pro­ gressive civil society networks such as the Alianza Social Continental/ Hemispheric Social Alliance (ASC/HSA) describes as a regional model of integration that supports the environmentally sustainable and democratic development of all the societies in the region (see ASC-HSA, 2006). The ASC/HSA also contends that the UNASUR pro­ ject and the Bolivarian dream of unification is threatened by the so-called free trade agreements that Washington has negotiated with Chile, Colombia, Peru, the Central American countries and the Dominican Republic. As the ASC/HSA makes clear in its documents and public information campaigns, these agreements compromise the national sovereignty, obstruct the local production of medicines, threaten public health, facilitate the profit-driven privatization of water and vital services such as health and sanitation, and threaten the survival of indigenous cultures, biodiversity, food sovereignty, and local control over natural resources. The «Alternatives for the Americas» proposal developed by this inter-American network of progressive civil society organizations and social movements calls on all governments in the region to subordinate trade and investments to sustainability and environmental protection as well as social justice and local democratic control over economic and social development (ASC/HSA 2002:5). The growing number and political influence of these kinds of networks, organizations and movements provide unquestionable evidence of the emergence of the social for­ ces and political conditions that Panitch (1996:89) and others (Harris, 1995:301-302; Jo­ nas and McCaughan, 1994) predicted in the 1990s would arise in opposition to neoli­ beralism, corporate-dominated pseudo globalization and the extension and consolida­ tion of the hegemony of the USA. It now seems increasingly possible that these forces and the political mobilization that they have helped to create will transform the politi­ cal regimes in the region as well as the nature of inter-American relations, bring about the regional integration of the Latin American countries and free these countries from US hegemony and the form of ‘turbo-capitalism’ to which they have been subjected. At this point, we can only speak in general terms about the new model(s) of develop­ ment that will replace the neoliberal model of uneven and inequitable development that has pillaged most of the region.

#### Environment collapse causes extinction – tipping points are coming

**Foster et al., Oregon sociology professor, 2010**

(John, The Ecological Rift: Capitalism’s War on the Earth, pg 14-8, ldg)

It is common today to see this ecological rift simply in terms of climate change, which given the dangers it poses and the intractable problems for capitalism it presents has grabbed all the headlines. But recently scientists—in a project led by Johan Rockstrom at the Stockholm Resilience Centre, and including Crutzen and the leading U.S. climatologist, James Hansen—have developed an analysis of nine "planetary boundaries" that are crucial to maintaining an earth-system environment in which humanity can exist safely. Climate change is only one of these, and the others are ocean acidification, stratospheric ozone depletion, the nitrogen and the phosphorus cycles, global freshwater use, change in land use, biodiversity loss, atmospheric aerosol loading, and chemical pollution. For the last two, atmospheric aerosol loading and chemical pollution, there are not yet adequate physical measures, but for the other seven processes clear boundaries have been designated. Three of the boundaries—those for climate change, ocean acidification, and stratospheric ozone depletion—can be regarded as tipping points, which at a certain level lead to vast qualitative changes in the earth system that would threaten to destabilize the planet, causing it to depart from the "boundaries for a healthy planet." The boundaries for the other four processes—the nitrogen and phosphorus cycles, freshwater use, change in land use, and biodiversity loss—are better viewed as signifying the onset of irreversible environmental degradation. Three processes have already crossed their planetary boundaries: climate change, the nitrogen cycle, and biodiversity loss. Each of these can therefore be seen, in our terminology, as constituting an extreme "rift" in the planetary system. Stratospheric ozone depletion was an emerging rift in the 1990s, but is now stabilizing, even subsiding. Ocean acidification, the phosphorus cycle, global freshwater use, and land system change are all rapidly emerging global rifts, though not yet extreme. Our knowledge of these rifts can be refined, and more plan-etary rifts may perhaps be discovered in the future. Nevertheless, the analysis of planetary boundaries and rifts, as they present themselves today, helps us understand the full scale of the ecological crisis now confronting humanity. The simple point is that the planet is being assaulted on many fronts as the result of human-generated changes in the global environment.4 In the planetary boundaries model developed by Rockstrom and his associates, each ecological process has a preindustrial value (that is, the level reached before the advent of industrial capitalism), a pro-posed boundary, and a current status. In the case of climate change the preindustrial value was 280 parts per million (ppm) of carbon dioxide concentration in the atmosphere; its proposed boundary is 350 ppm (necessary if tipping points such as a catastrophic rise in sea level are to be avoided); and its current status is 390 ppm. Biodiversity loss is measured by the rate of extinction (number of species lost per million species per year). The preindustrial annual rate, referred to as the "natural" or "background" rate of species loss, was 0.1-1 per million; the proposed boundary is 10 per million; whereas the current rate is greater than 100 per million (100-1,000 times the preindustrial back-ground rate). With respect to the nitrogen cycle, the boundary is con-cerned with the amount of nitrogen removed from the atmosphere for human use in millions of tons per year. Before the rise of industrial capitalism (more specifically before the discovery of the Haber-Bosch process early in the twentieth century), the amount of nitrogen removed from the atmosphere was 0 tons. The proposed boundary, to avoid irreversible degradation of the earth system, is 35 million tons per year. The current status is 121 million tons per year. In each of these extreme rifts, the stability of the earth system as we know it is being endangered. We are at red alert status. If business as usual continues, the world is headed within the next few decades for major tipping points along with irreversible environmental degradation, threatening much of humanity. Biodiversity loss at current and projected rates could result in the loss of upward of a third of all living species this century. The pumping of more and more nitrogen into the biosphere is resulting in the creation of dead zones in lakes and ocean regions (a phenomenon also affected by phosphorus). Each one of these rifts by itself constitutes a global ecological crisis. These ruptures reveal that the limits of the earth system are not determined by the sheer physical scale of the economy but by the particular rifts in natural processes that are generated.5 The emerging rifts in the other ecological processes, which have not yet overshot their boundaries, are scarcely less threatening. For the phosphorus cycle (categorized as part of a single planetary boundary together with the nitrogen cycle), the preindustrial quantity flowing into the oceans per year was approximately 1 million tons; the proposed boundary is 11 million tons (based on the assumption that ocean anoxic events begin at ten times the background rate); and its current status is already 8.5 to 9.5 million tons. In regard to ocean acidification, the value refers to a global mean saturation state of arag-onite (a form of calcium carbonate) in surface seawater. A decline in the number indicates an increase in the acidity of the ocean. The preindustrial value was 3.44 (surface ocean aragonite saturation state); the proposed boundary—after which there would be a massive die-down of shell-forming organisms—is 2.75; and the current status is 2.90. In the case of freshwater use, the preindustrial annual consumption of freshwater in km3 (cubic kilometers) was 415; the estimated boundary is 4,000 km3 (marking a threshold beyond which the irreversible degradation and collapse of terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems is likely); and the current rate of consumption is 2,600 km3. For change in land use, the parameters are set by the percentage of global ice-free land surface converted to cropland. In preindustrial times, this percentage was very low. The proposed boundary is 15 percent (after which there is the danger of triggering catastrophic effects on ecosystems), and the current status is 11.7 percent. In each of these emerging rifts, we are faced with an orange alert status, in which we are rapidly moving toward extreme conditions, whereby we will pass the planetary boundaries, undermining the earth system that supports the conditions of life. No measure for chemical pollution has yet been determined, but proposals include measuring the effects of persistent organic pollu-tants (otherwise known as POPs), plastics, endocrine disrupters, heavy metals, and nuclear waste on ecosystems and the earth system in general. Likewise, no measure has yet been determined for atmospheric aerosol loading (the overall particulate concentration in the atmosphere on a regional basis), which can disrupt monsoon systems, lead to health problems, and interact with climate change and freshwater boundaries. Stratospheric ozone depletion is the one previously emerging rift that was brought under control (as far as anthropogenic drivers were concerned) in the 1990s, reducing what was a rapidly growing threat to life on the planet due to an increase in ultraviolet radiation from the sun. The preindustrial value of ozone concentration was 290 (Dobson Units—the measurement of atmospheric ozone columnar density, where 1 Dobson Unit is defined as 0.01 millimeters thick under standard pressure and temperature); the proposed planetary boundary is a concentration of 276 (after which life on the planet would experience devastating losses); and the current status is 283. Between 60°S and 60°N latitude, the decline in stratospheric ozone concentrations has been halted. Nevertheless, it will take decades for the Antarctic ozone hole to disappear, and Arctic ozone loss will likely persist for decades. Life on the planet had a close call.6 The mapping out of planetary boundaries in this way gives us a better sense of the real threat to the earth system. Although in recent years the environmental threat has come to be seen by many as simply a question of climate change, protecting the planet requires that we attend to all of these planetary boundaries, and others not yet determined. The essential problem is the unavoidable fact that an expanding economic system is placing additional burdens on a fixed earth system to the point of planetary overload. It has been estimated that in the early 1960s humanity used half of the planet's biocapacity in a year. Today this has risen to an overshoot of 30 percent beyond the earth's regenerative capacity. Business-as-usual projections point to a state in which the ecological footprint of humanity will be equivalent to the regenerative capacity of two planets by the mid-2030s.7 Rockstrom and his associates concluded their article in Nature by stating: "The evidence so far suggests that, as along as the [planetary boundary] thresholds are not crossed, humanity has the freedom to pursue long-term social and economic development." Although this is undoubtedly true, what is obviously not addressed in this conclu-sion—but is clearly the point of their whole analysis—is that these thresholds have in some cases already been crossed and in other cases will soon be crossed with the continuation of business as usual. Moreover, this can be attributed in each and every case to a primary cause: the current pattern of global socioeconomic development, that is, the capitalist mode of production and its expansionary tendencies. The whole problem can be called "the global ecological rift," referring to the overall break in the human relation to nature arising from an alienated system of capital accumulation without end.'

#### Vote Neg to reject the Aff’s neoliberal economic engagement in favor of a commons-based approach. That solves and creates space to challenge neoliberalism

**De Angelis, East London political economy professor, 2003**

(Massimo, “Reflections on alternatives, commons and communities”, Winter, <http://www.commoner.org.uk/deangelis06.pdf>, DOA: 7-2-12, ldg)

This movement has posed the question of a plurality of “alternatives” to the social processes and arrangements that produce the horrors of modern global capital. In order to take the many calls for and practices of alternatives seriously, we have to make them relevant to the real people at the fringe or outside the movement. In other words, we want to move from movement to society not so much by persuading people to “join” our movement, but through a language and a political practice that by tracing the connections between diverse practices attempts to dissolve the distinctions between inside and outside the movement, i.e., actually moves ‘from movement to society’. To make the possibility of a new world that contains many worlds an actuality, we have to be able to shape our own discourse in such a way as to echo the needs and aspirations coming from below. We have to give coherence to their plurality, without imposing a model or reiterating dead ideologies. We need a discourse that helps to articulate the many alternatives that spring out of the points of crises of neoliberal capital, which seriously threaten to dispossess people of their livelihood and impose on them new or more intensified commodified patterns of life. We need a discourse that builds on the plurality of the many concrete struggles and their methods and help us to articulate a vision – not a plan – of the whole. Then we can better evaluate what are the global implications of our local struggles, as well as the local implications of global struggles for the building of a world that contains many worlds. But most of all, we need a discourse that recognizes the power we have to shape alternatives, at every level in society, that sets out from the simple fact that, contrarily to common belief, alternatives do exist, are everywhere and plural. To clarify, I think that every social node, that is every individual or network of individuals is a bearer of alternatives. This is evident not only when struggles erupt in any of the waged or unwaged local and trans-local nodes of social production. We just need to look around in the relative normality of daily routines to see that every social node “knows” of different ways to do things within its life-world and sphere of action longs for a different space in which things can be done in different ways. Each social node expresses needs and aspirations that are the basis of alternatives. For example: the alternative to working 10 hours a day is working 6; the alternative to poverty is access to the means of existence; the alternative to indignity is dignity; the alternative to building that dam and uprooting communities is not building that dam and leaving communities where they are; the alternative to tomatoes going rotten while transported on the back of an old woman for 20 miles is not GM tomatoes that do not rot, but access to land near home, or a home, or a road and a truck. Since every social node is aware of a spectrum of alternatives, the problem is simply how to make these alternatives actual? What resources are needed? How to coordinate alternatives in such a way that they are not pitted against each other as is the case of the competitive markets’ understanding of alternatives? How to solve the many existing problems without relying on the alienating coordinating mechanism of the market and creating instead social relations of mutual enrichment, dignity, and respect? These are I believe the bottom line questions on which a new political discourse must be based. Once we acknowledge the existence of the galaxy of alternatives as they emerge from concrete needs and aspirations, we can ground today’s new political discourse in the thinking and practice of the actualization and the coordination of alternatives, so as each social node and each individual within it has the power to decide and take control over their lives. It is this actualization and this coordination that rescues existing alternatives from the cloud of their invisibility, because alternatives, as with any human product, are social products, and they need to be recognized and validated socially. Our political projects must push their way through beyond the existing forms of coordination, beyond the visible fist of the state, beyond the invisible hand of competitive markets, and beyond the hard realities of their interconnections that express themselves in today forms of neoliberal governance, promoting cooperation through competition and community through disempowerment. As I will argue, this new political discourse is based on the project of defending and extending the space of commons, at the same time building and strengthening communities through the social fields.

### PTX

#### Raising the debt ceiling is likely but uncertain – time is running out

Stuart 9-26 (Jim Stewart, political blogger, Princeton graduate, “Shutdown and/or Default,” 9-26-2013, http://jimstuartnewblog.blogspot.com/2013/09/shutdown-andor-default.html)

After today, four days to go before a possible shutdown. After that, seventeen days to possible default. What's the forecast? Here's what I see, albeit with little clarity:¶ Friday or Saturday the Senate will return a clean CR at sequester spending levels back to the House. Right now, don't think Boehner can pass a clean CR without relying on Democrats. He was hoping to pass an omnibus conditional debt ceiling resolution on Saturday, before the budget vote, to get his caucus to shift focus to the debt ceiling. This afternoon, he found he doesn't have the votes. People want to see what happens on the Budget CR. So Boehner must put a conditional CR back to the Senate, ensuring a Tuesday shutdown, or ask Democrats for help. If Democrats say yes without conditions, there will be no shutdown. If they ask for something, most likely moving the budget target off the sequester levels, we will have shutdown, since the Senate won't have time to respond before the midnight Monday deadline. Best Guess: Boehner will ask for Democratic help and pass a clean CR - so no Shutdown.¶ The debt ceiling could follow a similar trajectory: the House will pass a contingent debt ceiling resolution containing a long list of demands - one year Obamacare delay, the Keystone pipeline, drilling on federal lands and offshore, reverse new EPA carbon capture rules, cut back the wings of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, etc. The Senate will strip all this out and send back a clean 14 month debt ceiling increase resolution. Meanwhile a very high stakes game of chicken will be going on: Obama says he will not negotiate the debt ceiling; Boehner says he has to and ultimately will. Boehner has raised the expectations of the GOP caucus very high - saying the debt ceiling is the maximum point of leverage with the Democrats, and that is where the GOP can make the most progress. I am very clear that Obama will not budge on this, and that the Democratic leadership team in the House and Senate will back him up. Will Boehner realize this in time? In their last big negotiation in 2011, Obama caved to save the country from default. I think Republicans expect him to cave. Will they all realize their mistake in time? And if they do, will they turn back and pass a clean resolution? Best Guess: Boehner will figure it out and decide to move with a clean resolution just in time to get it signed before October 17.¶ This is a highly hopeful forecast and I am basing it mostly on my assessment of Boehner as a person who will do the right thing - not for himself, but for his Party and his country, once he sees there are no good alternatives. Do not think he will take the lead in causing a shutdown; nor will he refuse to take a path that prevents default just to please the base. I am not at all confident, though. I assign just a 50-60% probability to the above scenario - in other words, not very high.¶ And here's another low probability forecast: If the game plays out as above, we will land on October 18 with a very angry and frustrated GOP base, an ecstatic Democratic Party, a deeply wounded Speaker Boehner, and the next budget deadline coming up on November 15, less than 30 days away. I think there's a chance that Boehner, possibly realizing his time is up as Speaker, will lead a Grand Bargain negotiation with Obama (cancel the sequester, replace it with a mix of targeted cuts, new tax revenues from tax reform, and chained CPI for Medicare and Social Security) that will pass the House with Democratic votes and be signed into law.¶ Pretty far out, I admit. I give it a 30% chance. But that's not zero. And wouldn't that be a great day for the country!

#### PC is key

Lillis & Wasson 9-7 (Mike Lillis, and Erik Wasson, The Hill, “Fears of wounding Obama weigh heavily on Democrats ahead of vote,” 9-7-2013, http://thehill.com/homenews/house/320829-fears-of-wounding-obama-weigh-heavily-on-democrats#ixzz2fOPUfPNr)

The prospect of wounding President Obama is weighing heavily on Democratic lawmakers as they decide their votes on Syria. Obama needs all the political capital he can muster heading into bruising battles with the GOP over fiscal spending and the debt ceiling. Democrats want Obama to use his popularity to reverse automatic spending cuts already in effect and pay for new economic stimulus measures through higher taxes on the wealthy and on multinational companies. But if the request for authorization for Syria military strikes is rebuffed, some fear it could limit Obama's power in those high-stakes fights. That has left Democrats with an agonizing decision: vote "no" on Syria and possibly encourage more chemical attacks while weakening their president, or vote "yes" and risk another war in the Middle East. “I’m sure a lot of people are focused on the political ramifications,” a House Democratic aide said. Rep. Jim Moran (D-Va.), a veteran appropriator, said the failure of the Syria resolution would diminish Obama's leverage in the fiscal battles. "It doesn't help him," Moran said Friday by phone. "We need a maximally strong president to get us through this fiscal thicket. These are going to be very difficult votes."

#### Plan drains capital – empirics

LeoGrande, 12

William M. LeoGrande School of Public Affairs American University, Professor of Government and a specialist in Latin American politics and U.S. foreign policy toward Latin America, Professor LeoGrande has been a frequent adviser to government and private sector agencies, 12/18/12, http://www.american.edu/clals/upload/LeoGrande-Fresh-Start.pdf

The Second Obama Administration Where in the executive branch will control over Cuba policy lie? Political considerations played a major role in Obama's Cuba policy during the first term, albeit not as preeminent a consideration as they were during the Clinton years. In 2009, Obama's new foreign policy team got off to a bad start when they promised Senator Menendez that they would consult him before changing Cuba policy. That was the price he extracted for providing Senate Democrats with the 60 votes needed to break a Republican filibuster on a must-pass omnibus appropriations bill to keep the government operating. For the next four years, administration officials worked more closely with Menendez, who opposed the sort of major redirection of policy Obama had promised, than they did with senators like John Kerry (D-Mass.), chair of the Foreign Relations Committee, whose views were more in line with the president's stated policy goals. At the Department of State, Assistant Secretary Arturo Valenzuela favored initiatives to improve relations with Cuba, but he was stymied by indifference or resistance elsewhere in the bureaucracy. Secretary Hillary Clinton, having staked out a tough position Cuba during the Democratic primary campaign, was not inclined to be the driver for a new policy. At the NSC, Senior Director for the Western Hemisphere Dan Restrepo, who advised Obama on Latin America policy during the 2008 campaign, did his best to avoid the Cuba issue because it was so fraught with political danger. When the president finally approved the resumption of people-to-people travel to Cuba, which Valenzuela had been pushing, the White House political team delayed the announcement for several months at the behest of Debbie Wasserman Schultz. Any easing of the travel regulations, she warned, would hurt Democrats' prospects in the upcoming mid-term elections.43 The White House shelved the new regulations until January 2011, and then announced them late Friday before a holiday weekend. Then, just a year later, the administration surrendered to Senator Rubio's demand that it limit the licensing of travel providers in exchange for him dropping his hold on the appointment of Valenzuela's replacement.44 With Obama in his final term and Vice-President Joe Biden unlikely to seek the Democratic nomination in 2016 (unlike the situation Clinton and Gore faced in their second term), politics will presumably play a less central role in deciding Cuba policy over the next four years. There will still be the temptation, however, to sacrifice Cuba policy to mollify congressional conservatives, both Democrat and Republican, who are willing to hold other Obama initiatives hostage to extract concessions on Cuba. And since Obama has given in to such hostage-taking previously, the hostage-takers have a strong incentive to try the same tactic again. The only way to break this cycle would be for the president to stand up to them and refuse to give in, as he did when they attempted to rollback his 2009 relaxation of restrictions on CubanAmerican travel and remittances. Much will depend on who makes up Obama's new foreign policy team, especially at the Department of State. John Kerry has been a strong advocate of a more open policy toward Cuba, and worked behind the scenes with the State Department and USAID to clean up the "democracy promotion" program targeting Cuba, as a way to win the release of Alan Gross. A new secretary is likely to bring new assistant secretaries, providing an opportunity to revitalize the Bureau of Western Hemisphere Affairs, which has been thoroughly cowed by congressional hardliners. But even with new players in place, does Cuba rise to the level of importance that would justify a major new initiative and the bruising battle with conservatives on the Hill? Major policy changes that require a significant expenditure of political capital rarely happen unless the urgency of the problem forces policymakers to take action.

#### Failure collapses global trade, investment and growth

Davidson 9-10 (Adam Davidson, co-founder of NPR’s Planet Money (Adam, “Our Debt to Society” New York Times, <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/09/15/magazine/our-debt-to-society.html?pagewanted=all>)

If the debt ceiling isn’t lifted again this fall, some serious financial decisions will have to be made. Perhaps the government can skimp on its foreign aid or furlough all of NASA, but eventually the big-ticket items, like Social Security and Medicare, will have to be cut. At some point, the government won’t be able to pay interest on its bonds and will enter what’s known as sovereign default, the ultimate national financial disaster achieved by countries like Zimbabwe, Ecuador and Argentina (and now Greece). In the case of the United States, though, it won’t be an isolated national crisis. If the American government can’t stand behind the dollar, the world’s benchmark currency, then the global financial system will very likely enter a new era in which there is much less trade and much less economic growth. It would be, by most accounts, the largest self-imposed financial disaster in history. Nearly everyone involved predicts that someone will blink before this disaster occurs. Yet a small number of House Republicans (one political analyst told me it’s no more than 20) appear willing to see what happens if the debt ceiling isn’t raised — at least for a bit. This could be used as leverage to force Democrats to drastically cut government spending and eliminate President Obama’s signature health-care-reform plan. In fact, Representative Tom Price, a Georgia Republican, told me that the whole problem could be avoided if the president agreed to drastically cut spending and lower taxes. Still, it is hard to put this act of game theory into historic context. Plenty of countries — and some cities, like Detroit — have defaulted on their financial obligations, but only because their governments ran out of money to pay their bills. No wealthy country has ever voluntarily decided — in the middle of an economic recovery, no less — to default. And there’s certainly no record of that happening to the country that controls the global reserve currency. Like many, I assumed a self-imposed U.S. debt crisis might unfold like most involuntary ones. If the debt ceiling isn’t raised by X-Day, I figured, the world’s investors would begin to see America as an unstable investment and rush to sell their Treasury bonds. The U.S. government, desperate to hold on to investment, would then raise interest rates far higher, hurtling up rates on credit cards, student loans, mortgages and corporate borrowing — which would effectively put a clamp on all trade and spending. The U.S. economy would collapse far worse than anything we’ve seen in the past several years.

#### Trigger nuclear wars – and turns multilat and global democracy

Merlini 11 (Cesare, nonresident senior fellow, Center on the United States and Europe, chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Italian Institute for International Affairs, “A Post-Secular World?” Survival, 53(2), 2011, ebsco, ldg)

Two neatly opposed scenarios for the future of the world order illustrate the range of possibilities, albeit at the risk of oversimplification. The first scenario entails the premature crumbling of the post-Westphalian system. One or more of the acute tensions apparent today evolves into an open and traditional **conflict** between states, perhaps even **involving the use of nuclear weapons.** The crisis might be triggered by a collapse of the global economic and financial system, the vulnerability of which we have just experienced, and the prospect of a second Great Depression, with consequences for peace and democracy similar to those of the first. Whatever the trigger, the unlimited exercise of national sovereignty, exclusive self-interest and rejection of outside interference would self-interest and rejection of outside interference would likely be amplified, emptying, perhaps entirely, the half-full glass of multilateralism, including the UN and the European Union. Many of the more likely conflicts, such as between Israel and Iran or India and Pakistan, have potential religious dimensions. Short of war, tensions such as those related to immigration might become unbearable. Familiar issues of creed and identity could be exacerbated. One way or another, the secular rational approach would be sidestepped by a return to theocratic absolutes, competing or converging with secular absolutes such as unbridled nationalism**.**

### T G2G

#### 1. Interpretation – economic engagement is only *direct aid* and *trade agreements* – the embargo is a restriction on private action

Daga 13 (Sergio Daga, director of research at Politicas Publicas para la Libertad, Bolivia, visiting senior policy analyst, Heritage Foundation, M.A. Economics, University of Chile, B.A. Economics, Catholic University of Bolivia, also trained at Libertad y Desarrollo, Chile, and the Atlas Economic Research Foundation, United States, “Economics of the 2013-2014 Debate Topic: U.S. Economic Engagement Toward Cuba, Mexico or Venezuela,” National Center for Policy Analysis, Debate Backgrounder No. 7, 5-15-2013, http://www.ncpa.org/pdfs/Message\_to\_Debaters\_6-7-13.pdf)

Economics is the branch of human knowledge concerned with the ¶ satisfaction of human wants through the production of goods and ¶ services, and the exchange of those goods and services between two ¶ or more individuals. Thus, economics encompasses human activities ¶ from simple barter between two individuals to international trade ¶ between firms or governments. Many of these economic activities ¶ are regulated by government, and some are outlawed. Trade and ¶ other economic activities that cross national borders — such as ¶ sales of goods and services, travel, migration or transfers of money ¶ — are regulated by both the government of the originating country ¶ and the government of the destination country. The government ¶ itself could be an economic actor, buying and selling from other ¶ governments or firms in other countries; or the government could ¶ regulate the private economic activities of individuals and firms.¶ Economic engagement between or among countries can take ¶ many forms, but this document will focus on government-to-government engagement through 1) international trade agreements ¶ designed to lower barriers to trade; and 2) government foreign ¶ aid; next, we will contrast government-to-government economic ¶ engagement with private economic engagement through 3) ¶ international investment, called foreign direct investment; and 4) ¶ remittances and migration by individuals. All of these areas are ¶ important with respect to the countries mentioned in the debate ¶ resolution; however, when discussing economic engagement by ¶ the U.S. federal government, some issues are more important with ¶ respect to some countries than to others.

### Gross CP

Alan Gross

#### The United States federal government should end its economic sanctions on the Republic of Cuba if, and only if, Cuba agrees to release Alan Gross.

#### Solves the AFF, avoids politics

Herrero 12/27/12 – (Ricardo, “Getting Serious about Alan Gross” The Huffington Post, Ricardo Herrero is Deputy Executive Director of the Cuba Study Group, Available online @ <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/ricardo-herrero/getting-serious-about-ala_b_2370767.html>)

Earlier this month, USAID subcontractor Alan Gross began his fourth year in a Cuban prison. Ever since his incarceration, a debate has raged over whether the United States should halt further efforts to engage with the Cuban people until the Cuban government releases Gross. Both Alan and his wife Judy have repeatedly called on the U.S. and Cuba to engage in a dialogue without preconditions. Sadly, like all things Cuba-related, the debate over Gross' incarceration has since devolved into an ideological three-ring circus where finding a solution has become a secondary objective behind not appearing to be making concessions to the enemy.¶ The Washington Post perfectly captured the tone deafness of the current debate in a recent editorial: "better relations between Cuba and the United States must be conditioned on real steps toward democratization by Havana. But until Mr.Gross is released, they ought to get worse." This position reflects exactly the sort of stale, inside-the-box thinking that has long plagued the discourse over U.S.-Cuba policy.¶ For years we've known that the Cuban government is incredibly adept at manipulating U.S. policy choices. Time and again, any attempt by the U.S. to increase its engagement with the Cuban people has been met with confrontation and repression by Cuban officials, which in turn emboldens hardliners in the U.S. to call for the tightening economic sanctions. This pattern has become all too predictable, and the Gross case is its latest example: arrested in Havana for bringing communication devices to the island less than three months after President Obama relaxed family travel and remittance restrictions in 2009 and only two weeks after the U.S. House held hearings on lifting the Cuba travel ban for all Americans. In response to Gross' arrest, U.S. hardliners blocked any further normalization efforts in Congress, though they weren't able to stop the Obama Administration from further loosening restrictions on people-to-people travel and remittances in January, 2011. Shortly thereafter, Gross was sentenced to 15 years in prison.¶ Secretary of State Hillary Clinton once said "It is my personal belief that the Castros do not want to see an end to the embargo and do not want to see normalization with the United States, because they would lose all of their excuses for what hasn't happened in Cuba in the last 50 years." If we believe this to be the case, then why don't we use this insight to steer our efforts in securing the release of Alan Gross?¶ The Cubans have often stated that they are willing to swap Gross for five Cuban spies who were arrested in Florida in 1998 for infiltrating a U.S. Navy base and several anti-Castro groups in Miami. The U.S. has refused to accept the swap, and the negotiations have remained stalled for almost three years.¶ So what can be done? There are three opportunities for securing Gross' release that could also help improve relations between the U.S. and Cuba:¶ 1. Introduce alternative terms to the negotiation. The Cubans have dictated the terms of the negotiation from day one, and hardliners in the U.S. government have seemingly been too happy to play along. However, just because the U.S. won't agree to the spy swap doesn't mean negotiations should stop there. U.S. sanctions on Cuba remain a decades-old morass of congressional actions, presidential directives and executive orders, resulting in an entrenched and inflexible foreign policy that is as incoherent as it is ineffective. There are plenty of outdated sanctions on the books that the United States could repeal or amend in exchange for Gross' release.¶ 2. Pursue Gross' release and economic engagement concurrently. In 2011, the Obama Administration announced a shift in the focus of U.S.-Cuba policy toward empowering civil society and supporting independent economic activity. If Cuba's burgeoning private sector is to grow into a viable alternative to the Island's top-down economic system, it will need a deeper economic relationship with the American private sector. By conditioning all further efforts to engage with the Cuban people on Gross' release, we are playing by the rules of those who benefit from the prolonged confrontation and mutual isolation between the two countries. Denying these private individuals an economic relationship with the United States only serves to further delay the kind of changes that policies like Helms-Burton were ill-designed to accelerate.¶ 3. Look to the Angel Carromero case as a model. We don't know what deal the Spanish government struck with the Cubans to secure the release of Angel Carromero, the Popular Party's pro-democracy activist who was charged with the negligent homicide of Oswaldo Payá and Harold Cepero and will now serve his sentence in Spain. What is clear is that through direct diplomacy, the Spanish have been far more successful at liberating political prisoners, democracy advocates, and businessmen from Cuban jails than any other country, all while promoting democracy inside the island through direct support to pro-democracy groups. On the other hand, our confrontational approach has only perpetuated the conflict without any progress to show for it.¶ The United Nations recently condemned Cuba's arbitrary detention of Alan Gross for the first time and the U.S. Embargo on Cuba for the 21st year in a row. By pivoting negotiations for Gross's release away from a spy-swap and toward win-win alternatives, both the United States and Cuba stand to gain credibility within the international community. The United States could finally pave the road to a future where it can lead an effective multilateral policy toward Cuba focused on the advancement of human rights and helping the Cuban people. Just as importantly, Alan would finally come home.

#### The plan kills credibility

Weissberg 10 - Professor of Political Science-Emeritus, University of Illinois-Urbana (Robert, “President Obama's Compulsive Appeasement Disorder”, August 27 of 2010, American Thinker, <http://www.americanthinker.com/2010/08/president_obamas_compulsive_ap.html>)

There's a simple explanation: we are no longer feared. Superpowers of yesteryear, going back to the Greeks and Romans, were feared for a reason -- they leveled a city to make an example. Today, by contrast, Uncle Sam relies on cajoling, bribery (think North Korea), entreating puny leaders of inchoate states (special envoys to the PLO's Mahmoud Abbas) and otherwise playing weak hands. We have gone from resolve to U.N. resolution. We've forgotten Machiavelli's sage advice: since love and fear can hardly exist together, if we must choose between them, it is far safer to be feared than loved.¶ Being feared does not require bombing Iran into the Stone Age, though that would certainly terrify North Korea and even slow down the Somali pirates. Being feared is when your enemy believes that you are willing to use overwhelming, deadly force, and this need not require nuking anybody. The trick is creating a credible, threatening persona -- convincing your enemy that while you may speak softly, you also carry a big stick and are willing to use it. Israel long ago learned this lesson, regardless of world outrage.

#### Obama’s credibility is solves Indo-Pak war – causes extinction

Ben Coes 11, a former speechwriter in the George H.W. Bush administration, managed Mitt Romney’s successful campaign for Massachusetts Governor in 2002 & author, “The disease of a weak president”, The Daily Caller, http://dailycaller.com/2011/09/30/the-disease-of-a-weak-president/

The disease of a weak president usually begins with the Achilles’ heel all politicians are born with — the desire to be popular. It leads to pandering to different audiences, people and countries and creates a sloppy, incoherent set of policies. Ironically, it ultimately results in that very politician losing the trust and respect of friends and foes alike.¶ In the case of Israel, those of us who are strong supporters can at least take comfort in the knowledge that Tel Aviv will do whatever is necessary to protect itself from potential threats from its unfriendly neighbors. While it would be preferable for the Israelis to be able to count on the United States, in both word and deed, the fact is right now they stand alone. Obama and his foreign policy team have undercut the Israelis in a multitude of ways. Despite this, I wouldn’t bet against the soldiers of Shin Bet, Shayetet 13 and the Israeli Defense Forces.¶ But Obama’s weakness could — in other places — have implications far, far worse than anything that might ultimately occur in Israel. The triangular plot of land that connects Pakistan, India and China is held together with much more fragility and is built upon a truly foreboding foundation of religious hatreds, radicalism, resource envy and nuclear weapons.¶ If you can only worry about preventing one foreign policy disaster, worry about this one.**¶** Here are a few unsettling facts to think about:¶ First, Pakistan and India have fought three wars since the British de-colonized and left the region in 1947. All three wars occurred before the two countries had nuclear weapons. Both countries now possess hundreds of nuclear weapons, enough to wipe each other off the map many times over.¶ Second, Pakistan is 97% Muslim. It is a question of when — not if — Pakistan elects a radical Islamist in the mold of Ayatollah Khomeini as its president. Make no mistake, it will happen, and when it does the world will have a far greater concern than Ali Khamenei or Mahmoud Ahmadinejad and a single nuclear device.¶ Third, China sits at the northern border of both India and Pakistan. China is strategically aligned with Pakistan. Most concerning, China covets India’s natural resources. Over the years, it has slowly inched its way into the northern tier of India-controlled Kashmir Territory, appropriating land and resources and drawing little notice from the outside world.¶ In my book, Coup D’Etat, I consider this tinderbox of colliding forces in Pakistan, India and China as a thriller writer. But thriller writers have the luxury of solving problems by imagining solutions on the page. In my book, when Pakistan elects a radical Islamist who then starts a war with India and introduces nuclear weapons to the theater, America steps in and removes the Pakistani leader through a coup d’état.¶ I wish it was that simple.¶ The more complicated and difficult truth is that we, as Americans, must take sides. We must be willing to be unpopular in certain places. Most important, we must be ready and willing to threaten our military might on behalf of our allies. And our allies are Israel and India.¶ There are many threats out there — Islamic radicalism, Chinese technology espionage, global debt and half a dozen other things that smarter people than me are no doubt worrying about. But the single greatest threat to America is none of these. The single greatest threat facing America and our allies is a weak U.S. president. It doesn’t have to be this way. President Obama could — if he chose — develop a backbone and lead. Alternatively, America could elect a new president. It has to be one or the other. The status quo is simply not an option.

### Shunning

#### Cuba is a flagrant, willful, and persistent violator of human rights – reject engagement with them — moral duty to shun

Beversluis 89 — Eric H. Beversluis, Professor of Philosophy and Economics at Aquinas College, holds an A.B. in Philosophy and German from Calvin College, an M.A. in Philosophy from Northwestern University, an M.A. in Economics from Ohio State University, and a Ph.D. in the Philosophy of Education from Northwestern University, 1989 (“On Shunning Undesirable Regimes: Ethics and Economic Sanctions,” *Public Affairs Quarterly*, Volume 3, Number 2, April, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via JSTOR, p. 17-19)

A fundamental task of morality is resolving conflicting interests. If we both want the same piece of land, ethics provides a basis for resolving the conflict by identifying "mine" and "thine." If in anger I want to smash your [end page 17] face, ethics indicates that your face's being unsmashed is a legitimate interest of yours which takes precedence over my own interest in expressing my rage. Thus ethics identifies the rights of individuals when their interests conflict. But how can a case for shunning be made on this view of morality? Whose interests (rights) does shunning protect? The shunner may well have to sacrifice his interest, e.g., by foregoing a beneficial trade relationship, but whose rights are thereby protected? In shunning there seem to be no "rights" that are protected. For shunning, as we have seen, does not assume that the resulting cost will change the disapproved behavior. If economic sanctions against South Africa will not bring apartheid to an end, and thus will not help the blacks get their rights, on what grounds might it be a duty to impose such sanctions? We find the answer when we note that there is another "level" of moral duties. When Galtung speaks of "reinforcing … morality," he has identified a duty that goes beyond specific acts of respecting people's rights. The argument goes like this: There is more involved in respecting the rights of others than not violating them by one's actions. For if there is such a thing as a moral order, which unites people in a moral community, then surely one has a duty (at least prima facie) not only to avoid violating the rights of others with one's actions but also to support that moral order. Consider that the moral order itself contributes significantly to people's rights being respected. It does so by encouraging and reinforcing moral behavior and by discouraging and sanctioning immoral behavior. In this moral community people mutually reinforce each other's moral behavior and thus raise the overall level of morality. Were this moral order to disintegrate, were people to stop reinforcing each other's moral behavior, there would be much more violation of people's rights. Thus to the extent that behavior affects the moral order, it indirectly affects people's rights. And this is where shunning fits in. Certain types of behavior constitute a direct attack on the moral order. When the violation of human rights is flagrant, willful, and persistent, the offender is, as it were, thumbing her nose at the moral order, publicly rejecting it as binding her behavior. Clearly such behavior, if tolerated by society, will weaken and perhaps eventually undermine altogether the moral order. Let us look briefly at those three conditions which turn immoral behavior into an attack on the moral order. An immoral action is flagrant if it is "extremely or deliberately conspicuous; notorious, shocking." Etymologically the word means "burning" or "blazing." The definition of shunning implies therefore that those offenses require shunning which are shameless or indiscreet, which the person makes no effort to hide and no good-faith effort to excuse. Such actions "blaze forth" as an attack on the moral order. But to merit shunning the action must also be willful and persistent. We do not consider the actions of the "backslider," the [end page 18] weak-willed, the one-time offender to be challenges to the moral order. It is the repeat offender, the unrepentant sinner, the cold-blooded violator of morality whose behavior demands that others publicly reaffirm the moral order. When someone flagrantly, willfully, and repeatedly violates the moral order, those who believe in the moral order, the members of the moral community, must respond in a way that reaffirms the legitimacy of that moral order. How does shunning do this? First, by refusing publicly to have to do with such a person one announces support for the moral order and backs up the announcement with action. This action reinforces the commitment to the moral order both of the shunner and of the other members of the community. (Secretary of State Shultz in effect made this argument in his call for international sanctions on Libya in the early days of 1986.) Further, shunning may have a moral effect on the shunned person, even if the direct impact is not adequate to change the immoral behavior. If the shunned person thinks of herself as part of the moral community, shunning may well make clear to her that she is, in fact, removing herself from that community by the behavior in question. Thus shunning may achieve by moral suasion what cannot be achieved by "force." Finally, shunning may be a form of punishment, of moral sanction, whose appropriateness depends not on whether it will change the person's behavior, but on whether he deserves the punishment for violating the moral order. Punishment then can be viewed as a way of maintaining the moral order, of "purifying the community" after it has been made "unclean," as ancient communities might have put it. Yet not every immoral action requires that we shun. As noted above, we live in a fallen world. None of us is perfect. If the argument implied that we may have nothing to do with anyone who is immoral, it would consist of a reductio of the very notion of shunning. To isolate a person, to shun him, to give him the "silent treatment," is a serious thing. Nothing strikes at a person's wellbeing as person more directly than such ostracism. Furthermore, not every immoral act is an attack on the moral order. Actions which are repented and actions which are done out of weakness of will clearly violate but do not attack the moral order. Thus because of the serious nature of shunning, it is defined as a response not just to any violation of the moral order, but to attacks on the moral order itself through flagrant, willful, and persistent wrongdoing. We can also now see why failure to shun can under certain circumstances suggest complicity. But it is not that we have a duty to shun because failure to do so suggests complicity. Rather, because we have an obligation to shun in certain circumstances, when we fail to do so others may interpret our failure as tacit complicity in the willful, persistent, and flagrant immorality.

### Econ

#### Doesn’t solve econ – current Cuban economic model prohibits FDI

Feinberg 11 - professor of international political economy at UC San Dieg, nonresident senior fellow with the Latin America Initiative at Brookings (Richard E., “Reaching Out: Cuba’s New Economy and the International Response”, November, Brookings, <http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/papers/2011/11/18%20cuba%20feinberg/1118_cuba_feinberg.pdf>)//ID

Despite these advances, the Cuban economy remains in the doldrums (as described in Section 1) . The main constraint slowing the Cuban economy is not U.S. sanctions (even as they have hit hard). Rather, it is Cuba’s own outdated economic model, inherited from the Soviet Union, of central planning . Cuba’s many commercial partners would like to invest more in Cuba and would prefer to purchase more Cuban exports to correct the imbalances in their bilateral trade accounts, but are frustrated by Cuba’s scant economic offerings.

#### Cuba trade not key to econ

Suchlicki 4/12/13 (Jaime, Professor Suchlicki was the founding Executive Director of the North-South Center, and until 1992, Director of the University's Research Institute for Cuban Studies. He is currently the Latin American Editor for Transaction Publishers. Professor Suchlicki is the author of Cuba: From Columbus to Castro, now in its fourth edition, and Mexico: From Montezuma to NAFTA (1996). He is a highly regarded consultant to the private and public sector on Cuba and Latin American Affairs, “What if…the U.S. Ended the Cuba Travel Ban and the Embargo?”, http://devresearchcenter.org/2013/04/12/what-if-the-u-s-ended-the-cuba-travel-ban-and-the-embargo/)

Trade¶ All trade with Cuba is done with state owned businesses. Since Cuba has very little credit and is a major debtor nation, the U.S. and its businesses would have to provide credits to Cuban enterprises. There is a long history of Cuba defaulting on loans.¶ Cuba is not likely to buy a substantial amount of products in the U.S. Cuba can buy in any other country and it is not likely to abandon its relationship with China, Russia, Venezuela, and Iran to become a major trading partner of the U.S.¶ Cuba has very little to sell in the U.S.

#### Lifting the embargo won’t lead to FDI or solve the economy

Cott 3(T. Norman Van Cott (tvancott@bsu.edu) is a professor of economics at Ball State University in Muncie, Indiana. June 2003, <http://www.fee.org/files/docLib/vancott0603.pdf> “The U.S. Embargo on Cuba: A Red Herring” , nkj)

An erroneous assumption plagues the now decades-old debate about the U.S. embargo on Cuba. Debaters, both pro and con, take it as given that Cubans would be inundated with things American should the embargo be lifted. Nothing could be further from the truth. For left-liberal opponents of the embargo, the error probably traces to wishful thinking—it seems they always want to prop up communist regimes. For conservative supporters of the embargo, the position probably reflects knee-jerk anxieties about the United States’ being played for a fool.¶ Wishful thinking and anxieties aside, no people in a country can buy things from other countries unless they can sell things to them. Those with little to sell necessarily buy little. Economic deprivation never put Tom, Dick, or Harry at the head of the line to buy things, and so it is with countries. Countries earn their spot in line by being productive.¶ With or without the U.S. embargo, Cuba has little to sell others. Its economy is a textbook example of what happens when the lifeblood of economic progress—private property and voluntary exchange—are trashed. For over 40 years, Cuban natural resources and human talent have wallowed in a communist quicksand of perverse incentives. The U.S. embargo didn’t put Cuba at the back of the line, thank you. No, Marx, Lenin, and Stalin taught Castro all he needed to know to get there. The embargo issue is a red herring when it comes to Cuba’s ability to buy from other countries.¶ It’s true that economists teach that international trade makes countries more productive. Does this mean that the embargo cuts Cuba out of these gains? Not at all. Gains from international trade are themselves the result of private property and voluntary exchange. They occur as owners of resources respond to price and profit signals implicit in world prices, thereby channeling the resources into areas of maximum national advantage. Cuba’s institutions prevent this.¶ What about U.S. capitalists’ funding a myriad of investment projects in Cuba if the embargo were abolished? Fat chance. Again, Cuba has a proven track record of hostility toward private property in general and foreign (especially U.S.) investment in particular. Capitalists have their own wealth on the line when funding new ventures. Only those bent on self-destruction would venture into a daunting situation like that of Cuba.¶ This is not to deny that numerous investment possibilities exist in Cuba. Why shouldn’t there be? The country has endured over 40 years of economic gobbledygook. But there is a deep chasm between potential investment projects and economically viable investment projects, a chasm made impassable in this case by Cuba’s intransigence when it comes to private property and voluntary exchange.

#### Competitiveness theory is flawed

**Porteous 6** 2/26, \*RUCE PORTEOUS is currently Head of Financial Risk with Standard Life Bank in Edinburgh, Scotland. He has a degree in Mathematical Statistics from Edinburgh University, Scotland, and postgraduate degrees, including a PhD, in Mathematical Statistics from Cambridge University, England, “The Coming Economic Collapse,” http://www.rense.com/general69/econm.htm, AJ

It has become popular by American politicians to blame China for the decline in America's production base. This is totally unfair, and shows both their ignorance and a failure to accept responsibility by the American leadership. Actually, it is through China being able to supply America with cheap consumer goods, and lend the capital to purchase these goods which has allowed the US to contain inflation, benefiting the American consumer. Germany, which is now the world's number one export nation and which has a wage structure higher than the US, has had to cope with a rising currency, but has still been able to expand its exports between 10-20% per annum, and continues to have an expanding large trade and current account surpluses. German manufactures also have to compete with their Asian competitors just as those from America, yet have a 160.5 billion trade surplus. So it would appear in the short-term, the loose monetary policies of America and Japan appear to have benefited everyone. Expanding the money supply has provided the capital to support the growth of the expanding Asian economies, especially those of India and China. Inflation (if you exclude property) has been contained (normally a consequences of a loose money policy) because of China and India being able to produce consumer goods and services cheaply for the global markets, preventing manufactures in the Anglo-Saxon economies from raising their prices.

#### Protectionism and mercantilism are inevitable

**Lincicome, 6/12** - international trade attorney with White & Case, LLP. senior trade policy adviser for Senator John McCain’s Presidential campaign. BA in Political Science from the University of Virginia and a JD from the University's School of Law. (Scott, “Is Missing American Trade Leadership Beginning to Bear Protectionist Fruit? (Hint: Kinda Looks Like It)”, JUNE 12, 2012, http://lincicome.blogspot.com/2012/06/is-missing-american-trade-leadership.html)/chm

Over the past few years, I and several other US **trade-watchers have lamented the U**nited **S**tates' **dwindling leadership on global trade** and economic issues **and** **warned of that trend's troubling potential ramifications**. It appears that at least one of our breathless predictions may finally be coming true. Starting **in** **mid-2009 -** when **it** **became** depressingly **clear that** the **Obama** administration **viewed trade in mostly political terms and thus would not be advancing a robust, proactive free trade agenda** - we free traders expressed grave concern that US recalcitrance could harm not only US companies and workers, but also the entire global free trade system. As I explained in a 2009 oped urging the President to adopt a robust pro-trade agenda (as outlined in this contemporary Cato Institute paper): Since the 1940s, the US has led the charge to remove international barriers to goods, services and investment. The result: a global trade explosion that has enriched American families, spurred innovation, enhanced our security and helped millions escape poverty. Every US president since Herbert Hoover has championed free trade because of its proven benefits.... Because of today's rules-based multilateral trading system and the interdependence of global markets, US fecklessness on trade shouldn't lead to devastating **protectionism** akin to the Smoot-Hawley-induced tariff wars of the 1930s. But **it's still a problem**. In 2008, global trade contracted for the first time since 1982, and **protectionist pressures abound**. The WTO's Doha Round is comatose, even though an ambitious deal could inject US$2 trillion into the reeling global economy. Considering **the US has steered every major trade initiative in modern history**, **any chance for significant progress on trade will disappear without strong American leadership** - in word and deed. Since that time, **the President** has clearly **not taken free traders' advice**. The WTO's Doha Round is dead, despite a pretty good opportunity to force the issue back in late 2010. The **Obama** administration **took three years to implement** already-**dusty FTAs** with Korea, Panama and Colombia and actually insisted on watering the deals down with new protectionist provisions in order to finally agree to move them. And while countries around the world are signing new trade agreements left and right, we've signed exactly zero and have eschewed important new participants and demanded absurd domestic protectionism in the one agreement that we are negotiating (the TPP). Meanwhile, on the home front the President has publicly championed mercantilism, as **his minions quietly pursued myriad efforts to restrict import competition and consumer freedom**, embraced competitive devaluation and maintained WTO-illegal policies (while publicly denouncing protectionism, of course). Pretty stark when you lay it all out like that, huh? Despite this depressing state of affairs, it did not appear that the United States' diversion from its long free trade legacy had resulted in a tangible increase in global **protectionism** (although the death of Doha certainly isn't a good thing). Unfortunately, a new blog post from the FT's Alan Beattie indicates that **those chickens may finally be coming home to roost**: One of the very few bright spots in governments’ generally grim recent performance of managing the world economy has been that trade **protectionism**, rampant during the Great Depression, **has been relatively absent. That may no longer be the case**. **The WTO**, fairly sanguine about the use of trade barriers over the past few years, **warns today that things are getting worrying**. The EU made a similar point yesterday. And this monitoring service has been pointing out for a long time that a lot of the new forms of protectionism aren’t counted under the traditional categories, thanks to gaping holes in international trade law. **After glancing at the bi-partisan protectionism on display in the** 2012 US **presidential campaign**, **Beattie** **concludes that**, on the global trade stage, "**things are looking scarier than they have for a while**." I'm certainly inclined to agree, and **one need only look** South **to Brazil's frighteningly rapid transition from once-burgeoning free trade star to economically-stagnant, unabashed protectionist** to see a scary example of why. And while I agree with Beattie that the world still isn't likely to descend into a 1930s-style trade war - we can thank the WTO and the proliferation of free market economics for that - **the rising specter of global protectionism is undoubtedly distressing.** And, of course**, it has risen just as America's free trade leadership has faded away**. Now, as we all know, correlation does not necessarily mean causation, and it's frankly impossible to know just how much **the dearth of US trade leadership** has actually affected global trade policies. But I think it's pretty safe to say that it **certainly hasn't helped matters**. Just ask yourself this: **how can the US admonish** Brazil or **any** other **country about its distressing mercantilism when the President is himself routinely preaching** - and his administration is busy implementing - similar policies? How can we decry the global "currency wars" when we're discretely advocating a similar strategy? How can we push back against nations' increasing use of market-distorting subsidies or regulatory protectionism when we're....

#### Trade is resilient.

**Chicago Tribune, ‘8** [“After Doha,” 8-9, http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/opinion/chi-0809edit2aug09,0,7859688.story]

Even people involved daily in ongoing international trade aren't reacting much differently. They're buying and selling goods across borders and oceans, dealing with the logistical complications of high oil prices, currency fluctuations, the price of labor, unit cost, quality control and the like. This doesn't mean that a successful completion of the Doha talks wouldn't have mattered. It's a big deal that for the first time in half a century, global trade talks have failed. The Doha talks—seven years in negotiation—would have slashed farm subsidies and further opened markets for manufactured goods and services. But with or without Doha, countries will continue to trade aggressively. The benefits and opportunities are just too great. International trade expanded from 40 percent of the world economy in 1990 to more than 55 percent by 2004, according to the World Bank. The fastest growing countries—among them China, Vietnam, Ireland—were those that expanded their trade. Countries left behind, including much of sub-Saharan Africa, traded the least. Even with the current slowdown in the international economy, the WTO predicts that trade will still grow 4.5 percent this year. (That will be down from 8.5 percent in 2006 and 5.5 percent last year.)

#### Trade doesn’t solve war.

**Gelpi & Greico, ‘5** [Christopher, Associate Professor of Political Science -- Duke, Joseph, Professor of Political Science -- Duke, “Democracy, Interdependence, and the Sources of the Liberal Peace,” Journal of Peace Research]

As we have already emphasized, increasing levels of trade between an autocratic and democratic country are unlikely to constrain the former from initiating militarized disputes against the latter. As depicted in Figure 1, our analysis indicates that an increase in trade dependence by an autocratic challenger on a democratic target from zero to 5% of the former's GDP would increase the probability of the challenger’s dispute initiation from about 0.31% to 0.29%. Thus, the overall probability of dispute initiation by an autocratic country against a democracy is fairly high (given the rarity of disputes) at 23 nearly .3% per country per year. Moreover, increased trade does little or nothing to alter that risk. Increases in trade dependence also have little effect on the likelihood that one autocracy will initiate a conflict with another. In this instance, the probability of dispute initiation remains constant at 0.33% regardless of the challenger’s level of trade dependence.

#### Turn – plan strengthens the regime, kills the economy, and undermines US influence in the region

Suchlicki ‘13 (Jaime, Emilio Bacardi Moreau Distinguished Professor and Director, Institute for Cuban and Cuban-American Studies, University of Miami, What If…the U.S. Ended the Cuba Travel Ban and the Embargo? 2/26/13, http://interamericansecuritywatch.com/what-if-the-u-s-ended-the-cuba-travel-ban-and-the-embargo/)

Lifting the ban for U.S. tourists to travel to Cuba would be a major concession totally out of proportion to recent changes in the island. If the U.S. were to lift the travel ban without major reforms in Cuba, there would be significant implications:

Money from American tourists would flow into businesses owned by the Castro government thus strengthening state enterprises. The tourist industry is controlled by the military and General Raul Castro, Fidel’s brother. American tourists will have limited contact with Cubans. Most Cuban resorts are built in isolated areas, are off limits to the average Cuban, and are controlled by Cuba’s efficient security apparatus. Most Americans don’t speak Spanish, have but limited contact with ordinary Cubans, and are not interested in visiting the island to subvert its regime. Law 88 enacted in 1999 prohibits Cubans from receiving publications from tourists. Penalties include jail terms. While providing the Castro government with much needed dollars, the economic impact of tourism on the Cuban population would be limited. Dollars will trickle down to the Cuban poor in only small quantities, while state and foreign enterprises will benefit most. Tourist dollars would be spent on products, i.e., rum, tobacco, etc., produced by state enterprises, and tourists would stay in hotels owned partially or wholly by the Cuban government. The principal airline shuffling tourists around the island, Gaviota, is owned and operated by the Cuban military. The assumption that the Cuban leadership would allow U.S. tourists or businesses to subvert the revolution and influence internal developments is at best naïve. As we have seen in other circumstances, U.S. travelers to Cuba could be subject to harassment and imprisonment. Over the past decades hundred of thousands of Canadian, European and Latin American tourists have visited the island. Cuba is not more democratic today. If anything, Cuba is more totalitarian, with the state and its control apparatus having been strengthened as a result of the influx of tourist dollars. As occurred in the mid-1990s, an infusion of American tourist dollars will provide the regime with a further disincentive to adopt deeper economic reforms. Cuba’s limited economic reforms were enacted in the early 1990s, when the island’s economic contraction was at its worst. Once the economy began to stabilize by 1996 as a result of foreign tourism and investments, and exile remittances, the earlier reforms were halted or rescinded by Castro. Lifting the travel ban without major concessions from Cuba would send the wrong message “to the enemies of the United States”: that a foreign leader can seize U.S. properties without compensation; allow the use of his territory for the introduction of nuclear missiles aimed at the United States; espouse terrorism and anti-U.S. causes throughout the world; and eventually the United States will “forget and forgive,” and reward him with tourism, investments and economic aid. Since the Ford/Carter era, U.S. policy toward Latin America has emphasized democracy, human rights and constitutional government. Under President Reagan the U.S. intervened in Grenada, under President Bush, Sr. the U.S. intervened in Panama and under President Clinton the U.S. landed marines in Haiti, all to restore democracy to those countries. The U.S. has prevented military coups in the region and supported the will of the people in free elections. U.S. policy has not been uniformly applied throughout the world, yet it is U.S. policy in the region. Cuba is part of Latin America. While no one is advocating military intervention, normalization of relations with a military dictatorship in Cuba will send the wrong message to the rest of the continent. Once American tourists begin to visit Cuba, Castro would probably restrict travel by Cuban-Americans. For the Castro regime, Cuban-Americans represent a far more subversive group because of their ability to speak to friends and relatives on the island, and to influence their views on the Castro regime and on the United States. Indeed, the return of Cuban exiles in 1979-80 precipitated the mass exodus of Cubans from Mariel in 1980. A large influx of American tourists into Cuba would have a dislocating effect on the economies of smaller Caribbean islands such as Jamaica, the Dominican Republic, the Bahamas, Puerto Rico, and even Florida, highly dependent on tourism for their well-being. Careful planning must take place, lest we create significant hardships and social problems in these countries. If the embargo is lifted, limited trade with, and investments in Cuba would develop. Yet there are significant implications.

### Leadership

**Multilateralism fails – organizations fail and exclusion of countries is inevitable – the US is not key**

**Gallagher 10 –** leading Australian consultant on trade and public policy (Peter, “Plurilateralism… get used to it,” 12/20/10, [http://www.petergallagher.com.au/index.php/site/article/plurilateralism...-get-used-to-it)//AY](http://www.petergallagher.com.au/index.php/site/article/plurilateralism...-get-used-to-it%29//AY)

Those Orga­ni­za­tions will go on. So will mul­ti­lat­er­al­ism. This week is only another reminder that col­lab­o­ra­tive man­age­ment of the global com­mons (peace, trade… pos­si­bly emis­sions) is, and always has been, very dif­fi­cult to achieve. The ‘one-world, one vision’ approach endorsed by the U.N. in its cur­rent form and backed for sixty years by the U.S. and Europe (chiefly) may be too hard to sus­tain for the next lit­tle while. Dur­ing the past decade, the veil of mul­ti­lat­eral col­lab­o­ra­tion thrown over the inner-workings of the U.N./Bretton-Woods man­age­ment frame­work has grown thin­ner and thin­ner. **There has always been a cer­tain amount of stiff-arming** behind the veil. But, with appro­pri­ate restraint—including by Japan—it worked for a long time to deliver effec­tive global col­lab­o­ra­tion. After this week, it will never be quite the same. But there’s no need for panic. It’s a shame but no emer­gency that a U.N. meet­ing turns out to be another expen­sive dud. Just relax and try to enjoy the ride. Enjoy the rich­ness of greater global diver­sity, for one thing. The extra­or­di­nary thing about this week in Copen­hagen is not what we didn’t see (an agree­ment on emis­sions) but what we *did* see, clearly for the first time. The veil of mul­ti­lat­er­al­ism has fallen long enough to show the world the present real­i­ties behind it. First, of course, the expen­sive, chaotic sham of 192 nations in at least as many lim­ou­sines, from Tuvalu to the United States, try­ing to agree on 1 text with at least 2 tar­gets lubri­cated by a $100billion bribe (that turned out to be only a $10billion i.o.u.) Sec­ond, and more impor­tant, The Pres­i­dent of the United States being intro­duced to a meet­ing to which he not been invited—*at which he did not even have a seat*—to nego­ti­ate a nar­row deal, sav­ing the appear­ance of col­lab­o­ra­tion, with Brazil, China, India and South Africa. To enter the room, Obama had to leave Europe and Japan out in the cold. He had to work out a deal with four giant economies that col­lec­tively hold quite a few mark­ers on the future of the global com­mons, but most of whom are by any mea­sure still poor coun­tries. The [account](http://bit.ly/8172r2) of this meet­ing is a vision of the global frame­work for col­lab­o­ra­tion now and in the next few decades. What we now have as a frame­work for global orga­ni­za­tion is a roil­ing, argu­men­ta­tive, pluri­lat­er­al­ism where alliances and coali­tions slip and slide along a dozen dif­fer­ent planes of inter­na­tional endeav­our. Farewell to the old two-handed back-room brawls and staged con­sen­sus of the *pax atlantica*. In the new frame­work broad, top-down ‘solu­tions’ like Kyoto’s tar­gets and the WTO’s ‘Sin­gle Under­tak­ing’ cannnot be made to work by a fly­ing visit from the U.S. Pres­i­dent or alter­nate hand-wringing and blus­ter from Brussels. The bad news—if you’d like the world to be a set­tled place ruled by, say, a benef­i­cent dic­ta­tor (oxy­moron) from Wash­ing­ton or even Beijing—is that ‘global gov­er­nance’ now becomes a tricky mat­ter of rec­on­cil­ing and align­ing many dif­fer­ent, prob­a­bly autonomous, or at best regional attempts to deal with the man­age­ment of global com­mons. **Guar­an­teed to be messy.**

#### No Middle East impact

Cook 7**—**CFR senior fellow for Mid East Studies. BA in international studies from Vassar College, an MA in international relations from the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies, and both an MA and PhD in political science from the University of Pennsylvania(Steven, Ray Takeyh, CFR fellow, and Suzanne Maloney, Brookings fellow, 6 /28, Why the Iraq war won't engulf the Mideast, http://www.iht.com/bin/print.php?id=6383265)u

Underlying this anxiety was a scenario in which Iraq's sectarian and ethnic violence spills over into neighboring countries, producing conflicts between the major Arab states and Iran as well as Turkey and the Kurdistan Regional Government. These wars then destabilize the entire region well beyond the current conflict zone, involving heavyweights like Egypt. This is scary stuff indeed, but with the exception of the conflict between Turkey and the Kurds, the scenario is far from an accurate reflection of the way Middle Eastern leaders view the situation in Iraq and calculate their interests there. It is abundantly clear that major outside powers like Saudi Arabia, Iran and Turkey are heavily involved in Iraq. These countries have so much at stake in the future of Iraq that it is natural they would seek to influence political developments in the country. Yet, the Saudis, Iranians, Jordanians, Syrians, and others are very unlikely to go to war either to protect their own sect or ethnic group or to prevent one country from gaining the upper hand in Iraq. The reasons are fairly straightforward. First, Middle Eastern leaders, like politicians everywhere, are primarily interested in one thing: self-preservation. Committing forces to Iraq is an inherently risky proposition, which, if the conflict went badly, could threaten domestic political stability. Moreover, most Arab armies are geared toward regime protection rather than projecting power and thus have little capability for sending troops to Iraq. Second, there is cause for concern about the so-called blowback scenario in which jihadis returning from Iraq destabilize their home countries, plunging the region into conflict. Middle Eastern leaders are preparing for this possibility. Unlike in the 1990s, when Arab fighters in the Afghan jihad against the Soviet Union returned to Algeria, Egypt and Saudi Arabia and became a source of instability, Arab security services are being vigilant about who is coming in and going from their countries. In the last month, the Saudi government has arrested approximately 200 people suspected of ties with militants. Riyadh is also building a 700 kilometer wall along part of its frontier with Iraq in order to keep militants out of the kingdom. Finally, there is no precedent for Arab leaders to commit forces to conflicts in which they are not directly involved. The Iraqis and the Saudis did send small contingents to fight the Israelis in 1948 and 1967, but they were either ineffective or never made it. In the 1970s and 1980s, Arab countries other than Syria, which had a compelling interest in establishing its hegemony over Lebanon, never committed forces either to protect the Lebanese from the Israelis or from other Lebanese. The civil war in Lebanon was regarded as someone else's fight. Indeed, this is the way many leaders view the current situation in Iraq. To Cairo, Amman and Riyadh, the situation in Iraq is worrisome, but in the end it is an Iraqi and American fight. As far as Iranian mullahs are concerned, they have long preferred to press their interests through proxies as opposed to direct engagement. At a time when Tehran has access and influence over powerful Shiite militias, a massive cross-border incursion is both unlikely and unnecessary. So Iraqis will remain locked in a sectarian and ethnic struggle that outside powers may abet, but will remain within the borders of Iraq. The Middle East is a region both prone and accustomed to civil wars. But given its experience with ambiguous conflicts, **the region has** also **developed an intuitive ability to contain its civil strife and prevent local conflicts from enveloping the entire Middle East.**

#### U.S. primacy isn’t key to peace---their data is flawed

Christopher Preble 10, director of Foreign Policy Studies at the CATO Institute, August 3, 2010, “U.S. Military Power: Preeminence for What Purpose?,” online: <http://www.cato-at-liberty.org/u-s-military-power-preeminence-for-what-purpose/>

Most in Washington still embraces the notion that America is, and forever will be, the world’s indispensable nation. Some scholars, however, questioned the logic of hegemonic stability theory from the very beginning. A number continue to do so today. They advance arguments diametrically at odds with the primacist consensus. Trade routes need not be policed by a single dominant power; the international economy is complex and resilient. Supply disruptions are likely to be temporary, and the costs of mitigating their effects should be borne by those who stand to lose — or gain — the most. Islamic extremists are scary, but hardly comparable to the threat posed by a globe-straddling Soviet Union armed with thousands of nuclear weapons. It is frankly absurd that we spend more today to fight Osama bin Laden and his tiny band of murderous thugs than we spent to face down Joseph Stalin and Chairman Mao. Many factors have contributed to the dramatic decline in the number of wars between nation-states; it is unrealistic to expect that a new spasm of global conflict would erupt if the United States were to modestly refocus its efforts, draw down its military power, and call on other countries to play a larger role in their own defense, and in the security of their respective regions.¶ But while there are credible alternatives to the United States serving in its current dual role as world policeman / armed social worker, the foreign policy establishment in Washington has no interest in exploring them. The people here have grown accustomed to living at the center of the earth, and indeed, of the universe. The tangible benefits of all this military spending flow disproportionately to this tiny corner of the United States while the schlubs in fly-over country pick up the tab.

#### US unilateral action is inevitable – ideology – committing to multilateralism in one instance doesn’t solve

**Bass 9** (James E Bass, Major, US Air Force, “Unilateral vs. Multilateral Engagement: A Scenario-Based Approach to Guiding America’s Future Foreign Policy,” Air Command and Staff College, Air University, p. 3-6, April 2009, http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA539615)

According to Stewart Patrick of the Center on International Cooperation, **America’s preference for unilateral engagement is explained by three inherent characteristics.** **First, a sense of “exceptionalism” that evolved from America’s founding principles has had major influence on US policy goals and engagement.**5 As a champion for liberal principles the US is motivated to cooperate with others to promote universal prosperity and security. Nevertheless, **American exceptionalism also motivates the US to protect its values, and avoid any engagement that might infringe upon its sovereignty**.6 In fact, America’s preoccupation with safeguarding sovereignty yielded a predilection for unilateralism throughout the 1900’s.7 Not until it attained great power status, did the US consent to multilateralism. Specifically, after World War II, the US employed multilateralism to rebuild a favorable international framework that would counter the strategic threat posed by the Soviet Union. The Cold War dominated foreign policy until the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991. During the Cold War period foreign policy was dictated by the executive branch and focused primarily on the threat of nuclear war. The President committed to multilateral agreements where it served national security.8 **Second, the system of checks and balances built into the US Constitution produced a separation of powers that limits the government’s ability to endorse multilateral commitments**. Specifically, two-thirds of the Senate must support a treaty for ratification to occur. **This construct makes it possible for political minorities to hinder multilateral engagement.**9 For example, during World War I the Republican-controlled Senate rejected US membership in the League of Nations despite President Wilson’s support.10 **Third, America’s current hegemonic status provides incentive to act unilaterally because multilateral engagement is based on rules and norms rather than power.** As a consequence, the weaker power is strengthened from the benefits of multilateral cooperation, while the stronger power endures the costs of restraint.11 For example, a given UN convention limiting freedom of action with regard to national instruments of power could severely hamper achievement of US strategic objectives putting vital interests at risk. On the same note, such a convention could embolden a weaker adversary to hold US interests at risk without fear of retribution assuming that the US will limit its response within the restraints of the convention. Here **it is helpful to note specific instances in which the three inherent characteristics aforementioned have guided US action on foreign policy issues**. To begin with, **the US has used military force without United Nations (UN) approval**. While the US did attain UN approval for coalition intervention to expel Iraqi forces from Kuwait, America’s frustrations with the impediments of multilateralism lead it to act without UN approval in the 1998 bombing of Iraq and the 1999 ousting of Serbian forces from Kosovo. **These interventions set a precedent for the future unilateral use of force**.12 Indeed, **the US demonstrated its most dramatic disregard for international institutions in March of 2003** when President Bush unilaterally issued Saddam Hussein an ultimatum despite a lack of UN support. While the US made an effort to gain UN authorization for the war in Iraq, there is little doubt that the administration had already determined its intended course of action prior to submitting the UN proposal for use of force in February of 2003. America’s praiseworthy efforts to gain UN support was a multilateral endeavor that initially suppressed anti-American sentiments.13 However, the “Bush Doctrine” and America’s failed efforts to restore stability in post-war Iraq proved US policy to be shortsighted resulting in international opposition to US policy and calling into question traditional east-west alliances.14 At the same time, the US has increasingly restricted support for UN peacekeeping operations since its failures in Somalia and Bosnia-Herzegovina.15 In addition to declining peacekeeping assistance, the US is also to blame, in part, for the shortcomings in UN effectiveness due to its neglectful financial provisions. In fact, the UN case is only one of several instances in which the US demonstrated a disregard for international institutions through its waning financial support during the 1990s.16 **The US has also shown disregard for multilateral cooperation on global security issues.** Regarding weapons of mass destruction (WMD) threats, the US Senate approved the Chemical Weapons Convention in 1997 only after insisting on exemptions that diluted its impact, and in 1999 the Senate weakened nonproliferation efforts and snubbed allies when it rejected the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.17 Also in 1999, the US upset international order by espousing support for a national missile defense (NMD) system that violated the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty. Risking global strategic stability, in 2001 the Bush administration pushed Moscow for modification of the ABM Treaty, and subsequently withdrew unilaterally in 2002 after failing to secure Russia’s cooperation.18 Yet another example of US indifference to multilateral cooperation with regard to WMD threats involves the 1972 Biological Weapons Convention (BWC). Ineffective due to the absence of a compliance scheme, international efforts to implement verification procedures were rejected by the Bush administration in 2001on the grounds that they did not coincide with US national interests.19 **US lack of interest in multilateral cooperation on global security issues extends beyond WMD threats**. For example, in 1997 the Clinton administration refused to sign the Ottawa Convention banning antipersonnel land mines. Despite the fact that the convention has been signed by 156 countries, the US still declines accession arguing that land mines are a critical component of its Korea strategy.20 Also in 2001, a draft UN convention to limit small arms trafficking was singularly opposed by the Bush administration’s insistence on curtailment of the conventions terms. The US was uncompromising on limits to civilian small arms ownership and advocated several other changes that weakened the draft convention.21 The US has held many countries to high standards on international issues such as human rights, technology transfers, antiterrorism, and narcotics interdiction, imposing punishment on those that fail to meet US standards.22 Nevertheless, the US has frequently been wary of taking on international commitments. For example, the US has declined to ratify the International Criminal Court and the UN conventions on the Rights of the Child and Elimination of Discrimination Against Women. While the US was a major contributor to the growth of multilateral free trade initiatives in the 1990s, such as the North American Free Trade Agreement and the World Trade Organization, it engaged in unilateralism to gain market concessions.23 **The US has also been reluctant to embrace conventions that address world-wide issues such as global warming**, evidenced by the Bush administration’s refusal to ratify the Kyoto Protocol on climate change in 2001.

#### Status quo solves Kashmir conflict

Tony Karon, Wednesday, Oct. 06, 2010, Why a Terrorist Strike on Europe Risks Geopolitical Meltdown, http://content.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,2023847,00.html

Drone attacks have reportedly been stepped up in the hope of disrupting that plot, allegedly revealed by a captured German of Afghan descent. **Following the Mumbai massacre**, carried out by the Pakistan-based jihadist group Lashkar-e-Taiba, **the U.S. had to work hard to restrain India from retaliating by bombing facilities in Pakistan used by the** various Kashmir jihadist groups **long cultivated by Pakistani intelligence — mindful of the danger that such an action could provoke a war between the nuclear-armed neighbors**. **But if Western cities were the target of a successful strike, it would be NATO that would be under pressure to respond**. Indeed, according to Bob Woodward's book Obama's Wars, Obama's National Security Adviser General Jim Jones told Pakistan's President Asif Ali Zardari that if Faisal Shahzad (the Pakistani-American sentenced to life imprisonment in New York City on Tuesday) had succeeded in his attempt to bomb Times Square last year, the U.S. "would [have] been forced to do things Pakistan would not like." Woodward wrote that retribution would entail the bombing of "up to 150 known terrorist safe havens inside Pakistan." If Jones' warning, as reported by Woodward, is to be taken seriously, it's not hard to deduce that a series of attacks in Europe that emanate from Pakistan would force a similar response.

#### human rights violations is an alt cause

**Burgsdorff, 9–** Ph. D in Political Science from Freiburg University, EU Fellow at the University of Miami (Sven Kühn von, “Problems and Opportunities for the Incoming Obama Administration”, March 2009 [http://aei.pitt.edu.proxy.lib.umich.edu/11047/1/vonBurgsdorfUSvsCubalong09edi.pdf)DF](http://aei.pitt.edu.proxy.lib.umich.edu/11047/1/vonBurgsdorfUSvsCubalong09edi.pdf%29DF)

In addition, the US needs to improve its international human rights reputation which was ¶ severely damaged by US engagements in Iraq and the treatment of prisoners in Guantanamo. The ¶ perception that the US does not do its utmost to fully respect international law is an issue that ¶ renders difficult joint efforts to make the UN a meaningful instrument for acting decisively against ¶ human rights violations.2¶ If the US wants to act more effectively in multilateral fora in general on ¶ human rights matters, Washington, as a matter of priority, needs to restore US credibility, thus ¶ making human rights a more defendable key priority in international relations. Together, the EU and ¶ US stand a far better chance of furthering democratic change and sustainable improvement of the ¶ living conditions in Cuba. It is also then that other foreign partners, notably from Latin America, ¶ could be more easily approached to engage on Cuba along commonly agreed upon agendas. A ¶ realistic scenario, however, has to consider that political change in Cuba will probably take longer¶ and most likely be preceded by economic reform measures coming from the regime itself. Foreign ¶ actors wishing to assist in this process in a meaningful manner, are well advised to pursue a long ¶ term, incentives-based approach to both the Cuban authorities and Cuba’s emerging civil society,¶ including the human rights defenders.

#### Normalized US-Cuban ties coming – solves the AFF

Gott ‘13

Richard Gott is a writer and historian. He worked for many years at the Guardian as a leader-writer, foreign correspondent and as the features editor. He is the author of Cuba: A New History, published by Yale University Press – Guardian – Feb 25th – http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2013/feb/25/cuba-us-ties-castro-raul

The mills of God grind slowly, yet they grind exceeding small. So it is with the history of Cuba, which has long moved forward at a barely observable speed. The announcement by Raúl Castro, aged 81, that he will retire in 2018 (after two terms in office), and that his likely successor as eventual president will be Miguel Diaz-Canel Bermúdez (now appointed vice-president), aged 52, suddenly catapults the half-century-old revolutionary process into new and unfamiliar waters.

By 2018, Fidel Castro, aged 86, long described as an ageing revolutionary, will likely be dead; so too will most likely be Cuba's revolutionary ally in Venezuela, Hugo Chávez. Barack Obama will also have left the scene, the last of nearly a dozen US presidents that the Cuban revolution has outlived. Cuba will then move forward at its customary glacial pace without any Castros at the helm and without any members of the revolutionary generation of 1959 that will by then have guided the country for nearly 60 years (the retiring vice-president, the revolutionary veteran José Ramón Ventura Machado, was born in 1930 and is 30 years older than his replacement). Four questions immediately pose themselves. What is the nature and character of the new leader? What will be his impact on the internal Cuban scene? What will be the future of the all-important economic relationship with Venezuela, which provides cheap oil in exchange for Cuban developmental aid (in terms of doctors, security advisers and sports instructors)? And how will a new Cuban leadership affect relations with the United States which has maintained an economic blockade of the island for the past half century? For supporters of the Cuban revolution, there are reasons to give optimistic answers to all four questions. Diaz-Canel may have an unfortunate physical resemblance to a Soviet-style Bulgarian apparatchik of yesteryear but he has proved to be a competent administrator and a genial party chief in two provinces, Villa Clara and Holguín. Plucked from relative obscurity to be the youngest ever member of the politburo, he has been minister of higher education and has recently taken on important foreign roles. With a background as a university professor and an enthusiastic cyclist, he has also served in the armed forces, a significant and necessary detail in the biography of a future leader. As a protégé of Raúl Castro, Diaz-Canel has been a supporter of the current programme to introduce market forces into some aspects of the economy and there is no reason to suppose that this would not continue. The list of reforms is impressive: the introduction of co-operatives outside the agricultural area; the creation of private farms and businesses; the sale of private houses and cars; and the availability of visas for foreign travel. For many people these reforms have not gone far enough, but the new mood of optimism in Cuba is palpable. Diaz-Canel has also been a strong advocate of the existing close relationship with Venezuela which will continue for the next six years under the likely Venezuelan presidency of Nicolas Maduro, the chosen successor of Chávez. So no change there either. An important feature of this relationship, aside from its economic benefits, is that Cuba is now respected and welcomed throughout the continent, not just with Venezuela's close ideological allies like Bolivia and Ecuador, but also with Brazil and Argentina. In this context it is now the US that is the odd man out. Indeed the most intriguing question now concerns Cuba's future relationship with the US. Many people have expressed the hope that Obama, with no re-election problem to worry about, might feel emboldened to make conciliatory noises towards the existing Castro government. Most people both in Cuba and in the US have begun to forget what the quarrel was all about. The road to a new friendship remains a possibility, yet one of the stumbling blocks has been the continued existence of a Castro in power. Under the terms of the Helms-Burton Act, imposed by the US Congress in 1996, the US cannot contemplate recognising a Cuban government in which one of the Castro brothers has a continuing role. By 2018, this will no longer be relevant. There seems little doubt that under a future President Diaz-Canel, Cuba would be able to forge a new and beneficial relationship with the US.

### Relations

**Alt causes to US-Cuban ties – Human Rights, Guantanamo, and Cuban exiles**

Hanson & Lee ‘13

Stephanie Hanson and Brianna Lee, Council on Foreign Relations, “U.S.-Cuba Relations”, 1/31/13 http://www.cfr.org/cuba/us-cuba-relations/p11113

What are the issues preventing normalization of U.S.-Cuba relations? Experts say these issues include: Human rights violations. In March 2003, the Cuban government arrested seventy-five dissidents and journalists, sentencing them to prison terms of up to twenty-eight years on charges of conspiring with the United States to overthrow the state. The Cuban Commission for Human Rights and National Reconciliation, a Havana-based nongovernmental group, reports that the government has in recent years resorted to other tactics besides prison --such as firings from state jobs and intimidation on the street-- to silence opposition figures. A 2005 UN Human Rights Commission vote condemned Cuba's human rights record, but the country was elected to the new UN Human Rights Council in 2006. Guantanamo Bay. Cuba indicated after 9/11 that it would not object if the United States brought prisoners to Guantanamo Bay. However, experts such as Sweig say Cuban officials have since seized on the U.S. prison camp--where hundreds of terror suspects have been detained--as a "symbol of solidarity" with the rest of the world against the United States. Although Obama ordered Guantanamo to be closed by January 22, 2010, the facility remains open as of January 2013, and many analysts say it is likely to stay in operation for an extended period. Cuban exile community. The Cuban-American community in southern Florida traditionally has heavily influenced U.S. policy with Cuba. Both political parties fear alienating a strong voting bloc in an important swing state in presidential elections.

**( ) Cuba doesn’t want close relations with the US**

French ‘13

Anya Landau French, Director of the New America Foundation U.S. – Cuba Policy Initiative, 2-10-2013, “Secretary Kerry: Will He or Won't He Take On Cuba?,” http://thehavananote.com/2013/02/secretary\_kerry\_will\_he\_or\_wont\_he\_take\_cuba

And, then there’s the Cuban government. As much as many in the Cuban government (particularly the diplomatic corps) want to reduce tensions with the United States and finally make real progress on long-standing grievances held by both sides, they aren’t desperate for the big thaw. Many U.S. analysts, including in government, speculate that this is because Cuba’s leaders don’t really want to change the relationship, that strife serves their needs better than would the alternative. That could be so, but there’s also a hefty amount of skepticism and pride on the Cuban side, as well. After so many decades and layers of what Cuba calls the U.S. blockade, Cubans are unwilling to have the terms of any ‘surrender’ dictated to them. In fact, they are bound and determined that there will be no surrender. They would argue, what is there to surrender but their government’s very existence, something the leadership obviously isn’t going to put on the table.

**Arizona law block US-Latin American ties:**

**blocks effective coop on global issues.**

Steinberg ‘10

(James B., Deputy Secretary of State, former Dean of the Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs at the University of Texas at Austin, Deputy National Security Adviser on the staff of the National Security Council, President and Director of Foreign Policy Studies at the Brookings Institution, affidavit filed in US v. Arizona, UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA, Case 2:10-cv-01413-NVW Document 6-1 Filed 07/06/10, <http://www.scribd.com/doc/33977183/U-S-v-Arizona-Exh-1-to-Motion-for-Preliminary-Injunction-Affidavit-of-James-Steinberg>)

55.If S.B. 1070, Arizona's attempt to set its own immigration policy in pursuit of "attrition through enforcement," were to go into effect, it would directly call into question the ability of the United States to speak with one voice at the international level on issues related to immigration and migration policy. Only the national government is in a position to accurately assess the impact of a policy such as S.B. 1070 on our overall foreign relations agenda and to balance the competing foreign relations considerations involved in the adoption and enforcement of such a law. When the United States incurs criticism of immigration law and policies adopted at the federal level, the United States is normally in a position to review the criticism and determine whether to defend the practices against attack or else to take appropriate action to modify its practices. The United States is also able to develop and implement immigration policy in anticipation of these and other foreign relations concerns. In this case, however, the policy being pursued has not been developed, nor would it be implemented, with sensitivity to the full range of foreign policy information and considerations available to the national government, and the United States is unable to calibrate its immigration and foreign policies to respond effectively to these claims. 56.If the several states were each allowed to pursue independent immigration enforcement policies such as the Arizona law, these serious concerns would be multiplied significantly, as the United States could be subjected to a cacophony of competing immigration enforcement priorities and agendas, with little regard for the sensitive diplomatic and foreign relations considerations that immigration policy addresses, and with an extreme adverse impact on the United States' ability to speak with one voice. 57.S.B. 1070 — and in particular the mandatory verification regime requirement — thus poses a risk of provoking retaliatory treatment against U.S. nationals by other states, and threatens ongoing adverse consequences for important and sensitive bilateral relationships with U.S. allies such as Mexico, for our regional relations in the western hemisphere, and for our global relations in regional and multilateral institutions. It is likely to hinder our ability to secure the cooperation of other states in efforts to promote U.S. interests internationally across a range of trade, security, tourism, and other interests unrelated to immigration. Finally, it is likely to undermine the United States' ability to engage effectively with the international community to promote the advancement and protection of human rights. Moreover, repairing such harm to international relations and U.S. stature in bilateral, regional and multilateral relationships after the fact can be extremely difficult.

**) Warming not real- recent temperatures show no increase**

Happer ‘12

(William is a professor of physics at Princeton. “Global Warming Models Are Wrong Again”, Wall Street Journal, 3/27/12, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304636404577291352882984274.html>)

What is happening to global temperatures in reality? The answer is: almost nothing for more than 10 years. Monthly values of the global temperature anomaly of the lower atmosphere, compiled at the University of Alabama from NASA satellite data, can be found at the website http://www.drroyspencer.com/latest-global-temperatures/. The latest (February 2012) monthly global temperature anomaly for the lower atmosphere was minus 0.12 degrees Celsius, slightly less than the average since the satellite record of temperatures began in 1979

**( ) Warming evidence skewed – urban heat island**

Evans ‘12

(David has a PhD in electrical engineering, worked from 1999 to 2006 for the Australian Greenhouse Office, an agency of the Australian government, designing a carbon accounting system- Financial Post, "Global Warming Theory Is Based on False Science.", 7 Apr. 2011, infotrac)

There are now several independent pieces of evidence showing that the earth responds to the warming due to extra carbon dioxide by dampening the warming. Every long-lived natural system behaves this way, counteracting any disturbance. Otherwise the system would be unstable. The climate system is no exception, and now we can prove it. But the alarmists say the exact opposite, that the climate system amplifies any warming due to extra carbon dioxide, and is potentially unstable. It is no surprise that their predictions of planetary temperature made in 1988 to the U.S. Congress, and again in 1990, 1995, and 2001, have all proved much higher than reality. They keep lowering the temperature increases they expect, from 0.30C per decade in 1990, to 0.20C per decade in 2001, and now 0.15C per decade—yet they have the gall to tell us "it's worse than expected." These people are not scientists. They overestimate the temperature increases due to carbon dioxide, selectively deny evidence, and now they conceal the truth. One way they conceal is in the way they measure temperature. The official thermometers are often located in the warm exhaust of air conditioning outlets, over hot tarmac at airports where they get blasts of hot air from jet engines, at waste-water plants where they get warmth from decomposing sewage, or in hot cities choked with cars and buildings. Global warming is measured in 10ths of a degree, so any extra heating nudge is important. In the United States, nearly 90% of official thermometers surveyed by volunteers violate official siting requirements that they not be too close to an artificial heating source. Global temperature is also measured by satellites, which measure nearly the whole planet 24/7 without bias. The satellites say the hottest recent year was 1998, and that since 2001 the global temperature has levelled off. Why does official science track only the surface thermometer results and not mention the satellite results?

**( ) Not anthropogenic – multiple warrants**

Spencer ‘12

(Roy, former NASA climatologist and author, “Ten Years After the Warming,” 2/26, <http://www.drroyspencer.com/2012/02/>)

As can be seen, in the last 10 years the estimated forcing has been the strongest. Yet, most if not all temperature datasets show little or no global-average warming recently, either in the atmosphere, at the surface, or in the upper 700 meters of the ocean. For example, here are the tropospheric temperatures up though a few days ago: So what is happening? You cannot simply say a lack of warming in 10 years is not that unusual, and that there have been previous 10-year periods without warming, too. No, we are supposedly in uncharted territory with a maximum in radiative forcing of the climate system. One cannot compare on an equal basis the last 10 years with any previous decades without warming. There are 5 possibilities for the recent cessation of warming which are most discussed: 1) cooling from anthropogenic aerosols has been cancelling out warming from more greenhouse gases 2) natural cooling from internal climate fluctuations or the sun is cancelling out the GHG warming 3) increased ocean mixing is causing the extra energy to be distributed into the deep ocean 4) the temperature ’sensitivity’ of the climate system is not as large as the IPCC assumes. 5) there is something fundamentally wrong with the GHG warming theory itself Of course, some combination of the above 5 explanations is also possible. The 1st possibility (aerosol cooling is cancelling out GHG forcing) is one of the more popular explanations with the climate modelers, and especially with NASA’s James Hansen. The uncertain strength (and even sign) of aerosol forcing allows the climate modelers to use aerosols as a tuning knob (aka fudge factor) in making their models produce warming more-or-less consistent with past observations. Using an assumed large aerosol cooling to cancel out the GHG warming allows the modelers to retain high climate sensitivity, and thus the fear of strong future warming if those aerosols ever dissipate. The 2nd possibility (natural cooling) is a much less desirable explanation for the IPCC crowd because it opens the door to Mother Nature having as much or more influence on the climate system than do humans. We can’t have that, you know. Then you would have to consider the possibility that most of the warming in the last 50 years was natural, too. Goodbye, AGW funding. The 3rd possibility (increased ocean mixing) is one of the more legitimate possibilities, at least theoretically. It’s popular with NCAR’s Kevin Trenberth. But one would need more observational evidence this is happening before embracing the idea. Unfortunately, how vertical mixing in the ocean naturally varies over time is poorly understood; the different IPCC models have widely varying strengths of mixing, and so ocean mixing is a huge wild card in the global warming debate, as is aerosol cooling. I believe much of past climate change on time scales of decades to many centuries might be due to such variations in ocean mixing, along with their likely influence on global cloud cover changing the amount of solar input into the climate system. The 4th possibility (the climate system is relatively insensitive to forcing) is the top contender in the opinion of myself, Dick Lindzen, and a few other climate researchers who work in this field. The 5th possibility (increasing GHGs don’t really cause warming) is total anathema to the IPCC. Without GHG warming, the whole AGW movement collapses. This kind of scientific finding would normally be Nobel Prize territory…except that the Nobel Prize has become more of a socio-political award in recent years, with only politically correct recipients. The self-flagellating elites don’t like the idea humans might not be destroying the Earth. The longer we go without significant warming, the more obvious it will become that there is something seriously wrong with current AGW theory. I don’t think there is a certain number of years – 5, 10, 20, etc. – which will disprove the science of AGW….unless the climate system cools for the next 10 years. Eek! But I personally doubt that will happen.

**Your authors are paid off and don’t use good data – oceans are resilient**

**Ridley, 10** (Matt, PhD, Zoology, visiting professor at Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory, June 15, 2010, “Threat From Ocean Acidification Greatly Exaggerated,” http://www.thegwpf.org/the-observatory/1106-matt-ridley-threat-from-ocean-acidification-greatly-exaggerated.html, Hensel)

Lest my critics still accuse me of cherry-picking studies, let me refer them also to the results of Hendrikset al. (2010, Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science 86:157). Far from being a cherry-picked study, this is a massive meta-analysis. The authors observed that ‘warnings that ocean acidification is a major threat to marine biodiversity are largely based on the analysis of predicted changes in ocean chemical fields’ rather than empirical data. So they constructed a database of 372 studies in which the responses of 44 different marine species to ocean acidification induced by equilibrating seawater with CO2-enriched air had been actually measured. They found that only a minority of studies demonstrated ‘significant responses to acidification’ and there was no significant mean effect even in these studies. They concluded that the world's marine biota are ‘more resistant to ocean acidification than suggested by pessimistic predictions identifying ocean acidification as a major threat to marine biodiversity’ and that ocean acidification ‘may not be the widespread problem conjured into the 21st century…Biological processes can provide homeostasis against changes in pH in bulk waters of the range predicted during the 21st century.’ This important paper alone contradicts Hoegh-Gudlberg’s assertion that ‘the vast bulk of scientific evidence shows that calcifiers… are being heavily impacted already’. In conclusion, I rest my case. My five critics have not only failed to contradict, but have explicitly confirmed the truth of every single one of my factual statements. We differ only in how we interpret the facts. It is hardly surprising that my opinion is not shared by five scientists whose research grants depend on funding agencies being persuaded that there will be a severe and rapid impact of carbon dioxide emissions on coral reefs in coming decades. I merely report accurately that the latest empirical and theoretical research suggests that the likely impact has been exaggerated.

**( ) Species can adapt – especially in tropical hotspots**

Wiley Sciences ‘12

(Citing research carried out at the University of Zurich led by Dr Richard Walters, David Berger now at Uppsala University and Wolf Blanckenhorn, Professor of Evolutionary Ecology at Zurich, “Newsflash: tropical species adapt to temperature changes,” <http://wattsupwiththat.com/2012/08/16/newsflash-tropical-species-adapt-to-temperature-changes/#more-69341>)

In the face of a changing climate many species must adapt or perish. Ecologists studying evolutionary responses to climate change forecast that cold-blooded tropical species are not as vulnerable to extinction as previously thought. The study, published in the British Ecological Society’s Functional Ecology, considers how fast species can evolve and adapt to compensate for a rise in temperature. The research, carried out at the University of Zurich, was led by Dr Richard Walters, now at Reading University, alongside David Berger now at Uppsala University and Wolf Blanckenhorn, Professor of Evolutionary Ecology at Zurich. “Forecasting the fate of any species is difficult, but it is essential for conserving biodiversity and managing natural resources,” said lead author Dr Walters. “It is believed that climate change poses a greater risk to tropical cold-blooded organisms (ectotherms), than temperate or polar species. However, as potential adaptation to climate change has not been considered in previous extinction models we tested this theory with a model forecasting evolutionary responses.” Ectotherms, such as lizards and insects, have evolved a specialist physiology to flourish in a stable tropical environment. Unlike species which live in varied habitats tropical species operate within a narrow range of temperatures, leading to increased dangers if those temperatures change. “When its environment changes an organism can respond by moving away, adapting its physiology over time or, over generations, evolving,” said Walters. “The first two responses are easy to identify, but a species’ ability to adapt quick enough to respond to climate change is an important and unresolved question for ecologists.” The team explored the idea that there are also evolutionary advantages for species adapted to warmer environments. The ‘hotter is better’ theory suggests that species which live in high temperatures will have higher fitness, resulting from a shorter generation time. This may allow them to evolve relatively quicker than species in temperate environments. The team sought to directly compare the increased risk of extinction associated with lower genetic variance, owing to temperature specialisation, with the lowered risk of extinction associated with a shorter generation time. “Our model shows that the evolutionary advantage of a shorter generation time should compensate species which are adapted to narrow temperature ranges,” said Walters. “We forecast that the relative risk of extinction is likely to be lower for tropical species than temperate ones.” “The tropics are home to the greatest biodiversity on earth, so it imperative that the risk of extinction caused by climate change is understood,” concluded Walters. “While many questions remain, our theoretical predictions suggest tropical species may not be as vulnerable to climate warming as previously thought.”

**Your authors are paid off and don’t use good data – oceans are resilient**

**Ridley, 10** (Matt, PhD, Zoology, visiting professor at Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory, June 15, 2010, “Threat From Ocean Acidification Greatly Exaggerated,” http://www.thegwpf.org/the-observatory/1106-matt-ridley-threat-from-ocean-acidification-greatly-exaggerated.html, Hensel)

Lest my critics still accuse me of cherry-picking studies, let me refer them also to the results of Hendrikset al. (2010, Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science 86:157). Far from being a cherry-picked study, this is a massive meta-analysis. The authors observed that ‘warnings that ocean acidification is a major threat to marine biodiversity are largely based on the analysis of predicted changes in ocean chemical fields’ rather than empirical data. So they constructed a database of 372 studies in which the responses of 44 different marine species to ocean acidification induced by equilibrating seawater with CO2-enriched air had been actually measured. They found that only a minority of studies demonstrated ‘significant responses to acidification’ and there was no significant mean effect even in these studies. They concluded that the world's marine biota are ‘more resistant to ocean acidification than suggested by pessimistic predictions identifying ocean acidification as a major threat to marine biodiversity’ and that ocean acidification ‘may not be the widespread problem conjured into the 21st century…Biological processes can provide homeostasis against changes in pH in bulk waters of the range predicted during the 21st century.’ This important paper alone contradicts Hoegh-Gudlberg’s assertion that ‘the vast bulk of scientific evidence shows that calcifiers… are being heavily impacted already’. In conclusion, I rest my case. My five critics have not only failed to contradict, but have explicitly confirmed the truth of every single one of my factual statements. We differ only in how we interpret the facts. It is hardly surprising that my opinion is not shared by five scientists whose research grants depend on funding agencies being persuaded that there will be a severe and rapid impact of carbon dioxide emissions on coral reefs in coming decades. I merely report accurately that the latest empirical and theoretical research suggests that the likely impact has been exaggerated.
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### Shunning

#### They justify any act—causes serial policy failure

Read 9 — Rupert Read, Reader in Philosophy at the University of East Anglia, 2009 (“The difference principle is not action-guiding,” Available Online at http://www.rupertread.fastmail.co.uk/The%20difference%20principle%20is%20not%20action%20guiding.doc, Accessed 04-15-2011)

There is a flaw in Utilitarianism that is one step beyond the problem mentioned above. It is a deeper, more ‘constitutive’ version of the ‘no stable rules’ problem. It is one of the most widely-touted serious flaws in Utilitarianism (at least, in Act Utilitarianism ) that it is ultimately not merely liable to defy our moral intuitions and produce social uncertainty, but is not action-guiding at all. Any course of action can be justified, given uncertainties about others’ reactions, other’s expectations, and so forth, with a good enough story to tell, and a long enough view of the consequences. Utilitarianism, in other words, never rules out any choice since it makes permissibility always depend on consequences in a manner that is in-terminable. When agents are act-utilitarians, they need to undertake an endlessly iterable process of trying to determine how they will react to one another’s actions.

This is a particular, very damaging version of the ‘calculation problem’ in Utilitarianism. How can we really calculate utility, when it depends upon the consequences of our actions, and these depend upon other people’s reactions to those? Gigantic, impenetrable co-ordination problems result.

#### Utilitarianism is morally monstrous—kill to save is never justified.

Kramer 11 — Nicholas Kramer, author of *Taking Responsibility for Empire—*a blog about American foreign policy, former associate investigator for an oversight & investigations committee in the United States Senate, 2011 (“Murdering Some to Save Others,” *Antiwar.com*, April 13th, Available Online at http://original.antiwar.com/nkramer/2011/04/12/murdering-some-to-save-others/, Accessed 04-15-2011)

In my ongoing quest to understand how morality and justice apply in a complex society, I have recently been watching a series of lectures on these topics available online from Harvard University’s Michael Sandel. Professor Sandel begins the series by posing two scenarios to his audience of Harvard undergraduates. In the first, Sandel suggests that a surgeon has a choice between saving five moderately injured patients at the cost of not saving one severely wounded patient, or saving the one at the cost of the five. When asked which choice they would make, by a show of hands the students almost unanimously indicate their preference for saving the most people possible. In Sandel’s second scenario, the choice is the same, but the surgeon must actually kill the one patient in order to save the rest (in this case, to harvest the vital organs necessary to keep the others alive). This time, not a single student supports the principle of saving the many at the cost of the one. Sandel then asks members of his audience to explain the apparent inconsistency in their collective logic; although these future leaders of our political and economic systems seem to have a very difficult time articulating their rationales, the difference between the scenarios is obvious, and the implications should be heartening to us all.

Murdering some people to save others is fundamentally immoral. When this principle is put before us in a hypothetical example such as Professor Sandel’s, it is easy to understand, even instinctual. I believe that, with the possible exceptions of serial killers, psychopaths, narcissists, and other outliers, the vast majority of people left to their own devices would not follow the cold calculations of utilitarianism to the extreme of murdering another person even if that action would benefit many others. I will leave it to the philosophers to determine why this is so, but most of us know such murders to be wrong and would not participate in them.

If that is the case, what then explains the recent line of “moral” reasoning expressed by liberals and neoconservatives alike in favor of the “humanitarian” bombing of Libya? There are only two explanations I can imagine: either the interventionists are among the outliers mentioned above, or there is something about murder by the state that allows people to circumvent their own innate moral instincts. During a recent discussion I had with a favorite college professor, he wondered how different our moral view of war would be if we had not developed the technology and mindset that allows for mass murder from afar. For instance, he asked rhetorically, “Would we really have gone into Hiroshima with broadswords and hacked to death 100,000 people of all ages, sizes, and shapes? Yet we dropped a single bomb on them, and those who lose sleep over that fact are considered so far out of the mainstream as to not be taken seriously.”

The simple and uncomfortable truth is that murder is murder, regardless of whether we do it with a 1,000-lb. explosive delivered via cruise missile or with a broadsword. As much as I would like to blame the pro-war liberals and neoconservatives for the horrors they support, the reality is that it is the state that allows and perpetuates the limitless destruction brought about by war in our name. The appeal of this destruction is so powerful that even people (such as Nicholas Kristof) who generally seem not to be mass murderers or overall “bad” folks can be seduced into blind support of absolutely immoral actions. If we accept that otherwise “good” people cannot be relied upon to maintain their moral principles when it comes to the actions of the state, the only way we can hope to inoculate ourselves against the temptations of state violence for “humanitarian” causes is to adopt a strictly non-interventionist foreign policy. I would not want to live in a society that condoned surgeons actively murdering some patients in order to save others; likewise, I despise and regret my implicit support for a government that murders Libyans to theoretically prevent the deaths of other Libyans. As heart-breaking as it is when people on the other side of the world kill each other, it is indeed better to save no one if that is the only way to avoid committing murder.

### Relations

#### Removing the embargo does not guarantee relations with Cuba

National Review, 09 – (Editors of the National Review, “Embrace Trade, Not Chávez”, National Review Online, APRIL 21, 2009, [http://www.nationalreview.com/node/227336/print)//SP](http://www.nationalreview.com/node/227336/print%29/SP)

This past weekend’s Summit of the Americas, in Trinidad and Tobago, was a carnival of platitudes and absurdities. As a “gift,” Venezuelan leader Hugo Chávez gave Pres. Barack Obama a radical-left history book written by Uruguayan author Eduardo Galeano. Nicaragua’s Daniel Ortega delivered a buffoonish anti-U.S. rant that lasted 50 minutes. Press coverage of the summit was dominated by talk of the Obama-Chávez meeting, the Ortega harangue, and the weakening of U.S. sanctions against Cuba. We are deeply skeptical of any U.S. rapprochement with Venezuela. Chávez is not simply a vulgar loudmouth; he is an authoritarian who has pulverized Venezuelan democracy, brutalized his political opponents, aided narcoterrorists in Colombia, and sought a partnership with Iran. According to the U.S. Treasury Department, the Chávez regime is guilty of “employing and providing safe harbor to Hezbollah facilitators and fundraisers.” As for Cuba, Obama himself continues to support the U.S. embargo. So do we. No, it has not toppled the Castro dictatorship, but it is a tool. Cuba will only liberalize when its rulers decide to liberalize. If and when they do, the embargo should be lifted. Until then, we see no reason to reward the Cuban government with a massive unilateral concession. We realize that farm-state politicians are eager for their constituents to gain access to the Cuban market. Their desire to end U.S. sanctions has nothing to do with Cuban freedom. Many of our libertarian friends argue that ditching the embargo would spur a loosening of Cuba’s economic and political controls. We wish it were that easy. Thus far, trading with the rest of the world has not persuaded Havana to hold free elections, release political prisoners, or even adopt Chinese-style economic reforms. What about “flooding” the island with American tourists? European and Canadian tourists have been swarming Cuba’s beaches and hotels for many years now. This has done nothing to ease political repression. Would lifting the embargo improve our image in Latin America? Perhaps, on balance, it would. But that alone is not a compelling reason to lift sanctions. Our Cuba policy should be designed to increase freedom for Cubans, not to curry favor among Latin governments that have neglected their democratic brethren in Castro’s island gulag. In his opening remarks to the summit, Obama proclaimed “a new chapter” of U.S. engagement with the Western Hemisphere — “based on mutual respect and common interests and shared values.” We hope that means Obama will pressure congressional Democrats to ratify the U.S.-Colombia free-trade deal, but we’re not holding our breath. His call for “a new chapter” in hemispheric relations was an implicit dig at the Bush administration. The conventional wisdom is that Bush “ignored” Latin America or was “disengaged” from the region. This charge is unfair. Among other things, the Bush administration played a key role in helping Brazil and Uruguay cope with the aftermath of the 2001 Argentine financial meltdown: It secured a $30 billion IMF package for Brazil and a $1.5 billion U.S. Treasury loan for Uruguay. Bush also signed free-trade pacts with Chile, Central America and the Dominican Republic (DR-CAFTA), Peru, Colombia, and Panama. He broadened “Plan Colombia” and provided valuable assistance to the Uribe administration in its fight against leftist guerrillas and right-wing paramilitaries. He launched the $1.4 billion Mérida Initiative to combat drug trafficking and crime in Mexico and Central America. And he championed a bold immigration plan that bitterly divided the Republican party and hurt his popularity among conservatives. In short, the idea that Bush ignored Latin America is bunk. There’s no question that the Bush administration shifted its focus after 9/11 — for obvious and understandable reasons — and that Latin America took a back seat to Afghanistan, Iraq, and other challenges. So far, President Obama has likewise spent far more time on the Middle East, Asia, and Europe than he has on the Western Hemisphere. Over the short term, Obama’s priorities in Latin America should be to aid the Mexican government in its bloody war against the drug cartels; to support Central American countries in their own struggles against violent crime (much of it fueled by gangs and drugs); to win congressional approval of the pending free-trade agreements with Colombia and Panama; and to enhance U.S. ties with Brazil, the region’s emerging giant. For now, at least, pursuing détente with Venezuela and Cuba would only be a fruitless distraction.

**The U.S. will stay self-absorbed – no improvement is possible without a change in politics**

**Farnsworth 2011 – vice president of the Council of the Americas and Americas Society** [Eric, “U.S.-Latin American Relations: From Here to Where?”, tApril 12, 2011, <http://www.as-coa.org/articles/us-latin-american-relations-here-where//cc>]

Washington will continue to be self-consumed and self-absorbed, limiting the ability and the desire of the United States to project influence abroad or to take on additional priorities outside the immediate political environment. Domestic politics will prevail. This has profound implications for U.S. relations with Latin America, particularly a Latin America that is newly empowered through economic growth to determine a different future.

Of course, Latin America is not homogeneous. It makes little sense to discuss the region en toto given the differences between Argentina and Guatemala or Haiti and Chile. The countries of the region are different, and therefore policies must be designed to take account of current realties on the ground. U.S. relations with Brazil are fundamentally different from U.S. relations with Venezuela or Colombia.

What is similar is the way that U.S. policies that are essentially domestic in nature affect the individual and diverse countries of the region. For example, immigration reform is more directly related to U.S. relations with Mexico, Central America, and the Caribbean; nonetheless, a lack of immigration reform also affects growing migrant communities from Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Peru, and Venezuela. Trade relations, another sensitive political issue domestically, also affect the region as a whole. **The inability to pass and implement pending agreements with Colombia and Panama** **or to abide by** the terms of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) provisions on cross-border trucking, **as well as Buy America** provisions in the stimulus package, a lack of progress to conclude the Doha Development Round of the World Trade Organization, and the moribund Free Area of the Americas, affect all Latin American countries by calling into question the ability of the United States to provide needed leadership on trade. Instead, regional trade agreements with other partners have proliferated, arguably making the conduct of trade relations in the hemisphere more complicated. Finally, security assistance is also at issue because of domestic priorities given spending constraints that affect the continued implementation of the Merida Initiative and assistance for the Caribbean Basin, Plan Colombia, and ongoing programs across the region.

Where do these issues stand? Given the November election results, comprehensive **immigration reform will not occur in the near term**. Trade relations are uncertain, depending on whether the White House will seek to push the Colombia and Panama agreements over the objections of its important labor constituency. Spending will be cut, affecting foreign aid and the ability to promote the Administration’s social agenda in the hemisphere. At this point, the United States is not in a position to “bear any burden” in the hemisphere, as says John F. Kennedy’s famous phrase.

As a result, Washington needs to take a step back and consider what its core interests are in the Americas and how best to promote them. The region has advanced considerably in the past decade at the same time that the tools available for use by the United States have diminished and interest in the region from nontraditional parties including China has increased exponentially. The game is changing. The question now is, how should Washington react?

**Snowden could crush any chances at diplomacy and cooperation**

**Llorente, June 24, 2013** [Elizabeth, “Edward Snowden Scandal Could Create A Rift In U.S.-Latin American Relations”, http://latino.foxnews.com/latino/politics/2013/06/24/edward-snowden-could-be-political-weapon-for-ecuador-against-us/#ixzz2XMlCZFdq//cc]

What has become a nightmare for the U.S. government could be a godsend to nations, such as Ecuador, that welcome opportunities to shame the superpower, experts said.

The foreign minister of **Ecuador** – a country that has cracked down on government critics and journalists under President Rafael Correa -- said that the South American nation **is considering granting asylum to** former U.S., National Security Agency contractor **Edward Snowden, wanted in the U.S. for revealing state secrets.**

Snowden has been on the run since he revealed that the United States has collected data on the telephone calls and emails of its citizens. The United States has filed espionage charges against the 29-year-old Snowden, and is demanding his extradition.

At a press conference on Monday, Ecuador Foreign Minister Ricardo Patiño said his nation’s decision to give consideration to Snowden’s asylum request "has to do with freedom of expression and with the security of citizens around the world."

Patiño said weighing asylum for Snowden was more important than whatever ramifications it would face in U.S.-Ecuador relations. Ecuador has allowed Wikileaks founder Julian Assange, to whom it granted political asylum, to remain at its embassy in London for months. “Ecuador puts its principles above its economic interests,” Patiño said.

**Experts on U.S.-Latin America relations said Ecuador is being opportunistic in taking a shot at the U.S.**

“**The chance to needle the United States is almost too irresistible**,” said Michael Shifter, president of the Inter-American Dialogue, a political think tank in Washington D.C.

“This is a tremendous temptation for countries like Ecuador, Cuba and Venezuela. It’s a way they can expose double standards, hypocrisy, a way to say 'the U.S. criticizes us because of clamping down on the press, but look at what the U.S. is doing.’”

Various published reports said that Snowden, who had been in Hong Kong, then traveled to Russia, was to leave for Havana on Monday. But he was not on the flight that was expected to take him to Cuba.

Reports said that he was going to go to Cuba, then Venezuela and possibly end up in Ecuador with hope of receiving asylum and being allowed to live there. Now reports say Snowden may travel to Cuba on Tuesday.

Political leaders in Cuba and Venezuela routinely have harsh words for the United States; former Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez, who died earlier this year, bolstered his international standing among nations that are adversaries of the United States by condemning and often mocking U.S. officials.

Chavez's successor, Nicolas Maduro, has continued the anti-U.S. barbs, even going so far as to accuse the United States of being somehow involved in the death of Hugo Chavez.

Cuban leader Fidel Castro, whose brother Raul succeeded him as president after he fell ill, often assailed U.S. lawmakers and said the U.S.-Cuba embargo amounted to terrorism.

**Cuba has no diplomatic relations with the United States**, and Havana airport officials often do not stamp traveling documents of Americans who go there in violation of the U.S. embargo and travel restrictions.

**Snowden's fate may rest with one of these countries willing to take the political risk and open their doors to him.**

“He [Snowden] doesn’t have a lot of choices,” said Robert Anello, a New York attorney who handles extradition cases and white collar crimes. “He’s a political hot potato for other countries. My sense is that it wasn’t his decision to leave Hong Kong. He’s left with those countries that see something to be gained from the political points he can offer them right now.”

**And although Cuba and Venezuela may allow him in temporarily, and aid in his transport, they too may not be willing to offer him refuge and deal with long-term consequences**, experts said.

Officials of both nations have been in recent talks with U.S. officials about improving aspects of their relations.

Cuba and the United States have been discussing direct mail service, as well as their migration policies.

And U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry, on his first trip to Latin America since taking office, met with Venezuela's foreign minister Elías José Jaua earlier this month to discuss restoring ambassador-level relations and ending more than a decade of steadily deteriorating ties.

Kerry said he was hopeful that a rapprochement could be achieved. The meeting, which came at Venezuela's request, took place just hours after Venezuela released from prison an American filmmaker who had been jailed on espionage charges, removing an immediate irritant in the relationship.

“**If Snowden came to Venezuela, they would not hand him over to the United States, they would give him safe haven**,” said David Smilde, a researcher with the Washington Office on Latin America, a political think tank.

“But **if they gave him [permanent] safe haven, that would seriously harm improved relations**.”

Some U.S. lawmakers assailed Snowden for seeking refuge in countries that are sworn enemies of the United States.

“**It would not be surprising if the NSA leaker finds safe haven in Cuba or Venezuela, two regimes that have a longstanding history of giving refuge to fugitives from U.S. law**," said U.S. Rep. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen in a statement. "Let us not forget that Phillip Agee, former CIA agent, leaked classified information about CIA personnel and fled the U.S. to seek refuge until he passed away in 2008 in Cuba."

"The cruel irony is that there are no press freedoms in either Cuba or Venezuela, yet Snowden who supposedly stands for transparency in government seeks refuge in police states like these two countries," the congresswoman said. "Those who misrule over Cuba and Venezuela, Raul Castro and Nicolas Maduro, do not allow independent free press, do not cooperate on terrorism related issues, disregard due process and an independent judicial system."

Kerry, indeed, warned about serious consequences for any nation that gives Snowden asylum or aids in his transport and evasion of extradition.

Giving Snowden support, said Shifter of the Inter-American Dialogue, would not do much to bolster the popularity of Raul Castro or Correa inside their own nations.

Correa, in particular, already is very popular in his country, having won reelection by a landslide.

“It’s basically about taking on a cause that puts the United States, from their point of view, in a questionable light,” he said. “And it’s trying to associated themselves with what they see as heroes, whistleblowers.”

That said, however, Smilde argued that the United States itself may not want to keep a bright spotlight on the Snowden saga for the long-run.

**“Right now there’s a lot of bravado,” said Smilde in a telephone interview from Caracas, where he is conducting research. “Once he gets safe passage, given asylum by some country, this will die down.”**

Plus, one must remember that the U.S. State Department is also walking a political tightrope right now, considering the damaging information Snowden revealed.

**“This is not flattering to the United States**,” said Smilde. **“It defends democracy all over the world, and here is someone who has revealed extensive surveillance by the U.S. government of its citizens. They’ll want this to go away.”**

**Cuba will crack down and tank relations in response**

**Cave, 12** – NYT correspondent (Damien, “Easing of Restraints in Cuba Renews Debate on U.S. Embargo”, November 19, 2012 http://www.nytimes.com/2012/11/20/world/americas/changes-in-cuba-create-support-for-easing-embargo.html?pagewanted=all&\_r=0)//eek

**Any easing would be a gamble. Free enterprise may not necessarily lead to the embargo’s goal of free elections, especially because Cuba has said it wants to replicate the paths of Vietnam and China, where the loosening of economic restrictions has not led to political change**. Indeed, **Cuban officials have become adept at using previous American efforts to soften the embargo to their advantage, taking a cut** of dollars converted into pesos **and marking up the prices at state-owned stores.** And **Cuba has a long history of tossing ice on warming relations. The latest example is the jailing of Alan Gross**, a State Department contractor who has spent nearly three years behind bars for distributing satellite telephone equipment to Jewish groups in Havana. Too many alt causes to relations **Hanson 9** - associate director and coordinating editor for the website of the Council on Foreign Relations (Stephanie, “U.S.-Cuba Relations”, 4-14, Council on Foreign Relations, [http://gees.org/documentos/Documen-03412.pdf)//](http://gees.org/documentos/Documen-03412.pdf%29//) ID **What is** **the main irritant in U.S.-Cuban relations**? **A fundamental incompatibility of political views, experts say.** **While experts say the United States wants regime change, "the most important objective of the Cuban government is to remain in power at all costs,"** says Felix Martin, an assistant professor at Florida International University's Cuban Research Institute. Fidel Castro has been an inspiration for Latin American leftists such as Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez and Bolivian President Evo Morales, who have challenged U.S. policy in the region. **What are the issues preventing normalization of U.S.-Cuba relations**? Experts say the issues preventing normalization of U.S.-Cuba relations include the following: • **Human rights violations**. In March 2003, the Cuban government arrested seventy-five dissidents and journalists, sentencing them to prison terms of up to twenty-eight years on charges of conspiring with the United States to overthrow the state. The Cuban Commission for Human Rights and National Reconciliation, a Havana-based nongovernmental group, reports that the government has in recent years resorted to other tactics--such as firings from state jobs and intimidation on the street--besides prison to silence opposition figures. A 2005 UN Human Rights Commission vote condemned Cuba's human rights record, but the country was elected to the new UN Human Rights Council in 2006. • **Guantanamo Bay**. Cuba indicated after 9/11 that it would not object if the United States brought prisoners to Guantanamo Bay. However, experts such as Sweig say **Cuban officials have** since **seized on the U.S. prison camp--where hundreds of terror suspects have been detained without recourse to trial--as a "symbol of solidarity"** with the rest of the world **against the United States**. Obama has ordered a review of U.S. policy on Guanatanamo Bay. • Cuban exile community. **The Cuban-American community in southern Florida has traditionally strongly influenced U.S. policy with Cuba. Both political parties fear alienating what is seen as a strong voting bloc in an important swing state in presidential elections**. Though the Bush admi nistration's tightened travel restrictions upset many Cuban-Americans, **hard-line Cuban exiles still lobby for regime change**.

### No warming impact

#### **Warming does not cause extinction – their models are flawed**

Stockwell 11 – David Stockwell 11, Researcher at the San Diego Supercomputer Center, Ph.D. in Ecosystem Dynamics from the Australian National University, developed the Genetic Algorithm for Rule-set Production system making contributions modeling of invasive species, epidemiology of human diseases, the discovery of new species, and effects on species of climate change, April 21, 2011, “Errors of Global Warming Effects Modeling,” online: <http://landshape.org/enm/errors-of-global-warming-effects-modeling/>

Predictions of massive species extinctions due to AGW came into prominence with a January 2004 paper in Nature called Extinction Risk from Climate Change by Chris Thomas et al.. They made the following predictions: ¶ “we predict, on the basis of mid-range climate-warming scenarios for 2050, that 15â€“37% of species in our sample of regions and taxa will be â€˜committed to extinctionâ€™.¶ Subsequently, three communications appeared in Nature in July 2004. Two raised technical problems, including one by the eminent ecologist Joan Roughgarden. Opinions raged from “Dangers of Crying Wolf over Risk of Extinctions” concerned with damage to conservationism by alarmism, through poorly written press releases by the scientists themselves, and Extinction risk [press] coverage is worth the inaccuracies stating “we believe the benefits of the wide release greatly outweighed the negative effects of errors in reporting”.¶ Among those believing gross scientific inaccuracies are not justified, and such attitudes diminish the standing of scientists, I was invited to a meeting of a multidisciplinary group of 19 scientists, including Dan Bodkin from UC Santa Barbara, mathematician Matt Sobel, Craig Loehle and others at the Copenhagen base of BjÃ¸rn Lomborg, author of The Skeptical Environmentalist. This resulted in Forecasting the Effects of Global Warming on Biodiversity published in 2007 BioScience. We were particularly concerned by the cavalier attitude to model validations in the Thomas paper, and the field in general: ¶ Of the modeling papers we have reviewed, only a few were validated. Commonly, these papers simply correlate present distribution of species with climate variables, then replot the climate for the future from a climate model and, finally, use one-to-one mapping to replot the future distribution of the species, without any validation using independent data. Although some are clear about some of their assumptions (mainly equilibrium assumptions), readers who are not experts in modeling can easily misinterpret the results as valid and validated. For example, Hitz and Smith (2004) discuss many possible effects of global warming on the basis of a review of modeling papers, and in this kind of analysis the unvalidated assumptions of models would most likely be ignored.¶ The paper observed that few mass extinctions have been seen over recent rapid climate changes, suggesting something must be wrong with the models to get such high rates of extinctions. They speculated that species may survive in refugia, suitable habitats below the spatial scale of the models.¶ Another example of an unvalidated assumptions that could bias results in the direction of extinctions, was described in chapter 7 of my book Niche Modeling.¶ When climate change shifts a species’ niche over a landscape (dashed to solid circle) the response of that species can be described in three ways: dispersing to the new range (migration), local extirpation (intersection), or expansion (union). Given the probability of extinction is correlated with range size, there will either be no change, an increase (intersection), or decrease (union) in extinctions depending on the dispersal type. Thomas et al. failed to consider range expansion (union), a behavior that predominates in many groups. Consequently, the methodology was inherently biased towards extinctions.¶ One of the many errors in this work was a failure to evaluate the impact of such assumptions.¶ The prevailing view now, according to Stephen Williams, coauthor of the Thomas paper and Director for the Center for Tropical Biodiversity and Climate Change, and author of such classics as “Climate change in Australian tropical rainforests: an impending environmental catastrophe”, may be here.¶ Many unknowns remain in projecting extinctions, and the values provided in Thomas et al. (2004) should not be taken as precise predictions. … Despite these uncertainties, Thomas et al. (2004) believe that the consistent overall conclusions across analyses establish that anthropogenic climate warming at least ranks alongside other recognized threats to global biodiversity. ¶ So how precise are the figures? Williams suggests we should just trust the beliefs of Thomas et al. — an approach referred to disparagingly in the forecasting literature as a judgmental forecast rather than a scientific forecast (Green & Armstrong 2007). These simple models gloss over numerous problems in validating extinction models, including the propensity of so-called extinct species quite often reappear. Usually they are small, hard to find and no-one is really looking for them.

#### **b) long time frame and adaptation solves**

Mendelsohn 9 – Robert O. Mendelsohn 9, the Edwin Weyerhaeuser Davis Professor, Yale School of Forestry and Environmental Studies, Yale University, June 2009, “Climate Change and Economic Growth,” online: http://www.growthcommission.org/storage/cgdev/documents/gcwp060web.pdf

#### These statements are largely alarmist and misleading. Although climate change is a serious problem that deserves attention, society’s immediate behavior has an extremely low probability of leading to catastrophic consequences. The science and economics of climate change is quite clear that emissions over the next few decades will lead to only mild consequences. The severe impacts predicted by alarmists require a century (or two in the case of Stern 2006) of no mitigation. Many of the predicted impacts assume there will be no or little adaptation. The net economic impacts from climate change over the next 50 years will be small regardless. Most of the more severe impacts will take more than a century or even a millennium to unfold and many of these “potential” impacts will never occur because people will adapt. It is not at all apparent that immediate and dramatic policies need to be developed to thwart long‐range climate risks. What is needed are long‐run balanced responses.

#### c) empirically disproven – scientific data and fossil record – *millions* of years of history are on our side

NIPCC 11 – the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change, an international panel of nongovernment scientists and scholars, March 8, 2011, “Surviving the Unprecedented Climate Change of the IPCC,” online: http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2011/mar/8mar2011a5.html

In a paper published in Systematics and Biodiversity, Willis et al. (2010) consider the IPCC (2007) "predicted climatic changes for the next century" -- i.e., their contentions that "global temperatures will increase by 2-4°C and possibly beyond, sea levels will rise (~1 m ± 0.5 m), and atmospheric CO2 will increase by up to 1000 ppm" -- noting that it is "widely suggested that the magnitude and rate of these changes will result in many plants and animals going extinct," citing studies that suggest that "within the next century, over 35% of some biota will have gone extinct (Thomas et al., 2004; Solomon et al., 2007) and there will be extensive die-back of the tropical rainforest due to climate change (e.g. Huntingford et al., 2008)."¶ On the other hand, they indicate that some biologists and climatologists have pointed out that "many of the predicted increases in climate have happened before, in terms of both magnitude and rate of change (e.g. Royer, 2008; Zachos et al., 2008), and yet biotic communities have remained remarkably resilient (Mayle and Power, 2008) and in some cases thrived (Svenning and Condit, 2008)." But they report that those who mention these things are often "placed in the 'climate-change denier' category," although the purpose for pointing out these facts is simply to present "a sound scientific basis for understanding biotic responses to the magnitudes and rates of climate change predicted for the future through using the vast data resource that we can exploit in fossil records."¶ Going on to do just that, Willis et al. focus on "intervals in time in the fossil record when atmospheric CO2 concentrations increased up to 1200 ppm, temperatures in mid- to high-latitudes increased by greater than 4°C within 60 years, and sea levels rose by up to 3 m higher than present," describing studies of past biotic responses that indicate "the scale and impact of the magnitude and rate of such climate changes on biodiversity." And what emerges from those studies, as they describe it, "is evidence for rapid community turnover, migrations, development of novel ecosystems and thresholds from one stable ecosystem state to another." And, most importantly in this regard, they report "there is very little evidence for broad-scale extinctions due to a warming world."¶ In concluding, the Norwegian, Swedish and UK researchers say that "based on such evidence we urge some caution in assuming broad-scale extinctions of species will occur due solely to climate changes of the magnitude and rate predicted for the next century," reiterating that "the fossil record indicates remarkable biotic resilience to wide amplitude fluctuations in climate."

### Econ

#### No cascading protectionism

**Ahearn, CRS International Trade specialist, 2009**

(Raymond, “The Global Economic Downturn and Protectionism,” 3-23, <http://www.policyarchive.org/handle/10207/bitstreams/19395.pdf>, DOA: 11-16-12, ldg)

There are a number of reasons why the threat of a return to protectionist, beggar-thy-neighbor policies could be vastly overstated. Unlike the 1930s, today’s global economy has several strong firewalls to prevent governments from raising trade barriers that result in a cycle of retaliation and counter-retaliation. These firewalls include more institutionalized obstacles to protectionism built into the WTO system, more policy instruments to address the economic slowdown, and a more interdependent and open world economy than existed in the 1930s. In addition, some in today’s media may tend to overstate the threat of protectionism by not always distinguishing between protectionist actions and protectionist pressures and/or by equating legitimate forms of protection with protectionism. The fact that there is ample room for increases in trade measures and barriers that are consistent with the rules and obligations of the WTO often may go unappreciated in some press coverage. These trade measures and barriers include increases in applied tariffs to bound rates, and imposition of countervailing and antidumping duties, so-called ‘defensive’ trade measures.4 Protection for limited periods of time and under prescribed conditions is built into the rules of the WTO as a political safety valve and as a recognition of the human and social costs that are associated with the often wrenching adjustments that accompany increased trade competition. Firewalls Against Protectionism WTO rules today serve to keep a lid on trade barriers of its 153 members through an elaborate set of mutual obligations and dispute settlement procedures. Unlike the 1930s when countries could impose higher trade barriers unilaterally without violating any international agreements or anticipating a foreign reaction, under today’s rules members can take their disputes to the WTO for settlement rather than engaging in reciprocal retaliatory actions. The fact that countries violating WTO obligations can face WTO-sanctioned retaliation helps constrain outbreaks of unilateral actions that could be mutually harmful.5 Pressures for protection are also dampened by a world economy that is much more interdependent and integrated than in the 1930s.6 Leading producers have become so international in their production operations and supply chains that they have developed a vested interest in resisting protectionism.7 Many industries that have faced import competition in the past – such as televisions and semiconductors—have found that international diversification or joint ventures with foreign partners are a more profitable way of coping with global competition than blocking goods at the border. In addition, many domestic industries have less incentive to ask for import restrictions because foreign rivals now produce in the domestic market, eliminating the benefits of trade barriers for domestic firms.8 Unlike the early 1930s, when governments took little responsibility for propping up financial institutions and were unable to pursue expansionary monetary policies due to fixed exchange rates under the gold standard, policymakers around the world today are adopting expansionary fiscal and monetary policies. These expansionary policies, in turn, have the capability of dampening protectionist pressures and demands that stem from job losses and related economic hardship with lower interest rates and increased expenditures on unemployment benefits and health care benefits.9 A related consideration is that today’s world economy is much more open than the world economy of the 1930s. Average tariffs on world trade have come down from the 50% range in the 1930s, to the 25% range in the 1980s, and to less than 10% today.10 Under these circumstances, it would require tremendous increases in protection to get the world back to anywhere near the conditions of the 1930s, although a major increase in tariffs (e.g. a doubling) would be disruptive even if it left tariffs well below the 1930s levels. Scorecard of Protective Measures To Date Empirical support exists for the view that existing legal, economic, and political firewalls are restraining today’s protectionist pressures. Most importantly, Pascal Lamy, the WTO’s Director General, reported in January 2009 that most WTO members have successfully kept domestic protectionist pressures under control “with only limited evidence of increases in trade restricting or trade distorting measures” taken during the last six months of 2008. This assessment was based on the first report of the WTO secretariat on the trade effects of the global economic crisis. The report found only “limited evidence” of an increase in tariffs, non-tariff barriers or trade-remedy actions by member countries, but noted that the most significant actions taken in response to the global crisis have involved “financial support of one kind or another to banks and other financial institutions and to certain industries, notably the automobile industry.”11 The WTO report notes tariff increases on selected products being implemented by India, Russia, Ecuador, and Ukraine. Countries adopting non-tariff measures include Indonesia (port of entry barriers) and Argentina (import licensing requirements). Argentina was cited for measures that attempt to boost exports of selected products. But the report indicates that there has been “no dramatic increase” in antidumping investigations in the second half of 2008 compared to first half of 2008, but raised the possibility of increased trade remedy actions in 2009.12 The World Bank, which has also been monitoring trade restrictions proposed and adopted since the beginning of the financial crisis, reached a conclusion similar to that of the WTO. Its initial report determined that there have been 47 trade restrictive measures imposed since the financial crisis began last summer, including 17 from G-20 countries, but that “these measures have probably had only marginal effects on trade flows to date.” In addition to the measures cited by the WTO, the World Bank report cited China’s import ban on various food products from the EU, and export subsidies provided by the EU, China, and India. Contrary to the WTO report, the World Bank report determined that “the number of antidumping cases (both investigations initiated and imposition of duties) surged in 2008.”13

#### Protectionism can never collapse interdependence

**Ikenson, CATO Trade Policy Studies associate director, 2009**

(Daniel, “A Protectionism Fling: Why Tariff Hikes and Other Trade Barriers Will Be Short-Lived,” 3-12, <http://www.freetrade.org/pubs/FTBs/FTB-037.html>, DOA: 11-16-12, ldg)

A Little Perspective, Please Although some governments will dabble in some degree of protectionism, the combination of a sturdy rules-based system of trade and the economic self interest in being open to participation in the global economy will limit the risk of a protectionist pandemic. According to recent estimates from the International Food Policy Research Institute, if all WTO members were to raise all of their applied tariffs to the maximum bound rates, the average global rate of duty would double and the value of global trade would decline by 7.7 percent over five years.8 That would be a substantial decline relative to the 5.5 percent annual rate of trade growth experienced this decade.9 But, to put that 7.7 percent decline in historical perspective, the value of global trade declined by 66 percent between 1929 and 1934, a period mostly in the wake of Smoot Hawley's passage in 1930.10 So the potential downside today from what Bergsten calls "legal protectionism" is actually not that "massive," even if all WTO members raised all of their tariffs to the highest permissible rates. If most developing countries raised their tariffs to their bound rates, there would be an adverse impact on the countries that raise barriers and on their most important trade partners. But most developing countries that have room to backslide (i.e., not China) are not major importers, and thus the impact on global trade flows would not be that significant. OECD countries and China account for the top twothirds of global import value.11 Backsliding from India, Indonesia, and Argentina (who collectively account for 2.4 percent of global imports) is not going to be the spark that ignites a global trade war. Nevertheless, governments are keenly aware of the events that transpired in the 1930s, and have made various pledges to avoid protectionist measures in combating the current economic situation. In the United States, after President Obama publicly registered his concern that the "Buy American" provision in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act might be perceived as protectionist or could incite a trade war, Congress agreed to revise the legislation to stipulate that the Buy American provision "be applied in a manner consistent with United States obligations under international agreements." In early February, China's vice commerce minister, Jiang Zengwei, announced that China would not include "Buy China" provisions in its own $586 billion stimulus bill.12 But even more promising than pledges to avoid trade provocations are actions taken to reduce existing trade barriers. In an effort to "reduce business operating costs, attract and retain foreign investment, raise business productivity, and provide consumers a greater variety and better quality of goods and services at competitive prices," the Mexican government initiated a plan in January to unilaterally reduce tariffs on about 70 percent of the items on its tariff schedule. Those 8,000 items, comprising 20 different industrial sectors, accounted for about half of all Mexican import value in 2007. When the final phase of the plan is implemented on January 1, 2013, the average industrial tariff rate in Mexico will have fallen from 10.4 percent to 4.3 percent.13 And Mexico is not alone. In February, the Brazilian government suspended tariffs entirely on some capital goods imports and reduced to 2 percent duties on a wide variety of machinery and other capital equipment, and on communications and information technology products.14 That decision came on the heels of late-January decision in Brazil to scrap plans for an import licensing program that would have affected 60 percent of the county's imports.15 Meanwhile, on February 27, a new free trade agreement was signed between Australia, New Zealand, and the 10 member countries of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations to reduce and ultimately eliminate tariffs on 96 percent of all goods by 2020. While the media and members of the trade policy community fixate on how various protectionist measures around the world might foreshadow a plunge into the abyss, there is plenty of evidence that governments remain interested in removing barriers to trade. Despite the occasional temptation to indulge discredited policies, there is a growing body of institutional knowledge that when people are free to engage in commerce with one another as they choose, regardless of the nationality or location of the other parties, they can leverage that freedom to accomplish economic outcomes far more impressive than when governments attempt to limit choices through policy constraints.

#### Trade resilient

**Suominen, German Marshall Fund transatlantic fellow, 2009**

(Katie, “A New Age Of Protectionism? The Economic Crisis And Transatlantic Trade Policy”, March, <http://www.gmfus.org/wp-content/blogs.dir/1/files_mf//galleries/ct_publication_attachments/BrusselsForum_Suominen_NewAge.pdf>, DOA: 11-16-12, ldg)

This paper makes three arguments. First, fears of an all-out trade war and spiraling protectionist backlash are exaggerated. There are a great many insurance policies in place to pre-empt anything akin to the beggar-thy-neighbor policies of the 1930s, including a solid multilateral system with bound tariffs and a credible dispute settlement mechanism, dozens of bilateral free trade deals with often deep tariff commitments, solid intellectual backing for free trade, well-organized export lobbies, and the unprecedentedly large stake that countries around the world have in the policies of their trading partners and the fortunes of the global trading system.

#### Cuba not key to US economy, democracy DA turns effective FDI, lifting embargo kills Latin American economies

Suchlicki 2k(JAIME SUCHLICKI is Emilio Bacardi Moreau Professor of History and International Studies and the Director of the Institute for Cuban and Cuban-American Studies at the University of Miami. He was the founding Executive Director of the North-South Center. For the past decade he was also the editor of the prestigious Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs. He is currently the Latin American Editor for Transaction Publishers and the author of Cuba: From Columbus to Castro (1997), now in its fourth edition, and editor with Irving L. Horowitz of Cuban Communism (1999). He is also the author of Mexico: From Montezuma to NAFTA (1998). He is a highly regarded consultant to both the private and public sector on Cuba and Latin American affairs. The U.S. Embargo of Cuba Jaime Suchlicki University of Miami June 2000 <http://www6.miami.edu/iccas/USEmbargo.pdf>, nkj) Note: The first line of the card is saying an aff argument and then refuting it.

Cuba is a potential economic bonanza for U.S. companies.

Given Cuba’s scant foreign exchange, its ability to buy U.S. products remains very limited. Cuba’s major exports, i.e. sugar, tobacco, nickel, citrus, are neither economically nor strategically important to the United States. Lifting the embargo would create severe market distortions in the already precarious economies of the Caribbean and Central America since the U.S. would have to divert some portion of the existing sugar quota away from these countries to accommodate Cuba. The impact of tourism diversion toward Cuba would profoundly hurt the economies of the Caribbean and Central American countries. Cuba, cited as one of the worst political and commercial risks in the world by several recently issued country risk guides, lags far behind China and Vietnam in establishing the necessary conditions for economic development and successful corporate involvement. Current foreign investments are small and limited to dollar sectors of the economy such as the tourist industry and mining. American companies are not “losing out.” In a free Cuba, U.S. companies will quickly regain the prominent role they held in pre-Castro Cuba.

**Extend Gallagher – mulilat fails**

**a. no coop – differences in particular regions and differentces in states’ interests**

**b. timeframe issue – multilateral institutions empirically don’t respond to security threats quick enough**

**c. mistrust – when states cooperate they have ideological differences and therefore structurally cannot resolve conflicts**

**No evidence that says that US involvement in multilaterial institutions is key to solvency – the UN should be trying to solve all of their impacts in the status quo – the fact that the issues still exist proves the failure of multilat**

**Multilat doesn’t solve anything – assumes every single one of their warrants – star this card**

Held et al, 13 – Master of University College and Professor of Politics and International Relations, at the University of Durham, and Director of Polity Press and General Editor of Global Policy (David, “Gridlock: the growing breakdown of global cooperation,” ProQuest, 5/24/2013, http://search.proquest.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/docview/1355105016) // MS

Economic and political shifts in large part attributable to the successes of the post-war multilateral order are now amongst the factors grinding that system into gridlock. The Doha round of trade negotiations is deadlocked, despite eight successful multilateral trade rounds before it. Climate negotiators have met for two decades without finding a way to stem global emissions. The UN is paralyzed in the face of growing insecurities across the world, the latest dramatic example being Syria. Each of these phenomena could be treated as if it was independent, and an explanation sought for the peculiarities of its causes. Yet, such a perspective would fail to show what they, along with numerous other instances of breakdown in international negotiations, have in common. Global cooperation is gridlocked across a range of issue areas. The reasons for this are not the result of any single underlying causal structure, but rather of several underlying dynamics that work together. Global cooperation today is failing not simply because it is very difficult to solve many global problems - indeed it is - but because previous phases of global cooperation have been incredibly successful, producing unintended consequences that have overwhelmed the problem-solving capacities of the very institutions that created them. It is hard to see how this situation can be unravelled, given failures of contemporary global leadership, the weaknesses of NGOs in converting popular campaigns into institutional change and reform, and the domestic political landscapes of the most powerful countries. A golden era of governed globalization In order to understand why gridlock has come about it is important to understand how it was that the post-Second World War era facilitated, in many respects, a successful form of 'governed globalization' that contributed to relative peace and prosperity across the world over several decades. This period was marked by peace between the great powers, although there were many proxy wars fought out in the global South. This relative stability created the conditions for what now can be regarded as an unprecedented period of prosperity that characterized the 1950s onward. Although it is by no means the sole cause, the UN is central to this story, helping to create conditions under which decolonization and successive waves of democratization could take root, profoundly altering world politics. While the economic record of the postwar years varies by country, many experienced significant economic growth and living standards rose rapidly across significant parts of the world. By the late 1980s a variety of East Asian countries were beginning to grow at an unprecedented speed, and by the late 1990s countries such as China, India and Brazil had gained significant economic momentum, a process that continues to this day. Meanwhile, the institutionalization of international cooperation proceeded at an equally impressive pace. In 1909, 37 intergovernmental organizations existed; in 2011, the number of institutions and their various off-shoots had grown to 7608 (Union of International Associations 2011). There was substantial growth in the number of international treaties in force, as well as the number of international regimes, formal and informal. At the same time, new kinds of. Postwar institutions created the conditions under which a multitude of actors could benefit from forming multinational companies, investing abroad, developing global production chains, and engaging with a plethora of other social and economic processes associated with globalization. These conditions, combined with the expansionary logic of capitalism and basic technological innovation, changed the nature of the world economy, radically increasing dependence on people and countries from every corner of the world. This interdependence, in turn, created demand for further institutionalization, which states seeking the benefits of cooperation provided, beginning the cycle anew. This is not to say that international institutions were the only cause of the dynamic form of globalization experienced over the last few decades. Changes in the nature of global capitalism, including breakthroughs in transportation and information technology, are obviously critical drivers of interdependence. However, all of these changes were allowed to thrive and develop because they took place in a relatively open, peaceful, liberal, institutionalized world order. By preventing World War Three and another Great Depression, the multilateral order arguably did just as much for interdependence as microprocessors or email (see Mueller 1990; O'Neal and Russett 1997). Beyond the special privileges of the great powers Self-reinforcing interdependence has now progressed to the point where it has altered our ability to engage in further global cooperation. That is, economic and political shifts in large part attributable to the successes of the post-war multilateral order are now amongst the factors grinding that system into gridlock. Because of the remarkable success of global cooperation in the postwar order, human interconnectedness weighs much more heavily on politics than it did in 1945. The need for international cooperation has never been higher. Yet the "supply" side of the equation, institutionalized multilateral cooperation, has stalled. In areas such as nuclear proliferation, the explosion of small arms sales, terrorism, failed states, global economic imbalances, financial market instability, global poverty and inequality, biodiversity losses, water deficits and climate change, multilateral and transnational cooperation is now increasingly ineffective or threadbare. Gridlock is not unique to one issue domain, but appears to be becoming a general feature of global governance: cooperation seems to be increasingly difficult and deficient at precisely the time when it is needed most. It is possible to identify four reasons for this blockage, four pathways to gridlock: rising multipolarity, institutional inertia, harder problems, and institutional fragmentation.

**Multilateralism fails to solve security threats – can’t de-escalate conflicts**

Jenkin, 6 – University of New Hampshire, citing Frank Harvey, University Research Professor of International Relations, professor in the Department of Political Science, and the director of the Centre for Foreign Policy Studies at Dalhousie University (Clinton, “Book Review: Smoke and Mirrors: Globalized Terrorism and the Illusion of Multilateral Security,” Sage Journal, Spring 2006, http://icj.sagepub.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/content/16/1/69.full.pdf+html) // MS

Smoke and Mirrors, a runner-up for the Donner Book Prize, offers a detailed examination of the nature of globalization and how it will affect and be affected by terrorism and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. The author examines the nature of multilateralism and the assumption that multilateral strategies are inherently better suited to a globalized world. He uses specific cases, such as the second Iraq war, ballistic missile defense (BMD), and nonproliferation, arms control, and disarmament (NACD), to develop a cost-benefit analysis of unilateral strategies and their multilateral alternatives. Finally, the author examines the moral, economic, and political pitfalls of adopting multilateralism as an end rather than a means to an end. This book offers the reader a perspective that runs counter to the prevailing political wisdom that multilateralism is a more efficient and beneficial strategy in an era of globalization and asymmetric security threats. Smoke and Mirrors describes globalization as increasing both the probability and the seriousness of asymmetric security threats. Globalization decreases the importance of vertical proliferation (the increase in the number of weapons of mass destruction possessed by a state that already has them) and increases the threat of horizontal proliferation (the increase in the number of states who possess weapons of mass destruction). Harvey outlines the conventional political wisdom that in the era of globalization, unilateral foreign policy must and will give way to multilateral alternatives. Multilateral initiatives have a long history of failure, and unilateral initiatives should not be so easily discarded until multilateral alternatives can demonstrate some record of greater benefits achieved with fewer resources. Horizontal proliferation has led to more states (as well as nonstate actors) that are willing to defy international authority, and this environment places pressure on states to reject international cooperation or protection and instead develop a competent unilateral security policy. States that are willing and able to protect themselves will be more secure in an era of globalization than states that choose or are forced to rely on multilateral security policies. The author questions the assumption that multilateral initiatives should be the default setting for states to develop security strategies. Harvey describes a unilateral-multilateral continuum along which any foreign policy can be placed. Multilateralism is simply the result of one state’s values and goals overlapping with another’s. Trying to adjust national priorities so that they become “multilateral” simply leads to countries making decisions that are not in the best interests of its citizens. An overreliance on multilateralism can cause a state to turn its national security over to another state that is making its own unilateral choices and then forcing them on others by withholding approval of a multilateral security policy. Two states cannot develop a useful working relationship if their values and/or priorities—as applied to the context of the alliance—do not match. What defines an international alliance is give and take; if the value of what is given does not match the value of what is taken, then the alliance is not beneficial and should be abandoned. Multilateralism cannot be considered an end in and of itself; rather, it is a means to a specific context-defined end. As such, it must be open to assessment via cost-benefit analysis. Harvey uses the proposed U.S. BMD program as a case study to posit that the costs and benefits of such unilateral security programs are more advantageous than are the costs and benefits of multilateral programs designed to accomplish the same goal. Harvey offers in-depth analysis of the BMD program, both technologically and politically. He outlines the costs and benefits of a U.S. BMD program and develops counterpoints to those who criticize the program as ineffective, too expensive, or detrimental to international alliances. He offers harsh criticism of those who are quick to attack BMD as costly and destabilizing but are not willing to apply those same standards to multilateral alternatives. Harvey closely examines the main multilateral alternative to BMD, which is NACD. Harvey outlines the successes and failures of such initiatives. He concludes that the problems with BMD, though significant, are technological in nature and have a fair probability of being overcome, whereas the problems with alternative NACD security measures are qualitative in nature and have no reasonable probability of ever working at all. Harvey also develops a critique of Canadian foreign policy, whose strong multilateral emphasis offers a stark contrast to the U.S. preference for unilateral initiatives. Canada’s reliance on multilateralism as a goal rather than as a tool has led it to make a series of inconsistent and illogical foreign policy decisions. Canada has placed itself on the morally indefensible side of several international issues, and in the process, it has begun to alienate its chief allies, primarily the United States. Canada’s goal of obtaining distinction in the international community has led it into the trap of giving away more than it has received and has left its citizens worse off than if it had taken principled—though perhaps unpopular—stances on world issues. Harvey’s arguments about the moral pitfalls of multilateralism are developed from a basic point that parents and primary schoolteachers have been making for generations: A correct course of action does not require majority or even plurality assent, and an incorrect course of action does not become correct because of widespread agreement.

### PTX

#### Link turns case – lack of a credible commitment causes serial cooperative failure – implementation guts solvency

Hamilton ’03 (Lee, Director of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, Washington Quarterly, Spring)

Few words in politics are bandied about as much as bipartisanship. All politicians recognize that, like freedom or prosperity, its approval ratings approach 100 percent. Yet translating rhetorical support for bipartisanship into practice can be extremely difficult. Although Americans have consistently said that they want their elected officials to work across party lines, the nation's politics have been excessively partisan over the past several years**.** U.S. foreign policy has suffered as a result. Foreign policy always has more force and punch when the nation speaks with one voice. When the president works with the opposing party and takes its views into consideration, the policy that results is more likely to have strong public support. Such a foreign policy makes the United States more respected and effective abroad. The United States is at a remarkable moment in its history. The international environment is relatively tranquil; there is no major threat to our security; and we enjoy a position of unprecedented economic, political, and cultural preeminence. We must not, however, take these good times for granted. Most Americans have barely begun to comprehend threats now on the horizon. To remain secure, prosperous, and free, the United States must continue to lead. That leadership requires a president and Congress working together to fashion a foreign policy with broad, bipartisan support. **[Continues]** Developing a bipartisan foreign policy will not be easy under any circumstances. We should expect rough patches, but, if Bush takes charge of U.S. foreign policy, reaches out and consults with Congress, builds on the areas of broad agreement, and works hard to reduce the friction around contentious issues, a strong bipartisan foreign policy could emerge. A foreign policy of unity is essential if the United States is to promote its values and interests effectively and help to build a safer, freer, and more prosperous world.

#### Investor confidence outweighs and is faster

Masters 13 (Jonathan, Deputy Editor at the Council on Foreign Relations, Backgrounder, jan 2 2013"US Debt Ceiling. Costs and Consequences")

Most economists, including those in the White House and from former administrations, agree that the impact of an outright government default would be severe. Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke has said **a U.S. default could be a** [**"recovery-ending event"**](http://blogs.wsj.com/economics/2011/03/01/bernanke-warns-on-debt-limit-chaos/) **that would likely spark another financial crisis**. Short of default, officials warn that legislative delays in raising the debt ceiling could also inflict significant harm on the economy.¶ Many analysts say congressional gridlock over the debt limit will likely sow significant uncertainty in the bond markets and place upward pressure on interest rates. Rate increases would not only hike future borrowing costs of the federal government, but would also raise capital costs for struggling U.S. businesses and cash-strapped homebuyers. In addition, rising rates could divert future taxpayer money away from much-needed federal investments in such areas as infrastructure, education, and health care.¶ The protracted and politically acrimonious debt limit showdown in the summer 2011 prompted Standard and Poor's to take the unprecedented step of downgrading the U.S. credit rating from its triple-A status, and **analysts fear such brinksmanship** in early 2013 could bring about similar moves from other rating agencies.¶ A 2012 study by the non-partisan Government Accountability Office estimated that [delays in raising the debt ceiling](http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-12-701) in 2011 cost taxpayers approximately $1.3 billion for FY 2011. BPC estimated the ten-year costs of the prolonged fight at roughly $19 billion.¶ The stock market also was thrown into frenzy in the lead-up to and aftermath of the 2011 debt limit debate, with the [Dow Jones Industrial Average](http://www.bizjournals.com/nashville/news/2011/08/08/slideshow-dows-10-worst-days-ever.html) plunging roughly 2,000 points from the final days of July through the first days of August. Indeed, the Dow recorded one of its worst single-day drops in history on August 8, the day after the S&P downgrade, tumbling 635 points.¶ Speaking to the [Economic Club of New York](http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/11/20/idUSW1E8KA00A20121120) in November 2012, Fed Chairman Ben Bernanke warned that congressional inaction with regard to the fiscal cliff, the raising of the debt ceiling, and the longer-term budget situation **was creating uncertainty** that "appears already to be affecting private spending and investment decisions and may be contributing to an increased sense of caution in financial markets, with adverse effects on the economy."

#### And, link turns relations

Shifter ‘12

(Michael is an Adjunct Professor of Latin American Studies at Georgetown University's School of Foreign Service. He is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations and writes for the Council's journal Foreign Affairs. He serves as the President of Inter-American Dialogue. “Remaking the Relationship: The United States and Latin America,” April, IAD Policy Report, http://www.thedialogue.org/PublicationFiles/IAD2012PolicyReportFINAL.pdf)

The most ominous change in the United States has taken place in the political realm. Politics have become less collaborative. It is increasingly difficult to find common ground on which to build solutions to the critical problems on the policy agenda. Compromise, the hallmark of democratic governance, has become an ebbing art, replaced by gridlock and inaction on challenges that would advance US national interests and well-being. In part as a result of these shifts, US-Latin American relations have grown more distant. The quality and intensity of ties have diminished. Most countries of the region view the United States as less and less relevant to their needs—and with declining capacity to propose and carry out strategies to deal with the issues that most concern them. In the main, hemispheric relations are amicable. Open conflict is rare and, happily, the sharp antagonisms that marred relations in the past have subsided. But the US-Latin America relationship would profit from more vitality and direction. Shared interests are not pursued as vigorously as they should be, and opportunities for more fruitful engagement are being missed. Well-developed ideas for reversing these disappointing trends are scarce.

#### Reducing defense spending signals weakness, undercuts relations and cooperation with allies

Kagan ‘09 (Robert, senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2/3/09, “No Time To Cut Defense,”)

A reduction in defense spending this year would unnerve American allies and undercut efforts to gain greater cooperation. There is already a sense around the world, fed by irresponsible pundits here at home, that the United States is in terminal decline. Many fear that the economic crisis will cause the United States to pull back from overseas commitments. The announcement of a defense cutback would be taken by the world as evidence that the **American retreat has begun.**

**Decline causes Middle East instability**

**Warrick, 08** – Washington Post Staff Writer (Joby, 11/15/08, “Experts See Security Risks in Downturn, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/11/14/AR2008111403864.html>)

Intelligence officials are warning that **the deepening global financial crisis could weaken fragile governments in the world's most dangerous areas and undermine the ability of the U**nited **S**tates and its allies **to respond to a new wave of security threats.** U.S. government officials and private analysts say the **economic turmoil has heightened the short-term risk of a terrorist attack**, as radical groups probe for weakening border protections and new gaps in defenses. **A protracted financial crisis could threaten the survival of friendly regimes from Pakistan to the Middle East while forcing Western nations to cut spending on defense**, intelligence and foreign aid, the sources said. **The crisis could also accelerate the shift to a more Asia-centric globe, as rising powers** such as China **gain more leverage** over international financial institutions **and greater influence** in world capitals. Some of **the more troubling and immediate scenarios** analysts are weighing **involve nuclear-armed Pakistan**, which already was being battered by inflation and unemployment before the global financial tsunami hit. Since September, Pakistan has seen its national currency devalued and its hard-currency reserves nearly wiped out. ad\_icon **Analysts also worry about the impact** of plummeting crude prices **on oil-dependent nations such as Yemen, which has a** large population of unemployed youths and a **history of support for militant Islamic groups.**
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### Uniqueness

#### He’s winning because he’s using capital to unify Democrats and exploit GOP divisions

**Allen, 9/19/13** (Jonathan, Politico, “GOP battles boost Obama” <http://www.politico.com/story/2013/09/republicans-budget-obama-97093.html>)

There’s a simple reason President Barack Obama is using his bully pulpit to focus the nation’s attention on the battle over the budget: In this fight, he’s watching Republicans take swings at each other.

And that GOP fight is a lifeline for an administration that had been scrambling to gain control its message after battling congressional Democrats on the potential use of military force in Syria and the possible nomination of Larry Summers to run the Federal Reserve.

If House Republicans and Obama can’t cut even a short-term deal for a continuing resolution, the government’s authority to spend money will run out on Oct. 1. Within weeks, the nation will default on its debt if an agreement isn’t reached to raise the federal debt limit.

For some Republicans, those deadlines represent a leverage point that can be used to force Obama to slash his health care law. For others, they’re a zero hour at which the party will implode if it doesn’t cut a deal.

Meanwhile, “on the looming fiscal issues, Democrats — both liberal and conservative, executive and congressional — are virtually 100 percent united,” said Sen. Charles Schumer (D-N.Y.).

Just a few days ago, all that Obama and his aides could talk about were Syria and Summers. Now, they’re bringing their party together and shining a white hot light on Republican disunity over whether to shut down the government and plunge the nation into default in a vain effort to stop Obamacare from going into effect.

The squabbling among Republicans has gotten so vicious that a Twitter hashtag — #GOPvsGOPugliness — has become a thick virtual data file for tracking the intraparty insults. Moderates, and even some conservatives, are slamming Texas Sen. Ted Cruz, a tea party favorite, for ramping up grassroots expectations that the GOP will shut down the government if it can’t win concessions from the president to “defund” his signature health care law.

“I didn’t go to Harvard or Princeton, but I can count,” Sen. Bob Corker (R-Tenn.) tweeted, subtly mocking Cruz’s Ivy League education. “The defunding box canyon is a tactic that will fail and weaken our position.”

While it is well-timed for the White House to interrupt a bad slide, Obama’s singular focus on the budget battle is hardly a last-minute shift. Instead, it is a return to the narrative arc that the White House was working to build before the Syria crisis intervened.

#### Not willing to negotiate doesn’t mean not involved – he’s using PC and it’s key

Blake 9/18/13 (Aaron, Covers National Politics for the Washington Post, The Washington Post, Post Politics, Carney Assures That Obama 'Has Twisted Arms')

White House press secretary Jay Carney on Wednesday fought back against criticism that President Obama has been disengaged from legislative battles on Capitol Hill.¶ "He has twisted arms," Carney said. "He has used the powers that are available to him to try to convince, persuade, cajole Republicans into doing the sensible thing...."¶ Pressed on Obama's role in the current budget debate and his refusal to negotiate over the debt ceiling, Carney rebuffed the idea that the president isn't involved.¶ “You’re assuming he’s above the fray," Carney said. "He’s not. He’s in the fray. And he was in the fray today, and he'll be in the fray until Congress does the right thing.”

### A2 pc not key

#### PC is finite and trades off with debt deal – overcomes ideology – and time constraints is an independent internal link – prefer issue-specific evidence

Moore 9-10 (Heidi Moore, U.S. finance and economics editor, The Guardian (UK), “Syria: the great distraction; Obama is focused on a conflict abroad, but the fight he should be gearing up for is with Congress on America's economic security,” 9-10-2013, http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2013/sep/10/obama-syria-what-about-sequester)

Before President Obama speaks to the nation about Syria tonight, take a look at what this fall will look like inside America.¶ There are 49 million people in the country who suffered inadequate access to food in 2012, leaving the percentage of "food-insecure" Americans at about one-sixth of the US population. At the same time, Congress refused to pass food-stamp legislation this summer, pushing it off again and threatening draconian cuts. ¶ The country will crash into the debt ceiling in mid-October, which would be an economic disaster, especially with a government shutdown looming at the same time. These are deadlines that Congress already learned two years ago not to toy with, but memories appear to be preciously short.¶ The Federal Reserve needs a new chief in three months, someone who will help the country confront its raging unemployment crisis that has left 12 million people without jobs. The president has promised to choose a warm body within the next three weeks, despite the fact that his top pick, Larry Summers, would likely spark an ugly confirmation battle – the "fight of the century," according to some – with a Congress already unwilling to do the President's bidding. ¶ Congress was supposed to pass a farm bill this summer, but declined to do so even though the task is already two years late. As a result, the country has no farm bill, leaving agricultural subsidies up in the air, farmers uncertain about what their financial picture looks like, and a potential food crisis on the horizon. ¶ The two main housing agencies, Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, have been in limbo for four years and are desperately in need of reform that should start this fall, but there is scant attention to the problem. ¶ These are the problems going unattended by the Obama administration while his aides and cabinet members have been wasting the nation's time making the rounds on television and Capitol Hill stumping for a profoundly unpopular war. The fact that all this chest-beating was for naught, and an easy solution seems on the horizon, belies the single-minded intensity that the Obama White House brought to its insistence on bombing Syria. ¶ More than one wag has suggested, with the utmost reason, that if Obama had brought this kind of passion to domestic initiatives, the country would be in better condition right now. As it is, public policy is embarrassingly in shambles at home while the administration throws all of its resources and political capital behind a widely hated plan to get involved in a civil war overseas.¶ The upshot for the president may be that it's easier to wage war with a foreign power than go head-to-head with the US Congress, even as America suffers from neglect.¶ This is the paradox that President Obama is facing this fall, as he appears to turn his back on a number of crucial and urgent domestic initiatives in order to spend all of his meager political capital on striking Syria.¶ Syria does present a significant humanitarian crisis, which has been true for the past two years that the Obama administration has completely ignored the atrocities of Bashar al-Assad.¶ Two years is also roughly the same amount of time that key domestic initiatives have also gone ignored as Obama and Congress engage in petty battles for dominance and leave the country to run itself on a starvation diet imposed by sequestration cuts. Leon Panetta tells the story of how he tried to lobby against sequestration only to be told: ¶ Leon, you don't understand. The Congress is resigned to failure.¶ Similarly, those on Wall Street, the Federal Reserve, those working at government agencies, and voters themselves have become all too practiced at ignoring the determined incompetence of those in Washington. ¶ Political capital – the ability to horse-trade and win political favors from a receptive audience – is a finite resource in Washington. Pursuing misguided policies takes up time, but it also eats up credibility in asking for the next favor. It's fair to say that congressional Republicans, particularly in the House, have no love for Obama and are likely to oppose anything he supports. That's exactly the reason the White House should stop proposing policies as if it is scattering buckshot and focus with intensity on the domestic tasks it wants to accomplish, one at a time.¶ The president is scheduled to speak six times this week, mostly about Syria. That includes evening news interviews, an address to the nation, and numerous other speeches. Behind the scenes, he is calling members of Congress to get them to fall into line. Secretary of State John Kerry is omnipresent, so ubiquitous on TV that it may be easier just to get him his own talk show called Syria Today.¶ It would be a treat to see White House aides lobbying as aggressively – and on as many talk shows – for a better food stamp bill, an end to the debt-ceiling drama, or a solution to the senseless sequestration cuts, as it is on what is clearly a useless boondoggle in Syria.¶ There's no reason to believe that Congress can have an all-consuming debate about Syria and then, somehow refreshed, return to a domestic agenda that has been as chaotic and urgent as any in recent memory. The President should have judged his options better. As it is, he should now judge his actions better.

#### Obama will win on debt ceiling if he maintains his position of strength

**Liasson, 9/21/13** (Mara, “Have Obama's Troubles Weakened Him For Fall's Fiscal Fights?” NPR, <http://www.npr.org/blogs/itsallpolitics/2013/09/21/224494760/have-obamas-troubles-weakened-him-for-falls-fiscal-fights>)

"[Obama] had some missteps within the caucus," Manley says, but "now that he has those situations behind him ... he can turn his attention to the debt limit and the spending issues." Manley says the president will be well-positioned to take on Republicans in those fiscal fights, "if only because ... their policies are so out of the mainstream that they won't enjoy any support on the Hill and/or with the American people." The plan to bomb Syria was extremely unpopular. But on budget issues, the president is on firmer footing with the public, who may not like Obamacare but don't want it repealed or defunded. So, in the House at least, Republicans are making demands the president cannot and will not meet. "You have never seen, in the history of the United States, the debt ceiling or the threat of not raising the debt ceiling being used to extort a president or a governing party, and trying to force issues that have nothing to do with the budget and have nothing to do with the debt," Obama has said. White House officials say Democrats will always have internal divisions, but right now they are nothing compared with the fights inside the GOP. "There is essentially a civil war brimming in the Republican Party right now," says Dan Pfeiffer, the president's senior adviser. Pfeiffer points to open warfare between Tea Party conservatives and moderates, and even between House and Senate conservatives, as Republicans struggle to settle on a viable budget strategy. "The important thing is, as we head into these budget battles this fall, Democrats ... are in lock-step about the way to approach this," he says, "which is that we are not going to negotiate on the debt ceiling — we're not going to allow the full faith and credit of the United States to be held hostage by the Republicans, who want to ... deny health insurance to millions of Americans. We're in lock-step and they're divided, so I feel pretty good about that." Despite the setbacks of the spring and summer, the Obama team is counting on the latent power of the presidency — one of the most resilient institutions in American life. Unlike on Syria, Obama seems to have a budget strategy. He's hanging tough on his two red lines: no negotiations on the debt ceiling and no changes to Obamacare. The president is willing for now to let the Republicans flirt with the unpopular and dangerous possibilities of a government shutdown and a debt default. It's a high-stakes game of chicken, and one where the White House feels confident it has the upper hand.

#### He just needs to stay the course

**Robinson, 9/20**/13 – Washington Post columnist (Eugene, “Obama Needs to Stand His Ground” <http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2013/09/20/obama_needs_to_stand_his_ground_120003.html>)

Obama is by nature a reasonable and flexible man, but this time he must not yield. Even if you leave aside what delaying or defunding Obamacare would mean for his legacy -- erasing his most significant domestic accomplishment -- it would be irresponsible for him to bow to the GOP zealots' demands.

The practical impact of acquiescing would be huge. Individuals who have been uninsured are anticipating access to adequate care. State governments, insurance companies and health care providers have spent vast amounts of time and money preparing for the law to take effect. To suddenly say "never mind" would be unbelievably reckless.

The political implication of compromising with blackmailers would be an unthinkable surrender of presidential authority. The next time he said "I will do this" or "I will not do that," why should Congress or the American people take him seriously? How could that possibly enhance Obama's image on the world stage?

Obama has said he will not accept a budget deal that cripples Obamacare and will never negotiate on the debt ceiling. Even if the Republicans carry through with their threats -- and this may happen -- the president has no option but to stand his ground.

You don't deal with bullies by making a deal to keep the peace. That only rewards and encourages them. You have to push back.

The thing is, this showdown is a sure political loser for the GOP -- and smart Republicans know it. Boehner doesn't want this fight, and in fact should be grateful if Obama hangs tough and shows the crazies the limits of their power. Republicans in the Senate don't want this fight. It's doubtful that even a majority of House Republicans really, truly want this fight, no matter what they say publicly.

But irresponsible demagogues -- I mean you, Sen. Ted Cruz, R-Texas -- have whipped the GOP base into a frenzy of unrealistic expectations. House members who balk at jumping off the cliff risk being labeled "moderate," which is the very worst thing you can call a Republican -- and the most likely thing to shorten his or her political career.

The way to end this madness is by firmly saying no. If Boehner won't do it, Obama must.

### A2 CIR

#### Yes capital- position of Obama is relative to republican strength- which is non-existent

Mardell 9/18/13 (Mark, North America Editor, BBC News, "Obama Presidency: Decline in the Fall?")

It won't be long before there is a new kid on the White House block, and that changes calculations.¶ As for the coming budget battles in Congress, while Mr Obama's position looks weak, the Republicans look weaker - and as close as 2016 is, the mid-term elections of 2014 are even closer.¶ It is unsurprising that, to some, this feels like a turning point.¶ But while fall always turns to winter, it doesn't always spell decline.

**Issue specific uniqueness first – assumes the thumper– only the plan will derail it**

**It’s dead – no vote – no thumper**

**Wilhelm 9/21**/13

Alex, “High-Skill Immigration Reform Likely Dead In 2013”, <http://techcrunch.com/2013/09/21/high-skill-immigration-reform-likely-dead-in-2013/>, CMR

After much speech and pomp, it appears that general immigration reform is **dead** in 2013, ending with it the chance of positive change to how we handle high-skill immigration. It didn’t have to end this way, but here we are and we need to face the current reality.¶ The Washington Post’s Greg Sargent reported yesterday that in the House, the so-called Gang of Seven will likely not bring forward a bill that could be passed in the lower chamber. That, and the fact that the Senate’s comprehensive bill was deceased upon hello in the House, means that options for functional immigration reform this year are now **essentially zero**.¶ High-skill immigration reform was lashed to larger immigration reform in the Senate, marking its fate in time with other pieces of what is generally referred to as “comprehensive” reform. As that effort has failed, so too has high-skill immigration reform faltered.¶ Sargent goes on to write that House Republicans could “roll out a series of piecemeal bills.” Theoretically, one of those smaller pieces of legislation could deal with high-skill immigration. However, if there is sufficient political will in the House for a push on the single issue **isn’t clear.** And it is also not plain how such a single bill could wind its way through the Senate, which has already passed its own immigration law.¶ In a somewhat depressing conclusion, Sargent states that “it remains very possible that House Republican leaders will simply **let reform die**.”¶ Next year is an election year, and the threat of primary challenges on the right remain real. Immigration is an exceptionally difficult issue for Republicans, given fierce base support for draconian legislation, and changing demographics that squeeze its leadership. For now, however, it appears that the threat of ‘being primaried’ remains a larger fear for House Republicans than long-term changes to the makeup of the American populace that do not, on projection, bode well for their party.¶ Unless something miraculous shakes loose, immigration reform looks dead for the year. And as such, we won’t see a rise in H-1B visas and the like. It didn’t have to end this way, but here we are and we need to face the current reality.

### A2 Compart

#### Debt ceiling needs all remaining floor time to pass – and it’s getting it now – thumpers don’t apply

Gerson 9/18/13 - served as a senior adviser to President George W. Bush (Michael, Virginian Pilot, “The politics of paralysis” lexis)

The remainder of legislative time and attention that hasn't been spent on Syria this year will now be consumed by the budget and debt-ceiling debates - in which the best possible outcome is the avoidance of self-inflicted wounds.¶ Republican leaders seem prepared to combine the continuing resolution and debt-ceiling increase, extend both for a year with the budget at level spending, and impose a one-year delay in implementing Obamacare. They won't get the last part - Obama would veto anything including it - but the Republican base insists.¶ The Obama administration, in return, offers nothing. It is continuing the practice of starting a negotiation process by refusing to negotiate.¶ Coming to an eventual compromise between one side that demands the moon and the other side that demands and offers nothing at all won't be easy. The protection of Obamacare is the one "red line" the administration holds absolutely sacred.¶ But conservatives sense opportunity in a weakened president and a deeply unpopular law. And Speaker John Boehner's room to maneuver is extremely limited by a small faction of his party that is just big enough to paralyze him. It is a recipe for confidence-shaking, market-spooking, down-to-the-wire confrontation.¶ In the shadow of this conflict, little else will grow. According to Yuval Levin of the Ethics and Public Policy Center, "only things that have to pass - or else the government shuts down or the economy crashes - are going to pass this year."

#### Only the plan crowds it off the agenda

Ornstein 9-1 (Norm Ornstein, resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, 9/1/13, Showdowns and Shutdowns, www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2013/09/01/showdowns\_and\_shutdowns\_syria\_congress\_obama)

Then there is the overload of business on the congressional agenda when the two houses return on Sept. 9 -with only nine legislative days scheduled for action in the month. We have serious confrontations ahead on spending bills and the debt limit, as the new fiscal year begins on Oct. 1 and the debt ceiling approaches just a week or two thereafter. Before the news that we would drop everything for an intense debate on whether to strike militarily in Syria, Congress-watchers were wondering how we could possibly deal with the intense bargaining required to avoid one or more government shutdowns and/or a real breach of the debt ceiling, with devastating consequences for American credibility and the international economy. Beyond the deep policy and political divisions, Republican congressional leaders will likely use both a shutdown and the debt ceiling as hostages to force the president to cave on their demands for deeper spending cuts. Avoiding this end-game bargaining will require the unwavering attention of the same top leaders in the executive and legislative branches who will be deeply enmeshed in the Syria debate. The possibility -even probability -of disruptions caused by partial shutdowns could complicate any military actions. The possibility is also great that the rancor that will accompany the showdowns over fiscal policy will bleed over into the debate about America and Syria.

### A2 Winners Win

#### Empirically false and the plan is more likely to disrupt Obama’s careful issue selection

Eberly, 13 - coordinator of Public Policy Studies and assistant professor in the Department of Political Science at St. Mary's College of Maryland (Todd, Baltimore Sun, “The presidential power trap” <http://articles.baltimoresun.com/2013-01-21/news/bs-ed-political-capital-20130121_1_political-system-george-hw-bush-party-support/2>)

Only by solving the problem of political capital is a president likely to avoid a power trap. Presidents in recent years have been unable to prevent their political capital from eroding. When it did, their power assertions often got them into further political trouble. Through leveraging public support, presidents have at times been able to overcome contemporary leadership challenges by adopting as their own issues that the public already supports. Bill Clinton's centrist "triangulation" and George W. Bush's careful issue selection early in his presidency allowed them to secure important policy changes — in Mr. Clinton's case, welfare reform and budget balance, in Mr. Bush's tax cuts and education reform — that at the time received popular approval.

However, short-term legislative strategies may win policy success for a president but do not serve as an antidote to declining political capital over time, as the difficult final years of both the Bill Clinton and George W. Bush presidencies demonstrate. None of Barack Obama's recent predecessors solved the political capital problem or avoided the power trap. It is the central political challenge confronted by modern presidents and one that will likely weigh heavily on the current president's mind today as he takes his second oath of office.

#### Link outweighs the link turn on timeframe – especially true for the debt vote

Silber 07 [PhD Political Science & Communication – focus on the Rhetoric of Presidential Policy-Making – Prof of Poli Sci – Samford, [Marissa, WHAT MAKES A PRESIDENT QUACK?, Prepared for delivery at the 2007 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, August 30th-September 2nd, 2007, UNDERSTANDING LAME DUCK STATUS THROUGH THE EYES OF THE MEDIA AND POLITICIANS]

Important to the discussion of political capital is whether or not it can be replenished over a term. If a President expends political capital on his agenda, can it be replaced? Light suggests that “capital declines over time – public approval consistently falls: midterm losses occur” (31). Capital can be rebuilt, but only to a limited extent. The decline of capital makes it difficult to access information, recruit more expertise and maintain energy. If a lame duck President can be defined by a loss of political capital, this paper helps determine if such capital can be replenished or if a lame duck can accomplish little. Before determining this, a definition of a lame duck President must be developed.

#### Even if they’re right, Obama believes it’s finite and will act in accordance

Burnett, 13

Bob Burnett, Founding Executive @ CiscoSystems, Berkeley writer, journalist, columnist @ huffington post, 4/5, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/bob-burnett/keystone-xl-obama_b_3020154.html>

On April 3 and 4, President Obama spoke at several San Francisco fundraisers. While he didn't specifically mention the Keystone XL pipeline, the tenor of his remarks indicated that he's likely to approve the controversial project. Obama seems to be most influenced by his inherent political pragmatism. I've heard Barack Obama speak on several occasions. The first was February 19, 2007, at a San Francisco ore-election fundraiser with a lengthy question and answer session. Towards the end of the event a woman asked then presidential-candidate Obama what his position was on same-sex marriage. For an instant, Obama seemed surprised; then he gathered himself and responded he was aware of strong feelings on both sides of this issue and his position was evolving. Five years later, in May of 2012, President Obama announced his support for same-sex marriage. What took Obama so long to make up his mind? No doubt he needed to clarify his own moral position -- although the Protestant denomination he was baptized into, the United Church of Christ, announced its support for same-sex marriage in 2005. But I'm sure the president carefully weighed the political consequences and, last May, thought the timing was right. Over the last six years I've realized Barack Obama has several personas. On occasion he moves us with stirring oratory; that's Reverend Obama, the rock star. Once in a while, he turns philosophical; that's Professor Obama, the student of American history. On April 3, I saw Politician Obama, the pragmatic leader of the Democratic Party. Obama has learned that, as president, he only gets a fixed amount of political capital each year and has learned to ration it. In 2007, he didn't feel it was worth stirring up controversy by supporting same-sex marriage; in 2012 he thought it was. He's a cautious pragmatist. He doesn't make snap decisions or ones that will divert his larger agenda. Intuitively, most Democrats know this about the president. At the beginning of 2012, many Democratic stalwarts were less than thrilled by the prospect of a second Obama term. While their reasons varied, there was a common theme, "Obama hasn't kept his promises to my constituency." There were lingering complaints that 2009's stimulus package should have been bigger and a communal whine, "Obama should have listened to us." Nonetheless, by the end of the Democratic convention on September 6, most Dems had come around. In part, this transformation occurred because from January to September of 2012 Dems scrutinized Mitt Romney and were horrified by what they saw. In January some had muttered, "There's no difference between Obama and Romney," but nine months later none believed that. While many Democrats were not thrilled by Obama's first-term performance, they saw him as preferable to Romney on a wide range of issues. In 2009, Obama got a bad rap from some Dems because they believed he did not fight hard enough for the fiscal stimulus and affordable healthcare. In March of 2011, veteran Washington columnist, Elizabeth Drew, described Obama as: ... a somewhat left-of-center pragmatist, and a man who has avoided fixed positions for most of his life. Even his health care proposal -- denounced by the right as a 'government takeover' and 'socialism' -- was essentially moderate or centrist. When he cut a deal on the tax bill, announced on December 7 [2010], he pragmatically concluded that he did not have the votes to end the Bush tax cuts for the wealthiest, and in exchange for giving in on that he got significant concessions from the Republicans, such as a fairly lengthy extension of unemployment insurance and the cut in payroll taxes. Making this deal also left him time to achieve other things -- ratification of the START treaty, the repeal of don't ask, don't tell. Drew's description of the president as a "left-of-center pragmatist" resonates with my sense of him. He is a political pragmatist who, over the past five years, has learned to guard his political capital and focus it on his highest priorities.In this year's State-of-the-Union address half of the president's remarks concerned jobs and the economy. We gather here knowing that there are millions of Americans whose hard work and dedication have not yet been rewarded. Our economy is adding jobs -- but too many people still can't find full-time employment. Corporate profits have rocketed to all-time highs -- but for more than a decade, wages and incomes have barely budged. It is our generation's task, then, to reignite the true engine of America's economic growth -- a rising, thriving middle class. He also spoke passionately about the need to address to address global warming, "For the sake of our children and our future, we must do more to combat climate change." But it's clear that's a secondary objective. At one of the Bay Area fundraisers, President Obama observed that his big challenge is to show middle-class families that, "we are working just as hard for them as we are for an environmental agenda." Obama isn't going to block the Keystone XL pipeline because he doesn't believe that he can make the case his action will help the middle-class. He's conserving his political capital. He's being pragmatic

#### Especially true for Obama’s second term – picking issues is key

Walsh 12 Ken covers the White House and politics for U.S. News. “Setting Clear Priorities Will Be Key for Obama,” 12/20, http://www.usnews.com/news/blogs/Ken-Walshs-Washington/2012/12/20/setting-clear-priorities-will-be-key-for-obama

And there is an axiom in Washington: Congress, the bureaucracy, the media, and other power centers can do justice to only one or two issues at a time. Phil Schiliro, Obama's former liaison to Congress, said Obama has "always had a personal commitment" to gun control, for example.¶ But Schiliro told the New York Times, "Given the crisis he faced when he first took office, there's only so much capacity in the system to move his agenda." So Obama might be wise to limit his goals now and avoid overburdening the system, or he could face major setbacks that would limit his power and credibility for the remainder of his presidency.

#### Plan is popular with the wrong group – obstructionism is ideological – keeping Dems on board is the only way to overcome it – solves their non-uniques and takes out their turns

Benen 9-12 (Steve Benen, analyst, “Republican leaders vs. the GOP's 'Neanderthals'” The Maddow Blog, 9-12-2013, http://maddowblog.msnbc.com/\_news/2013/09/12/20454025-republican-leaders-vs-the-gops-neanderthals?lite)

A significant, outcome-changing contingent within the House GOP caucus is driven by such irrational hatred of the Affordable Care Act that it won't accept anything short of everything. Party leaders realize this approach would trigger a shutdown that the public would blame on Republicans. But if Boehner crafted a far-right spending measure to make extremists happy, this would quickly be rejected by the Senate and White House, again leading to a shutdown that the public would blame on Republicans. The best way out is for the Speaker to give up on the radical wing of his party and strike a deal with House Democrats by scrapping the destructive sequestration policy. The shutdown would be averted; the economy would get a boost (remember when Congress occasionally thought about the economy?); and the Speaker would win plaudits for bipartisan cooperation and governing.

#### Dem unity key – only way Boehner can pass anything

Weisman 9-12 (Jonathan Weisman, political analyst, 9-12-2013, “Boehner seeks help on deficit discussions”, NYT, http://www.twincities.com/national/ci\_24084222/boehner-seeks-help-deficit-discussions?source=rss)

With Congress momentarily freed from the Syrian crisis, lawmakers plunged back into their fiscal standoff Thursday as Speaker John Boehner appealed to the Obama administration and Democratic leaders to help him resolve divisions in the Republican ranks that could lead to a government shutdown by month's end.¶ In meetings with Democratic and Republican congressional leaders Thursday after a session with Treasury Secretary Jacob Lew on Wednesday, Boehner sought a resumption of negotiations that could keep the government running and yield a deficit-reduction deal that would persuade recalcitrant conservatives to raise the government's borrowing limit.¶ Much of the federal government will shut down Oct. 1 unless Congress OKs new spending bills to replace expiring ones, and by mid-October, the Treasury Department will lose the borrowing authority to finance the government and pay its debts.¶ "It's time for the president's party to show the courage to work with us to solve this problem," said Boehner, who argued that budget deals have been part of past agreements to raise the debt limit.¶ But a bloc of 43 House Republicans undercut the speaker's deficit-reduction focus, introducing yearlong funding legislation that would increase Pentagon and veterans' spending and delay President Barack Obama's health care law for a year -- most likely adding to the budget deficit. That bloc is large enough to thwart any compromise that does not attract Democratic support.

### A2 Oil Lobbies

#### Oil Lobby power exaggerated

Mearsheimer and Walt, ‘7

John J. Mearsheimer and Stephen M. Walt, Israel Lobby and Foreign Policy, p. 143, http://www.thirdworldtraveler.com/Israel/US\_Israel\_Lobby\_2\_ILUSFP.html

If Arab petrodollars or energy companies were driving American policy, one would expect to see the United States distancing itself from Israel and working overtime to get the Palestinians a state of their own. Countries like Saudi Arabia have repeatedly pressed Washington to adopt a more evenhanded position toward the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, but to little avail, and even wielding the "oil weapon" during the 1973 October War had little effect on U.S. support for Israel or on overall American policy in the region. Similarly, if oil companies were driving U.S. policy, one would also have expected Washington to curry favor with big oil producers like Saddam Hussein's Iraq, Muammar Gaddafi's Libya, or the Islamic Republic of Iran, so that U.S. companies could make money helping them develop their energy resources and bringing them to market. Instead, the United States imposed sanctions on all three of these countries, in sharp opposition to what the oil industry wanted: Indeed in some cases the U.S. government deliberately intervened to thwart business deals that would have benefited U.S. companies. If the oil lobby were as powerful as some critics believe, such actions would not have occurred

#### Even the credible possibility of default will destroy the economy

**Davis, 9/18/13 -** professor of political science at Brigham Young University(Richard, Deseret News, “Raise the debt ceiling, then talk about spending less” <http://www.deseretnews.com/article/865586538/Raise-the-debt-ceiling-then-talk-about-spending-less.html>)

This is a strategy popular with the Republican right wing, but it is bad policy for the nation. Paying the nation’s bills is not about politics. It sends the wrong signal to investors that U.S. political leaders are not serious about the consequences of default. The nation’s bond rating was lowered after the last near-default. That would happen again if the government defaulted. Even the possibility of default makes investors jittery and undermines our reputation as a nation that always lives up to its promise to pay its bills. A lower bond rating costs taxpayers more money because borrowing comes at a heavier price, just as a lower credit score for failure to pay bills hurts an individual.

### A2 Chamber of Commerce

#### No effect on Congress

Steinzor, 11

Rena Steinzor, CPR President; Professor of Law, University of Maryland Carey School of Law, 8/23/11, <http://www.progressivereform.org/CPRBlog.cfm?idBlog=F87DDA22-0216-0D4F-99EF9C5CB3807670>

The plans themselves, at first look, are largely well-intentioned given the assignment the agencies were given. The EPA plan discusses, for instance, how the internet could be better used to facilitate on-line reporting by polluting plants. In some instances, though, the changes, if done as planned, would have real-life negative consequences: the planned axing of “clearance testing” under EPA’s renovation, repair and painting rule will save money, yes, but run the risk of leaving lead dust behind to poison children when they move back into renovated buildings. The EPA’s final plan dutifully calculates the cost savings of its regulatory changes, but it all but ignores foregone regulatory benefits, such as these. The plans won’t placate big business or Republicans in Congress. Eric Cantor reliably called them “underwhelming,” while the Chamber of Commerce complained that the administration has made a “ a worthy effort at making technical changes to the regulatory process, but the results of this lookback will not have a material impact on the real regulatory burdens facing businesses today.” Give a few inches, and you don’t get anything in return. So what is the White House doing, then? It’d be one thing to engage in this exercise if the agencies had lots of free time on their hands and there wasn’t anything more important to work on. But that’s not the case. In constant (adjusted for inflation) dollars, agencies like EPA have the same purchasing power that they had in the mid-1980’s. Our current economic situation comes largely thanks to under regulation of financial markets. We’re in an era of “too big to fail,” the BP oil spill, the West Virginia mine collapse and a series of food safety emergencies that hospitalize hundreds or thousands. Agencies have little money to fix these problems, and are about to have even less. Rather than support them in their missions and let them prioritize what needs to be done in terms of the lives saved, public health preserved, and natural resources protected, the Administration diverts money to pandering to the forces that cannot be placated and will never support the President when the chips are down. The White House has thankfully stepped back from its worst anti-regulatory rhetoric from January. But it does not seem to understand the big-picture situation: under-regulation is the problem of the day, and the agencies need help, not the unfunded mandate that is regulatory look-back. Meanwhile, OMB recently asked the agencies to prepare for 5 or 10 percent budget cuts. The full reviews of existing rules will be time-consuming to do, and it’s troubling that OIRA, supposedly the kings and queens of cost-benefit analysis, doesn’t seem to care this time about trade-offs—that is, what the agencies won’t get done while they are doing these plans. Meanwhile, the latest regulatory agendas from the agencies, from July, show more delays. These are not agencies with free time on their hands. It’s unhelpful for the White House to flatly state, over and over again, that the agencies will simply get the look-back done with no other work lost. The White House touts the transparency of the look-back process, and they are opening the rule changes to public comment. Transparency in rulemaking shouldn’t be an optional thing that you implement when you like, though. OMB recently held a worker safety rule, for young workers in grain elevators, for nine months. After getting bad press, OMB is apparently releasing the rule. Will OMB release the original version of the rule from the Department of Labor, so the public can see what was changed? This is the transparency that’s needed – transparency that may not make you always look good. Ironically, this look-back process will make strict new rules harder to adopt – because the clear message to agencies from the White House is to back off, and because the look-back uses their resources. But the White House won’t get political credit for that from their target audience – just disappointment from progressives, disappointed at the whole exercise.

### A2 ILaw A/O

#### International law isn’t key to global cooperation to solve transnational problems

Estreicher, 2003 Law Professor at NYU, (Samuel, “Rethinking the Binding Effect of Customary International Law,” Virginia Journal of International Law Association, Fall, 44 Va. J. Int'l L. 5)

As for the subsidiary law that an increasingly interdependent world needs in advance of treaties, traditional CIL could not easily play this role as it was essentially backwards looking. The new, instantaneous customary law tries to play this role, but in a way that hardly comports with legitimacy. Without relying on CIL, states, international organizations, and other actors have ample means of identifying problems requiring interstate cooperation, drafting instruments that might command state support, and marshaling the forces of moral suasion. It is hard to see that the "law" aspiration of CIL offers the prospect of a significant incremental gain. In any event, the ultimate question is whether any such benefit warrants the accompanying costs - to which I now turn.
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### PTX

#### Unilateral action would trigger impact- Obama won’t do

Robb 9/25 (Greg, “If all else fails, Obama will raise debt ceiling himself: analyst”, Market Watch WSJ, <http://blogs.marketwatch.com/capitolreport/2013/09/25/if-all-else-fails-obama-will-raise-debt-ceiling-himself-analyst/>)

The provision in question, Section 4 of the amendment, says that the validity of the public debt “shall not be questioned.”¶ Laurence Tribe, a noted professor of constitutional law at Harvard, tried at the time to throw cold water on such arguments.¶ In an op-ed in the Times, Tribe said that **only Congress has the power to borrow money on the credit of the United States.** Arguments that the president may do whatever is necessary to avoid default “has **no logical stopping point,**” Tribe noted.¶ In addition, **a legal cloud would hang over any newly issued bonds**, Tribe said, **because of the risk that the government might refuse to honor those debts as legitimate**.¶ Back in **2011, Obama and administration officials shied away from the suggestion he could act unilaterally**.

#### PC is the warrant for their empirics – only proves the DA

Sargent 9/13/13 (Greg, The Washington Post, "The Morning Plu: Delusions and Lies About Obamacare Come Back to Haunt GOP Leaders")

Of course, public opinion always tilts against the debt limit — that didn’t stop Republicans from caving on it earlier this year — and as the [NBC write-up](http://firstread.nbcnews.com/_news/2013/09/13/.UjL___5RkKc.twitter) notes, Obama has the bully-pulpit, which ultimately flipped opinion on it last time. But for conservatives looking for ways to rally the shock troops for the coming confrontation, this poll could boost their case that the GOP must hold firm in its demand to block or delay Obamacare, probably in the debt ceiling fight, where GOP leaders say they will make their stand against the law. Some are already [pointing to it](https://twitter.com/conncarroll/status/378490225816649729) as proof of leverage.