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#### CIR will pass now but it will be tough

Nowicki, 10-30 -- Arizona Republic's national political reporter

[Dan, and Erin Kelly, "Fleeting Hopes for Immigration Reform," AZ Central, 10-30-13, www.azcentral.com/news/politics/articles/20131029fleeting-hopes-immigration-reform.html?nclick\_check=1, accessed 10-31-13, mss]

However, reform backers point to encouraging signs in addition to the intense push by the business lobby. Key House Republicans, including Reps. Paul Ryan of Wisconsin, Mario Diaz-Balart of Florida and Darrell Issa of California, reportedly are working on proposals to address the status of the estimated 11 million undocumented immigrants who already have settled in the United States, which is the central issue for Democrats and immigration activists. The Democrat-controlled Senate on June 27 passed a sweeping reform bill that included a 13-year pathway to citizenship for immigrants who pass background checks, pay assessed taxes and fines and take other steps to get right with the law, as well as a massive investment in border security. There are indications that some Republicans are becoming impatient with the House inaction on piecemeal bills that have been talked about since the Senate bill passed. Two House Republicans — Reps. Jeff Denham of California and Ileana Ros-Lehtinen of Florida — have become the first two GOP lawmakers to sign onto a comprehensive immigration bill offered by House Democrats. Rep. Joe Heck, R-Nev., last week said in a written statement that the growing possibility that the House might punt on immigration reform in 2013 reflects “the leadership vacuum in Washington that rightly has so many people frustrated with this dysfunctional Congress.” Sen. Jeff Flake, R-Ariz., a former 12-year House member who helped negotiate the Senate bill, said Monday on Twitter that momentum appears to be building in the House. “That’s good news for Arizona, and the country,” he said in the message. For their part, Boehner and his fellow House Republican leaders have not yet publicly declared immigration reform dead, which even the most pessimistic reform supporters say means there is still a chance the House could act in November or early December. House committees so far have approved five bills, including legislation to strengthen border security and require employers to use a federal database to ensure they are hiring people who are legally eligible to work in the United States. “The speaker said last week, ‘I still think immigration reform is an important subject that needs to be addressed. And I’m hopeful,’ ” Boehner spokesman Michael Steel told The Arizona Republic on Tuesday via e-mail. “He added that he supports a step-by-step immigration process.” Businesses speak out Hoping to make sure immigration reform gets on the House’s 2013 agenda, more than 600 business, law-enforcement, religious and political leaders from Arizona and nearly 40 other states flooded Capitol Hill on Tuesday. The fly-in was organized by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and other groups, including FWD.us, which was founded by leaders of high-tech companies. The activists, mostly self-described conservatives, met with more than 100 members of Congress to urge them to take action on broad legislation that includes a way for most undocumented immigrants in the U.S. to earn citizenship. “In every corner of the Capitol, the energy these farmers, tech leaders, police chiefs and pastors brought to the Hill was palpable,” said Ali Noorani, executive director of the National Immigration Forum. “They brought a new perspective to the debate, one informed by what they see every day in their local businesses, churches and police stations — a broken system that has a negative impact on local communities nationwide.” Peoria Vice Mayor Tony Rivero is a conservative Republican who urged Arizona’s GOP congressmen to support reform this year. His city needs more farmworkers who are legally authorized to work, and it needs its undocumented residents to come out of the shadows, he said. “My message to our congressional delegation is that, as a constituent and a conservative Republican, I support a solution to this problem,” Rivero said. “We need to secure the border, identify the people who are here illegally and put them on a path to legality and put enforcement measures in place to make sure we aren’t here again in 10 years.” Former Phoenix Police Chief Jack Harris said he told members of Arizona’s congressional delegation that the current immigration system makes police officers’ jobs more complicated. “Every community is trying to solve the problem in a different way,” he said. “In some places, you (an undocumented immigrant) can get a driver’s license. In some places, you can’t. Some places are very liberal and report almost no crimes (committed by undocumented immigrants). Others deport you for just minor infractions. There’s great confusion among the law-enforcement community about what the rules are and what their authority is.” ‘I do care about them’ The conservative lobbying efforts are in conjunction with efforts from more liberal immigration-advocacy groups. Last week, a contingent of 44 undocumented immigrants and their supporters traveled from Phoenix by bus to Washington, D.C., and Ohio in hope of meeting with Boehner to persuade him to schedule a vote on a bill that includes a pathway to citizenship. The group, which included many “dreamers,” or undocumented immigrants brought to the United States as children, never got the opportunity to talk with Boehner. However, the immigration activists from the advocacy group Promise Arizona who camped outside Franks’ house did get the chance to talk with the representative for more than 25 minutes. They initially were buoyed by his response, which they interpreted as support for a pathway to citizenship. However, Franks later clarified to The Republic that he would not support a special pathway to citizenship. Franks said he would support legalizing undocumented immigrants under certain conditions but would not allow them to subsequently seek citizenship. Or the undocumented immigrants could return to their home countries and apply for green cards and citizenship that way, he said. Franks said he didn’t fully articulate his position to the activists because he felt compassion for their pleas. “Sometimes, in any situation, you don’t hit people in the face with the worst of it,” Franks said. “I wanted them to know, while maybe we didn’t agree on everything, there were some things we do agree on. I do care about them.” Proponents are positive Glenn Hamer, president and CEO of the Arizona Chamber of Commerce and Industry, said the group of Arizonans that flew in as part of the U.S. Chamber-led D.C. visit were going to meet with all nine House members from Arizona. After morning meetings with Republican Reps. Paul Gosar, Matt Salmon and David Schweikert, Hamer said the sessions were positive. “There is complete agreement that we have a busted immigration system,” he said. “It’s fair to say that there is an understanding that we need immigration reform. It’s very clear that the House is going to pass its vision for immigration reform. If it’s simply the Senate bill or bust, then nothing will happen.” Flake said he believes the methodical and strategic lobbying by the business community, faith groups and activist organizations will **help** motivate the House. He said he is OK with House Republicans taking a step-by-step strategy rather than passing a comprehensive bill like the one he helped craft in the Senate. “My position is, if you can move it piecemeal or sequentially, that’s fine,” Flake said. “If you have to go comprehensive, that’s fine. Let’s get something to the president’s desk.” Frank Sharry, executive director of the pro-reform organization America’s Voice, said the two House Republicans who signed on to the alternative Democratic bill also are examples of **momentum**. “When that bill was first introduced, it was widely panned as a Democratic ‘message bill’ that was going nowhere and was setting up the blame game in a run toward 2014,” Sharry said. “But because Democrats made the smart move of making sure every policy in the bill was passed with bipartisan support either in the Senate or the House, it has become a serious offering and a **place where Republicans can go.** I think you will see more Republicans getting on board.” Because of Boehner’s leadership style and uneasy relationship with many of his rank-and-file members, Sharry said, it may take “a convergence and emergence of a critical mass of Republicans to convince leadership to go forward.” Hamer said he believes there is still a possibility for compromise between the House and Senate. “I don’t want to be too Pollyannaish,” he said. “Passing immigration reform is not like renaming a post office. It’s going to be tough.”

#### Obama’s PC is key- but he’s using restraint

Nowicki, 10-25 -- Arizona Republic's national political reporter

[Dan, "Pleas from Obama may hinder immigration bill push," USA Today, 10-25-13, www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2013/10/25/obama-immigration-bill-partisanship/3188629/, accessed 10-31-13, mss]

One leading national champion of immigration change dismissed the idea that Obama should defer to House Republicans who dislike him. Frank Sharry, executive director of the pro-reform organization America's Voice and an expert in immigration politics, said **the restraint** that **Obama has shown** thus far is testament to how badly the president wants a bill passed. For example, Obama has refrained from trying to punish Republicans politically for holding it up, he said. "Come on, he's the president. He gets to use the bully pulpit to try to set the agenda," Sharry said. "Obviously, it's only going to happen if the House Republicans decide to do it. Everybody in the world knows that everybody wants to get it done except for the divided House GOP." Another immigrant advocate called on Obama to show more leadership by curtailing his administration's "outrageous number of deportations" although such a step also could rile House Republicans. Some GOP lawmakers already have suggested they don't trust the Obama administration to properly enforce any new immigration or border-security laws that might be passed. "From our perspective, the president is definitely a big stakeholder and player in getting immigration reform done," said Cristina Jimenez, managing director of the immigrant-youth network United We Dream. "We don't believe that for the president to step up and push Congress to get this done undermines the efforts," she said. "But we also believe that the president himself could do more."

#### Plan requires Obama to invest a huge amount of political capital, particularly because of the new Congress

Birns & Strain 11-18 - Larry Birns, Director of the Council on Hemispheric Affairs, and Kelsey Strain, Research Associate at the COHA, November 18, 2010, "The Mid-Term Elections: An Easy Prediction for the Future of U.S.-Cuba Relations," online: http://www.coha.org/the-mid-term-elections-an-easy-prediction-for-the-future-of-u-s-cuba-relations/

As former U.S. Ambassador to Cuba, Wayne Smith, explains, “There is a small minority blocking the sensible will of the majority.” Despite such a forceful push for reform across the globe, Washington has repeatedly failed to show a willingness to alter its Cuban policy. A misreading of the conciliatory attitude from Miami’s Cuban community has kept timorous Washington politicians from daring to think boldly when it comes to Cuba. In spite of a new congressional make-up and a desk filled with challenges coming from around the world, President Obama’s commitment to “new relations” with the island should be seen through. Given the new environment in which he will be working, a normalization of U.S.-Cuban relations will only happen if Obama makes it a primary objective, should he decide that it is worth the political investment.

#### Skilled workers solve warming

**Herman and Smith, 10**

(Richard T. Herman is the founder of Richard T. Herman & Associates, an immigration and business law firm in Cleveland, Ohio which serves a global clientele in over 10 languages. He is the co-founder of a chapter of TiE, a global network of entrepreneurs started in 1992 in Silicon Valley. He has appeared on National Public Radio, FOX News, and various affiliates of NBC, CBS, and ABC. He has also been quoted in such publications as USA Today,InformationWeek, PCWorld, ComputerWorld, CIO, Site Selection and National Lawyers Weekly, Robert L. Smith is a veteran journalist who covers international cultures and immigration issues for the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Ohio’s largest newspaper. Bob grew up in Cleveland, where he lives with his wife, Cleveland Orchestra violinist Chul-In Park, and their two children, Jae, 5, and Sun-Hee, 3. He has written extensively about immigration issues and has interviewed people at all points of the immigrant experience, from undocumented field workers to hugely successful entrepreneurs, Parts of this paper were excerpted from the book “[Immigrant Inc.: Why Immigrant Entrepreneurs are Driving the New Economy (and how they will save the American worker)](http://www.immigrantinc.com/)” (John Wiley & Sons, 2009) by Richard T. Herman & Robert L. Smith.  Available wherever books are sold, “Why Immigrants Can Drive the Green Economy,” Immigation Policy Center, <http://immigrationpolicy.org/perspectives/why-immigrants-can-drive-green-economy>)

Raymond Spencer, an Australian-born entrepreneur based in Chicago, has a window on the future—and a gusto for investing after founding a high-technology consulting company that sold for more than $1 billion in 2006. “I have investments in maybe 10 start-ups, all of which fall within a broad umbrella of a ‘green’ theme,” he said. “And it’s interesting, the vast majority are either led by immigrants or have key technical people who are immigrants.” It should come as no surprise that immigrants will help drive the green revolution. America’s young scientists and engineers, especially the ones drawn to emerging industries like alternative energy, tend to speak with an accent. The 2000 Census found that immigrants, while accounting for 12 percent of the population, made up nearly half of the all scientists and engineers with doctorate degrees. Their importance will only grow. Nearly 70 percent of the men and women who entered the fields of science and engineering from 1995 to 2006 were immigrants. Yet, the connection between immigration and the development and commercialization of alternative energy technology is rarely discussed. Policymakers envision millions of new jobs as the nation pursues renewable energy sources, like wind and solar power, and builds a smart grid to tap it. But Dan Arvizu, the leading expert on solar power and the director of the National Renewable Energy Laboratory of the U.S. Department of Energy in Golden, Colorado, warns that much of the clean-technology talent lies overseas, in nations that began pursuing alternative energy sources decades ago. Expanding our own clean-tech industry will require working closely with foreign nations and foreign-born scientists, he said. Immigration restrictions are making collaboration difficult. His lab’s efforts to work with a Chinese energy lab, for example, were stalled due to U.S. immigration barriers. “We can’t get researchers over here,” Arvizu, the son of a once-undocumented immigrant from Mexico, said in an interview in March 2009, his voice tinged with dismay. “It makes no sense to me. We need a much more enlightened approach.” Dr. Zhao Gang, the Vice Director of the Renewable Energy and New Energy International Cooperation Planning Office of the Ministry of Science and Technology in China, says that America needs that enlightenment fast. “The Chinese government continues to impress upon the Obama administration that immigration restrictions are creating major impediments to U.S.-China collaboration on clean energy development,” he said during a recent speech in Cleveland. So what’s the problem? Some of it can be attributed to national security restrictions that impede international collaboration on clean energy. But Arvizu places greater weight on immigration barriers, suggesting that national secrecy is less important in the fast-paced world of green-tech development. “We are innovating so fast here, what we do today is often outdated tomorrow. Finding solutions to alternative energy is a complex, global problem that requires global teamwork,” he said. We need an immigration system that prioritizes the attraction and retention of scarce, high-end talent needed to invent and commercialize alternative energy technology and other emerging technologies. One idea we floated by Arvizu was a new immigrant “Energy Scientist Visa,” providing fast-track green cards for Ph.D.s with the most promising energy research, as reviewed by a panel of top U.S. scientists. Arvizu enthusiastically responded, “Wow, that’s a brilliant idea.” As the recent submission of the Startup Visa Act bill suggests, there’s really no shortage of good ideas of leveraging immigration to jumpstart the economy. The challenge is getting the American people to understand that high-skill immigration creates jobs, that the current system is broken, and that action is required now. Suffering an Antiquated System [▲](http://immigrationpolicy.org/perspectives/why-immigrants-can-drive-green-economy#up) While unlimited H1-B visas are available to foreign workers at U.S. government and university research labs, the antiquated green-card system creates a disincentive for immigrant researchers who seek a more permanent stay and status in the U.S. Anyone coming to America from a foreign land experiences the U.S. immigration system. They seldom forget the experience. This vast bureaucracy, with tentacles reaching into myriad federal agencies, wields enormous power over the lives of people trying to follow its directives. Federal immigration authorities decide if a persecuted family can escape Congo, if a prospective college student from Germany will start the school year on time in Cleveland, or if a Honduran family separated for years will be reunited in Miami. U.S. immigration law dictates who can enter America and how long they can stay. Congress can enact new immigration policies as it deems fit—and it did so in 1986 and in 1990. But the foundation of the system remains the Federal Immigration and Nationality Acts of 1965 and 1952. The 1965 act diversified America by opening immigration to new parts of the world, but it also levied restrictions that soon become dated and counterproductive. In a manufacturing era, the act made family reunification an overarching goal, while paying relatively little attention to the migration of highly skilled workers. In fact, it imposed rigid nationality quotas on skilled immigrants. The result, critics say, is a dinosaur of a system ill-equipped to deal with the demands of a fast-changing, global economy. [CONTINUED] “Our immigration laws discriminate pretty heavily against highly talented scientists and engineers who want to come to this country and be part of our technological establishment,” Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke told a Congressional panel in May 2009. Of particular concern to employers and economists are two sets of quotas: one that limits the number of visas available to skilled workers, and another that limits the visas available to a nationality. The U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Service (USCIS) issues about 1 million green cards per year. Also known as immigrant visas, green cards bestow permanent residency, or the right to live and work permanently in America. A green card puts one on the path to citizenship. In a typical year, the vast majority of green cards go to people sponsored by a family member already here. There is no limit to the numbers of green cards that can be issued to the spouses, parents, and unmarried children of naturalized U.S. citizens. America accepts far fewer people whose main reason for coming is to practice a profession, to pursue science, or to start a company—even if that person possesses extraordinary ability. The government is restricted by law to issuing 140,000 employment or skill-based green cards each year to applicants and their immediate family members. That’s about 15 percent of the immigrant visa pool. A chunk of green cards are set aside for religious workers and wealthy investors, so the United States actually offers 120,000 employment-based green cards each year. Within the employment visa categories, known as EB visas, are several subcategories that acknowledge skill levels. For example, 40,000 visas are designated for persons of extraordinary ability—outstanding professors, researchers, and multinational executives. Another 40,000 visas are designated for professionals with advanced academic degrees whose work will serve U.S. national interests. And another 10,000 visas are available for wealthy people who commit to investing in a U.S. enterprise and creating jobs. So, out of 1 million green cards issued in an average year, 90,000, or about 9 percent, are reserved for persons with advanced degrees, exceptional skills, or capital to create jobs. Put another way, about 9 percent of immigrant visas are reserved for high-skill immigrants—the people driving the New Economy. It’s a scant amount in the context of a U.S. labor force of 154 million people. Should those exceptional immigrants hail from a nation whose workers are in high demand—for example, India and China—they face delays imposed by a nationality quota system. The 1965 immigration law sets per-country limits on employment visas. People from any one nation cannot use more than 7 percent of the visas available that year. This means that workers from large sending countries are forced to wait, sometimes more than 8 years, because their visa allotment has been “oversubscribed” by their fellow citizens. The 7 percent quota applies equally to every nation on Earth, regardless of its size or the potential number of immigrants it sends to America. For example, Malawi, which has a population of 10.5 million people, is allocated the same amount of employment visas as India, which has a population of over 1 billion. In any given year, only 5,600 green cards are reserved for Indians with advanced academic degrees or extraordinary ability, the same number available to nationals of Malawi. Congress has sought to circumvent the quotas and respond to industry demands—especially in high technology—with guest worker visas like the H1-B, a source of some controversy. The H-1B is a temporary visa for a professional offered a job by a U.S. company that agrees to pay the prevailing market wage. Only 65,000 regular H-1B visas are available each year, a quota set in the early 1990s and temporarily increased to 195,000 from 2001 to 2003. Many employers say the cap is set too low to meet their needs, especially as they seek to staff engineering and software positions. Some lawmakers would like to help them with a higher quota. These skilled immigrants often come to America as students, then go to work in growing industries. A 2008 study by the National Foundation for American Policy found that for each worker hired on an H-1B visa, at least five new jobs were created. But many labor groups argue that the cap is already set too high. Only a bachelor’s degree is required to qualify for this visa, and critics charge the H-1B visas crowd skilled Americans out of the workplace, suppress wages, and make it easier for employers to outsource jobs to low-cost countries like India. Even immigrant advocates criticize the H-1B as a second-class visa that produces an anxious life. Tied to their employers, the guest workers cannot switch jobs unless their new employer is willing to sponsor their visa, and their spouses are not allowed to work. The three-year visa can be renewed once. But after six years, the visa holder must go home unless he or she is able to get a green-card sponsor. The national-origin quotas, coupled with a limit of 90,000 immigrant visas reserved for highly skilled professionals or investors, helps to explain why so many talented immigrants—many of them H-1B visa holders—wait in vain for permission to live and work in America. Many are now leaving the U.S., or simply not coming to study or work on an H1B. After revealing the high-skill visa backlog in 2007, Vivek Wadhwa and his researchers at Duke University began to examine the impact. With the support of the Kauffman Foundation, they surveyed about 1,200 Chinese and Indian professionals who had studied or worked in America and returned home. The returnees were an impressive bunch, overwhelmingly young, smart, and ambitious, as described in the March 2009 report, “America’s Loss is the World’s Gain.” Nearly 90 percent held master’s or doctorate degrees. Many said they expected to start their own companies. Homesickness was common among the immigrants who went back, and many expressed frustration with the U.S. immigration system. But even more said the home country suddenly offered good jobs and bright career prospects. That is the new reality that demands a response, Wadhwa argues. Foreign-born mathematicians, engineers, and chemists can now find world-class companies in Bangalore, Beijing, Tel Aviv, Seoul, and Singapore. With high-tech opportunities blossoming elsewhere, and anti-immigrant attitudes hardening in America, Wadhwa said his adopted homeland faces a crisis. “The United States is no longer the only place where talented people can put their skills to work,” he writes. “It can no longer expect them to endure the indignities and inefficiencies of an indifferent immigration system, and it must now actively compete to attract these people with good jobs, security and other amenities.” The competition is heating up. In an earlier study, Wadhwa pointed out that most high-skilled immigrants obtained their primary education before coming to America, meaning that the United States inherited the benefits of schooling that was paid for elsewhere. Some countries are looking to recoup that investment and attract their diasporas back home. Alberta, Canada, sensing an opportunity to snatch talent from America, is sending recruiting teams to U.S. cities to lure disgruntled foreign professional workers on temporary H-1B visas. The province is offering expedited permanent-residency cards and quicker pathways to entrepreneurship. Many researchers believe these immigrant-attraction strategies will show results. “The reality of the global economy is that employers and their capital will follow the talent—wherever that talent is permitted to work and flourish,” Stuart Anderson, executive director of the National Foundation for American Policy, wrote in 2007. “While members of Congress often talk about ‘protecting’ American jobs, those who persist in pursuing restriction on hiring skilled foreign nationals unfortunately are inhibiting creation and innovation in the United States.” In 2007, Microsoft opened up a research and development facility in Vancouver, Canada, just over the border from its Seattle headquarters. Microsoft defended its decision by citing U.S. immigration restrictions on high-skilled talent. Perhaps no country understands better the role of foreign talent in creating jobs for its people than Singapore. In July 2008, Singapore’s Prime Minister, Lee Hsien Loong, declared that Singapore must be open to foreign talent to achieve a “critical mass” for innovation and entrepreneurship. Even with the global recession in full swing, Singapore Deputy Prime Minister Wong Kan Seng announced that restricting the entry of high-skill immigrants would be “short sighted” and “could ultimately lead to more job losses for Singaporeans.” America loses more than innovation if newly minted graduates go elsewhere; it loses tax dollars. A 2009 report by the respected Technology Policy Institute found that immigration restrictions cost billions in lost opportunity, taxes, and wages. The institute concluded that legislation considered by Congress to loosen green-card and H-1B visa restrictions could reduce the federal deficit on the order of $100 billion across 10 years. In short, fantastic opportunities are being lost as high-skill immigrants are steered elsewhere. We need to polish our welcome. For starters, Wadhwa argues, the United States could reduce the huge backlog of visa requests simply by making more visas available to skilled immigrants and by accelerating the processing times. His is one voice in a growing chorus that hopes to wrest the spotlight from illegal immigration and illuminate the larger wave, its potential, and the consequences of inaction. But the academic studies, while critically important, do not seem to cut through the noise and connect with the American people. The American people are not demanding high-skill immigration reform. They don’t see it as a job-creation opportunity. The word “immigrant” almost automatically summons an angry response that immigrants “take jobs.” Something else is needed. Time for a New Narrative [▲](http://immigrationpolicy.org/perspectives/why-immigrants-can-drive-green-economy#up) Stories connect us to each other. Drawing from the same well of human aspiration, triumph and failure, our personal stories create an emotional bond that transforms strangers into familiar faces. As America once again struggles with the question of whether and how to welcome the immigrant stranger, the telling of new immigrant stories is needed to help heal the chasm between “us” and “them,” and between our personal immigrant past and our nation’s immigrant present and future. During this Great Recession, with unemployment near 10%, the immigration narrative also needs to offer hope for Americans—hope that tomorrow will be better. Hope today comes in the form of good old American jobs. We have been told that maybe 4 million blue and white-collar jobs may be created by advances in alternative energy technology, and that wind, solar, thermal, and other sources of energy will move us closer to energy independence, greater national security and a healthier planet. But so far, we haven’t been that interested in asking the question, “who will create and commercialize this new green technology? Much like the role that immigrants played, in partnership with American-born colleagues, in the information technology revolution and the elevation of Silicon Valley to almost mythical status, immigrants are now emerging as key drivers of America’s quest for world-class clean energy technology. A glance at recent research on the contributions of immigrants supports the expectation that immigrants are helping to lead the green economy and other emerging industries: Immigrants are nearly twice as likely as native-born Americans to start a business. Immigrants are filing patents at twice the rate of the American-born. Immigrants founded more than half of the high-tech companies in Silicon Valley. Immigrants are much more likely to earn an advanced degree than the native-born. (Continued……. (Feel Free to ask for the deleted text) Throughout Michigan and the Midwest, civic and union leaders cheered the made-in-America strategy. U.S. Senator Debbie Stabenow of Michigan told the national media that a company founded by immigrants was moving the country in the right direction. “We need a twenty-first century manufacturing strategy in this country,” she said. “Companies like A1234 are not only creating quality, good-paying jobs in Michigan, but are insuring that we do not move from a dependence on foreign oil to a dependence on foreign technology.” John Dingell, a member of Congress from Michigan, called the A123-Chrysler partnership momentous on two levels. “The future of this country is dependent upon addressing two vital challenges—stopping the spread of global warming, and creating the next generation of manufacturing jobs here in the United States,” he said. “This project gets us closer to achieving both of those goals.”

#### Warming is an existential risk – *quickening* reductions is key to avoiding extinction

Mazo 10 – PhD in Paleoclimatology from UCLA

(Jeffrey Mazo, Managing Editor, Survival and Research Fellow for Environmental Security and Science Policy at the International Institute for Strategic Studies in London, 3-2010, “Climate Conflict: How global warming threatens security and what to do about it,” pg. 122)

The best estimates for global warming to the end of the century range from 2.5-4.~C above pre-industrial levels, depending on the scenario. Even in the best-case scenario, the low end of the likely range is 1.goC, and in the worst 'business as usual' projections, which actual emissions have been matching, the range of likely warming runs from 3.1--7.1°C. Even keeping emissions at constant 2000 levels (which have already been exceeded), global temperature would still be expected to reach 1.2°C (O'9""1.5°C)above pre-industrial levels by the end of the century." Without early and severe reductions in emissions, the effects of climate change in the second half of the twenty-first century are likely to be catastrophic for the stability and security of countries in the developing world - not to mention the associated human tragedy. Climate change could even undermine the strength and stability of emerging and advanced economies, beyond the knock-on effects on security of widespread state failure and collapse in developing countries.' And although they have been condemned as melodramatic and alarmist, many informed observers believe that unmitigated climate change beyond the end of the century could pose an existential threat to civilisation." What is certain is that there is no precedent in human experience for such rapid change or such climatic conditions, and even in the best case adaptation to these extremes would mean profound social, cultural and political changes.

### 2

#### Substantial is that which grounds and shapes – not numerical minutiae. The primary substance that is the foundation for economic engagement toward Cuba is the embargo. The plan only changes an instance of the embargo – this is ACCIDENTAL NOT SUBSTANTIAL

Malaguti, 11 (Michael J., practices with the Concord firm of Ransmeier & Spellman, “Substantial Confusion: The Use and Misuse of the Word ‘Substantial’ in the Legal Profession,” August, 52 N.H.B.J. 6, p. l/n)

Aristotle's definies substance as "that which is neither predicable of a subject nor present in a subject." n25 By this, Aristotle is referring to what he calls "primary substance" - "the truest and most definite sense of the word." n26 Aristotle tells us that the individual man and the individual horse are both primary substances. n27 Individual instances of things are not predicable of a subject because an individual instance cannot be said of a subject. Put another way, it would be impossible for me to assert "Eric" of "John." n28 This follows from the proposition that "John" and "Eric" are individual instances. Additionally, "Eric" is not present in "John." That is, "John" is not characterized by "Eric-ness" but rather "John-ness." But primary substances are not the only substances. "Eric" and "John" themselves fall into broader categories of things. "Eric" and "John" are both "humans." n29 Pause for a moment to note why "human" is not a primary substance by applying Aristotle's definition. First, "human" is predicable of a subject. n30 It is possible to say that "Eric" or "John" is characterized by "human-ness." n31 It is also true that "humanness" is present in "Eric" or "John." Secondary substances, then, are "the species and genera of the primary substances - the kinds into which the primary substances fall." n32 One author's explanation helps concretize these concepts: Each individual entity has a primary "substance" (Greek: ousia). One sense of this term is that" [o]usia is what something is; the answer to the question 'What is F' tells us the ousia of F. In these cases it is rendered by 'essence' . . . . " This primary and individual substance (the particular individual, "Eric") underlies everything else, including and especially the "secondary" substances to which the individual belongs, in this case "man" and "animal." We see then that the particular entity "Eric" consists of an essential substance that makes him what he is. n33 It is from Aristotle's definition that we have received the word "substance" into the English language: "A [secondary] substance . . . is the essence (the 'what it is to be'), the form (morphe or eidos), of a [primary substance]. . . ." n34 Thus, the word substance "corresponds to the Greek ousia, which means 'being,' transmitted via the Latin substantia, which means 'something that stands under or grounds things.'" n35 Lastly, and most significant, is Aristotle's distinction between "substance" and "accident:" With respect to any substance, we can typically distinguish between properties that are essential for the thing to be the kind of thing it is and properties that are inessential (the accidents) . . . . An individual [\*8] diamond must consist of carbon in appropriate crystalline structure, and must have a scratch hardness of 10 on the Mohs scale - these are essential properties. But it may be large or small; white, blue, red, green or black; be set in a crown or other setting - these are accidental properties. n36 This illustrates what is meant when it is said that substance is "that which lies beneath." The accidental properties may come and go, but the substance, standing as it does beneath the accidental properties, remains. It is clear then that substance, as it was originally used, had nothing to do with size - a descriptive category that is embodied today in the most prevalent use of "substance." n37 The substance-accident dichotomy illustrates this perfectly. Something is "substantial" if it lies beneath - that is, if it is essential to making something what it is. Significantly, size was, to Aristotle, an accidental property. As Aristotle observed in Categories: Expressions which are in no way composite signify substance, quantity, quality, relation, place, time, po-sition, state, action, or affection. To sketch my meaning roughly, examples of substance are "man" or "the horse", of quantity, such terms as "two cubits long" or "three cubits long", of quality, such attributes as "white", "grammatical". "Double", "half", "greater", fall under the category of relation; "in the market place", "in the Lyceum", under that of place; "yesterday", "last year", under that of time. "Lying", "sitting", are terms indicating position.; "shod", "armed", state; "to lance", "to cauterize", action; "to be lanced", "to be cauterized", affection. n38 It therefore would not have made sense to Aristotle to say, for instance, a "substantial amount," or a "substantial number," because such a statement rests on a conflation of substance and accident. To use the diamond example, the size of the diamond may change without affecting its "diamond-ness."

Prefer it

1) Limits – Allowing any other definition is unpredictable. Justifies lifting the embargo for any commodity – infinitely delimits

2) Ground – marginal changes to manifestations of the embargo NOT the embargo policy itself destroys negative link ground for trade DA’s and CP ground which also shifts the uniqueness debate

### 3

#### Obama is taking a hard line stance against Cuba now

Forero 13 - NPR's South America correspondent and The Washington Post's correspondent for Colombia and Venezuela (Juan, “Obama's Unfinished Business: Latin America”, January 22 of 2013, NPR, <http://www.npr.org/2013/01/22/169980241/obamas-unfinished-business-latin-america>)

FORERO: Well, I think there's two policy shifts in Cuba that are super significant. I think one of them is what you just mentioned, you know, this visa policy. And the other one is that the Cuban government has also been moving to permit small-scale private enterprise on the island. Things are so bad there that the state has been releasing workers - in other words, laying people off. And those people are supposed to try to find jobs and get things rolling with their own little businesses. That's going to be very tough in a country like that. And these are big changes. And of course there's talk about whether the United States would ever move on any significant change such as ending its economic embargo of the island.¶ And I don't see that that is going to happen. I mean, the U.S. has long said that the Castros - that is Raul, the president, and his brother Fidel - have to be gone before the U.S. engages Cuba. And I think it's important to note that American diplomats, I think, would love to see an end to the embargo.¶ Because it's very damaging to the U.S. It permits the Cubans to claim it's being bullied by a superpower. And the embargo just hasn't worked. You know, it hasn't ousted the communist government there. But the Obama administration, I think, faces domestic issues here. First of all, most Americans simply don't care about Cuba. And I think that the Cuban-American community, which does, has a leadership which continues to support a hard line against Cuba.¶ And Obama knows full well that that community, the Cuban-American community, particularly in Florida, does vote.

#### Cuban policy is appeasement – it pleases Castro

Walser 12 – Ph.D. and a Senior Policy Analyst at The Heritage Foundation (Ray, “Cuban-American Leaders: “No Substitute for Freedom” in Cuba”, June 25 of 2012, <http://blog.heritage.org/2012/06/25/cuban-american-leaders-no-substitute-for-freedom-in-cuba/>)

However, these pleasing liberal assumptions are negated on a daily basis by hard-headed facts on the ground in Cuba. With each new step lifting restrictions on travel and remittances have come more demands for additional actions—not a reciprocal loosening of the regime’s grip on its citizens.¶ A one-of a-kind letter entitled “Commitment to Freedom,” signed by a distinguished battery of Cuban-American former senior executives for Fortune 500 companies and released on June 25, advises Washington and the Obama Administration to curb its enthusiasm for a policy of appeasement and concessions. It warns against falling for the Castro regime’s deceptive campaign to secure U.S. capital infusion and bank credits and lure some Cuban-American businessmen without ushering in a true economic and political opening.¶ The former CEOs argue that recent economic reforms heralded as game-changing are, in fact, “mostly cosmetic, heavily-taxed and revocable, and offer no legal protection or investment return.” The letter’s signatories further warn that the Castro regime “is seeking to divide and neutralize the Cuban-American community, and lure some of its businessmen, by selling the fallacious concept that there is no solution to Cuba’s predicament other than supporting cosmetic reforms without liberty and democracy.”¶ They are correct when they say the future “lies not with the current failed, octogenarian rulers, but with the leaders of the growing pro-democracy movement.”¶ The Obama Administration policy aimed at easing travel and remittances to Cuba has visibly failed to advance genuine economic or political freedom. With the unjust detention of American Alan Gross and the continual crackdown on dissent and protest, the regime cannot hide its iron fist of political repression.¶ It is time to take a tougher look at the shortcomings of U.S. Cuba policy and remind ourselves, as these former CEOs do, that when it comes to ending the tyranny of the Castro regime, there is “no substitute for freedom.”

#### Appeasement triggers multiple scenarios for nuclear war – it is only a question of perception

Hanson 9 - American military historian, columnist and the Martin and Illie Anderson Senior Fellow at Stanford University's Hoover Institution (Victor, “Change, Weakness, Disaster, Obama: Answers from Victor Davis Hanson”, December 7 of 2009, Interview between Bernard Chapin and Hanson, <http://pjmedia.com/blog/change-weakness-disaster-obama-answers-from-victor-davis-hanson/>)

BC: Are we currently sending a message of weakness to our foes and allies? Can anything good result from President Obama’s marked submissiveness before the world?¶ Dr. Hanson: Obama is one bow and one apology away from a circus. The world can understand a kowtow gaffe to some Saudi royals, but not as part of a deliberate pattern. Ditto the mea culpas. Much of diplomacy rests on public perceptions, however trivial. We are now in a great waiting game, as regional hegemons, wishing to redraw the existing landscape — whether China, Venezuela, Iran, North Korea, Pakistan, Syria, etc. — are just waiting to see who’s going to be the first to try Obama — and whether Obama really will be as tenuous as they expect. If he slips once, it will be 1979 redux, when we saw the rise of radical Islam, the Iranian hostage mess, the communist inroads in Central America, the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, etc.¶ BC: With what country then — Venezuela, Russia, Iran, etc. — do you believe his global repositioning will cause the most damage?¶ Dr. Hanson: I think all three. I would expect, in the next three years, Iran to get the bomb and begin to threaten ever so insidiously its Gulf neighborhood; Venezuela will probably cook up some scheme to do a punitive border raid into Colombia to apprise South America that U.S. friendship and values are liabilities; and Russia will continue its energy bullying of Eastern Europe, while insidiously pressuring autonomous former republics to get back in line with some sort of new Russian autocratic commonwealth. There’s an outside shot that North Korea might do something really stupid near the 38th parallel and China will ratchet up the pressure on Taiwan. India’s borders with both Pakistan and China will heat up. I think we got off the back of the tiger and now no one quite knows whom it will bite or when.

### 4

#### A. Discourses of danger reproduces an American identity – that posits the US as a the defender of global freedom and liberty

Campbell, 98- Professor of International Politics University of Newcastle (David, Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity)

The crisis of representation the United States faces is unique only in the particularities of its content. The form of the dilemma is something common to all states. The state has never been a stable ground on which a fixed identity has been secured against danger: the variety of state forms throughout modernity have always been a historically contingent panoply of practices that have served to constitute identity through the negation of difference and the temptation of otherness. With the intensification of state power in the late nineteenth century, Foreign Policy helped contain and discipline the identities to which foreign policy had given rise. In our late modern era, where we find proliferating challenges that cannot be readily contained within the state, the discourse of danger associated with the discursive economy of foreign policy/Foreign Policy will have to work overtime to overcome the ever present threats to the once stable representation of an always unstable sovereign domain. The discursive economy of foreign policy will thus be taxed in its efforts to reproduce and contain challenges to the political identity of nations such as the United States. However, for (the United States of) America— which I have argued is the imagined community par excellence, the state that requires a discourse of danger probably more than any other— the crisis of representation is particularly acute. The operation of anticommunism as a prominent discourse of danger in the United States throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries— with its ability to encompass the entire population, intensively structure the practices of everyday life, and offer a link between internal and external threats in ways that circumscribe the boundaries of legitimacy— is probably the best example of an effective discourse of danger. But with (as discussed in the Introduction) the globalization of contingency, the erasure of the markers of certainty, and the rarefaction of political discourse, reproducing the identity of "the United States" and containing challenges to it are likely to require new discourses of danger. Of course, talk of a shift from old to new discourses of danger drastically oversimplifies the complexity of this cultural terrain. Transformations of this kind do not occur in discrete or sequential stages, for there has always been more than one referent around which danger has crystallized. What appears as new is often the emergence of something previously obscured by that which has faded away or become less salient. In this context, there is no shortage on the horizons of world politics of potential candidates for new discourses of danger (such as AIDS, "terrorism," and the general sign of anarchy and uncertainty). Consider just one example. The environment has occasionally emerged as an international discourse of danger. For example, a focus on the environmental catastrophes of Eastern Europe has been prominent. 2 One of the effects of this interpretation has been to reinscribe East-West understandings of global politics in a period of international transformation by suggesting that "they" in the East are technologically less sophisticated and ecologically more dangerous than "we" in the West. This produces a new boundary that demarcates the "East" from the "West" in a period when the old frontiers of identity are no longer sustainable. But environmental danger can also be figured in a manner that challenges traditional forms of identity inscribed in the capitalist economy of the "West." As a discourse of danger that results in disciplinary strategies that are de-territorialized, involve communal cooperation, and refigure economic relationships, the environment can serve to enframe a different rendering of "reasoning man" than that associated with the subjectivities of liberal capitalism, thereby making it more unstable and undecidable than anticommunism. 3 The major issues regarding the possible emergence of a new discourse of danger(s) in this period can be indicated by some questions. In terms of the reproduction of American identity along the lines established in the cold war, will any of the likely candidates be as extensive or intensive as that which they are needed to replace? In other words, are we going to witness the persistence of cold war practices even after their most recent objects of contention have passed on? Will these practices be represented in the mode of the society of security? Or, alternatively, do any of the new dangers being focused on in this juncture contain the possibility for a different figuration of American identity that would diverge from the enmity of the cold war? These questions, dealing with the rewriting of security, inform the argument in the remaining chapters. To make the analysis more specific, the first task is to consider an issue that has been officially identified a danger or threat necessitating vigilance and defense in the (so-called) post-cold war world: the incidence of drug consumption in America. Before proceeding, an observation about the strategy of argumentation employed in this chapter is in order. It begins with a consideration of the claims of "fact" made by the policy discourses to support their articulation of danger. In discussing counterevidence, my intent is not to juxtapose one realm of fact with another. To the contrary, my desire is to demonstrate that within each realm of policy discourse it is possible to construct, in its own terms, a competing narrative that denaturalizes and unsettles the dominant way of constructing the world, thus prying open the space for an alternative interpretation concerned with the entailments of identity. Indeed, although I begin this chapter by operating largely within the terms of these policy discourses, I have attempted to politicize the terms of the debate. For example, instead of "the drug problem" or "drug abuse" I speak of "drug consumption"; instead of "drug users" or "addicts" I speak of "drug consumers" or "people addicted"; and instead of "drug traffickers" and "cartels" I speak of the "drug industry." Of course, no representation is neutral, and the terms of my discourse are certainly contestable, but their estranging quality is designed to help make obvious the way in which formulations of identity are sequestered within even the technical arguments of public policy with which we are most familiar. 4 As such, this consideration of contemporary discourses illustrates the relevance to the current period of the idea that foreign policy/Foreign Policy is constitutive of political identity.

#### B. That makes extinction inevitable

Willson, 02- Ph.D New College San Fransisco, Humanities, JD, American University (Brian, “Armageddon or Quantum Leap? U.S. Imperialism and Human Consciousness from an Evolutionary Perspective”, [**http://www.brianwillson.com/quantum.html**](http://www.brianwillson.com/quantum.html))

Awaiting the impending U.S. government's concocted "preventive" war against Iraq (indeed, against the world), this is perhaps one of the most frightening moments in human history. In a surreal scenario, the U.S. government is renewing active threats of using nuclear weapons and reviving use of anti-personnel land mines, and is introducing new technological weapons of death we can only imagine, and some we cannot. As grim as this scene is, I believe it must be the inevitable and logical extension of the continued growth ad nauseum of the American Way Of Life (AWOL) in particular, and the Western Way Of Life in general. Premeditated murder of thousands--perhaps millions--of innocents is the price for AWOL's insatiable consumption and its bloodthirsty vengeance, totally abdicating responsibility for lethal consequences to the planet and its species, including, ironically, our own. Perhaps Gaia is presenting the current transparent dangers to us as like a cosmic gift so that we might actually be able to *see* the extraordinary folly of our ways in time to creatively "storm the Bastille."U.S. Terrorist Roots U.S. civilization was founded on and has been sustained by terrorism, facilitated by Eurocentric racism, classism, and arrogant ethnocentrism. The grossest irony of all, of course, is that the "War on Terror," to be successful, must focus on our own civilization, the most egregious proponent of terror the world has even known. Terror was systematically utilized since our country's beginnings in the 1600s. The following instructions, facilitated by a cruel racism, are part of the historic record: "burning and spoiling the [Indian] country," (Captain John Underhill, Massachusetts Bay Colony, 1636); "put to death the [Pequot Indian] men of Block Island" (Massachusetts Bay Governor John Winthrop's order to Captain John Endecott, 1637); "laying waste," and instilling "terror...by any means" among the Indians (General George Washington, 1779); "[with] malice enough in our hearts to destroy everything that contributes to their support" (General John Sullivan, 1779).

In a prominent history book published in 1906 (*The History of the United States,* James Wilford Garner, Ph.D. and Henry Cabot Lodge, Ph.D, L.L.D), the "destruction" of the American Indian is explained as follows: "History teaches that inferior people must yield to a superior civilization....They must take on civilization or pass out. The Negro was able to endure slavery while learning the rudiments of civilization; the Indian could not endure slavery, and...refused to be taught." Attitudes uttered by white, Puritan, Christian men, civilian and military, thus set the tone for our civilization, sentiments that to this day have not been seriously renounced. We remain primarily a white male supremacy society with overtly expressed as well as suppressed sentiments of racism and classism dominating much of our political life and foreign policy. How can someone drop a bomb knowing that thousands of innocents will be murdered if the bomber is not possessed by cruel racism and/or ugly ethnocentrism? Conveniently left out of the historical record is the fact that our civilization has been founded on three holocausts, the first being theft of virtually all our land base at gunpoint while murdering millions of the original inhabitants. The second brought us "free" labor from Africa, but resulted in two-thirds of all those originally targeted for apprehension being murdered in the process of trying to escape or from being stowed as human cargo in slave ships known as floating coffins. The third holocaust took place during what the founder and publisher of *Time* and *Life* magazines, Thomas Luce, called "The American Century." This century witnessed more than 300 military and perhaps 10,000 covert interventions by the U.S. into more than 100 countries, stealing resources at gunpoint while murdering millions of the increasing numbers of impoverished people struggling for independence. "American exceptionalism" must succeed at *any* cost. In the process, the three Buddhist "poisons" are employed: greed -- for profit at any cost of human suffering; hatred -- of any obstacles to profit; ignorance -- of the intimate link between Western corporations/governments and "Third World" repressive regimes.  U.S. Oligarchy It does not matter which of the two parties, the republocrats or demoblicans, is in power. They both easily consented to the selection of their chief executive officer in violation of the rights of thousands of illegally disenfranchised Black voters, and of their Constitutional system itself that makes no provision for the Supreme Court to make such selection. Both believe in preserving the "national security" of AWOL, which means continued, unabated acceleration of extraction, consumption and pollution patterns, and obscene profits for the plutocrats and their bribed oligarchs in Washington. For all this to happen, Mr. Bush, indeed, has laid out the necessary plans for a world imperium to assure, in his and his cohorts' minds, continuation of our Western way of life, business- and profits-as-usual.  These oligarchs are not able to perceive the fact that further continuation of AWOL guarantees our destruction. They are not able to even consider the need for radical contraction and creative alternatives. They act as if blind drunk with their personal and political values of money and power, under the cloak of their disfigured version of Jesus. Unfortunately, the inevitable consequences of their business-as-usual forces are systematic destruction of virtually all sustainable ecosystems and human-created institutions.   Origins of "Civilization" Some history. As the revolution of urban civilization took root some 5,000 years ago the basic ingredients of "Western civilization" were introduced into our human evolutionary journey. The basic model of "civilization," for all but the most isolated and exceptional Indigenous groups, has seen the advent of powerful male oligarchs surrounded by elite bureaucracies of scribes and priests, overseeing hierarchies that involuntarily enforced large numbers of laborers, often violently captured during wars, to construct large projects for the pleasure of the king. Wars, systematic violence, and harsh class division originated with "civilizations." Secrecy of priestly knowledge about cosmic regularities and calendar-making assured that knowledge was monopolized by the small elite surrounding the oligarch. And the maxim, "the best defense is attack," was often used in early warfare, roots of our preventive strikes of today. According to Asian and Scandinavian scholars there have been nearly 15,000 wars during the last 5,000 years.   Extraordinarily Dangerous Trends The U.S. economy reveals increasing vulnerabilities to the fiction and hot air behind Wall Street and the continued exploitation and creation of misery upon which it is based. The U.S. regime has chosen to protect its illusion of omnipotence under the veil of fighting "terrorism" and its curtailing of civil liberties is similar to a police state. Increasingly desperate means used by people in power to maintain that power is a historically typical, predictable phenomenon. Never before, however, have oligarchs commanded so much power and possessed so many weapons of mass destruction, with explicit intentions to use such weapons preventively rather than defensively. I believe that we are at a pivotal point in history. We sit precariously perched on a ledge overlooking imminent extinction as a very real possibility at this juncture in our long, 7- to 8-million-year human evolutionary journey. Academics often talk about how history is cyclical, but two demonstrable trends, clearly not cyclical, indicate that we are dangerously near the end of our evolutionary branch

#### C. Alternative text – reject the affirmative to desecuritize the Political. Vote negative to challenge securitization itself in favor of a political ethic that approaches problems in non-security terms and exposes the limits of their methodology.

#### D. Framework – security is a communicative action that requires discursive justification – there is an ethical responsibility to justify securitization in political discussion. The role of the ballot is to interrogate methodologies – to weigh their case the Aff has to legitimize securitization first

Williams, 03 [Michael – IR Prof @ University of Ottawa, “Words, Images, Enemies: Securitization and International Politics,” International Studies Quarterly, Vol. 47, No. 4 (Dec., 2003), pp. 511-53, Published by: Blackwell Publishing on behalf of The International Studies Association, JSTOR] <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3693634>

A second major criticism of the Copenhagen School concerns the ethics of securitization. Simply put, if security is nothing more than a specific form of social practice-a speech-act tied to existential threat and a politics of emergency-then does this mean that anything can be treated as a "security" issue and that, as a consequence, any form of violent, exclusionary, or irrationalist politics must be viewed simply as another form of "speech-act" and treated "objectively"? Questions such as these have led many to ask whether despite its avowedly "constructivist" view of security practices, securitization theory is implicitly committed to a methodological objectivism that is politically irresponsible and lacking in any basis from which to critically evaluate claims of threat, enmity, and emergency.29 A first response to this issue is to note that the Copenhagen School has not shied away from confronting it. In numerous places the question of the ethics of securitization are discussed as raising difficult issues. As Wever has argued in relation to theorizing the highly sensitive issue of identity, for example, Such an approach implies that we have to take seriously concerns about identity, but have also to study the specific and often problematic effects of their being framed as security issues. We have also to look at the possibilities of handling some of these problems in nonsecurity terms, that is to take on the problems but leave them unsecuritized. This latter approach recognizes that social processes are already under way whereby societies have begun to thematize themselves as security agents that are under threat. This process of social construction can be studied, and the security quality of the phenomenon understood, without thereby actually legitimizing it. (1995: 66; see also Waever, 1999). As sustained as these considerations have been, it must be admitted that the answers are somewhat less searching than the questioning, and that this remains one of the most underarticulated aspects of securitization theory (Wyn Jones, 1999: 111-12). I would like to suggest, however, that there are two important issues at stake in these questions, each of which can be clarified through a greater recognition of the Schmittian elements of securitization theory. The first, and simplest point is that in some ways the Copenhagen School treats securitization not as a normative question, 27 I owe this insight especially to Didier Bigo. 28 Again, there are clear links here between securitization theory and classical Realism's stress on the "ethic of responsibility." 29 Voiced, for example, in Erickson (1999). These issues are, of course, also central to debates concerning social constructivismm ore generally.S ee in particulart he exchange between John Mearsheimer( 1994/95, 1995) and Alexander Wendt (1995). A broad overview can be found in Price and Reus-Smit (1998). 521 Words, Images, Enemies: Securitization and International Politics but as an objective process and possibility. Very much like Schmitt, they view securitization as a social possibility intrinsic to political life. In regard to his concept of the political, for example, Schmitt once argued, It is irrelevant here whether one rejects, accepts, or perhaps finds it an atavistic remnant of barbaric times that nations continue to group themselves according to friend and enemy, or whether it is perhaps strong pedagogic reasoning to imagine that enemies no longer exist at all. The concern here is neither with abstractions nor normative ideals, but with inherent reality and the real possibility of making such a distinction. One may or may not share these hopes and pedagogic ideals. But, rationally speaking, it cannot be denied that nations continue to group themselves according to the friend-enemy antithesis, that the distinction still remains actual today, and that this is an ever present possibility for every people existing in the political sphere (1996 [1932]: 28).30 In certain settings, the Copenhagen School seems very close to this position. Securitization must be understood as both an existing reality and a continual possibility. Yet equally clearly there is a basic ambivalence in this position, for it raises the dilemma that securitization theory must remain at best agnostic in the face of any securitization, even, for example, a fascist speech-act (such as that Schmitt has often been associated with) that securitizes a specific ethnic or racial minority. To say that we must study the conditions under which such processes. I would like to suggest that it is in response to these issues, and in regard to the realm of ethical practice, that the idea of security as a speech-actta kes on an importance well beyond its role as a tool of social explanation. Casting securitization as a speechact places that act within a framework of communicative action and legitimation that links it to a discursive ethics that seeks to avoid the excesses of a decisionist account of securitization. While the Copenhagen School has been insufficiently clear in developing these aspects of securitization theory, they link clearly to some of the most interesting current analyses of the practical ethics of social-constructivism. As Thomas Risse (2000) has recently argued, communicative action is not simply a realm of instrumental rationality and rhetorical manipulation. Communicative action involves a process of argument, the provision of reasons, presentation of evidence, and commitment to convincing others of the validity of one's position. Communicative action (speech-acts) are thus not just given social practices, they are implicated in a process of justification. Moreover, as processes of dialogue, communicative action has a potentially transformative capacity. As Risse puts it: Argumentative rationality appears to be crucially linked to the constitutive rather than the regulative role of norms and identities by providing actors with a mode of interaction that enables them to mutually challenge and explore the validity claims of those norms and identities. When actors engage in a truth-seeking discourse, they must be prepared to change their own views of the world, their interests, and sometimes even their identities. (2000: 2)31 30 More broadly,i t can be argued that for Schmitti t was not only a possibilityb, ut a choice, a decision, that he paradoxically saw as necessary if a vital human life was to be lived. For an analysis of Schmitt in relation to a vitalistic romanticisma nd a virulenth ostilityt o liberalisms ee againW olin( 1992). Schmitt'sv italismm arkso ne of the clearest differences with the Copenhagen School, as discussed below. 31 Risse's analysis here draws greatly on that of Habermas. For Habermas's own treatment of speech-act theory see Habermas (1984). For Habermas's own views on Schmitt see Habermas (1990); a recent brief survey of the relationship between Habermas and Schmitt in the context of International Relations is Wheeler (2000), and a more extended and varied collection is Wyn Jones (2001). As speech-acts, securitizations are in principle forced to enter the realm of discursive legitimation. Speech-act theory entails the possibility of argument, of dialogue, and thereby holds out the potential for the transformation of security perceptions both within and between states. The securitizing speech-act must be accepted by the audience, and while the Copenhagen School is careful to note that "[a]ccept does not necessarily mean in civilized, dominance-free discussion; it only means that an order always rests on coercion as well as on consent," it is nonetheless the case that "[s]ince securitization can never only be imposed, there is some need to argue one's case"(Buzan et al., 1998: 23), and that "[s]uccessful securitization is not decided by the securitizer but by the audience of the security speech-act: does the audience accept that something is an existential threat to a shared value? Thus security (as with all politics) ultimately rests neither with the objects nor with the subjects but among the subjects"( 1998:31). It is via this commitment to communicative action and discursive ethics, I would like to suggest, that the Copenhagen School seeks to avoid the radical realpolitik that might otherwise seem necessarily to follow from the Schmittian elements of the theory of securitization. Schmitt appeals to the necessity and inescapability of decision, enmity, and "the political." He appeals to the mobilizing power of myth in the production of friends and enemies, and asserts the need for a single point of decision to the point of justifying dictatorship. He mythologizes war and enmity as the paramount moments of political life.32 By contrast, the Copenhagen School treats securitization as a social process, and casts it as a phenomenon largely to be avoided. Securitization is the Schmittian realm of the political, and for precisely this reason it is dangerous and-by and large-to be avoided.33 This element of the Copenhagen School is clearly illustrated in the concepts of "desecuritization" and "asecurity" which form integral aspects of securitization theory. As a consequence of their Schmittian understanding of security-and in contrast to many (indeed most) other forms of security studies-the Copenhagen School does not regard security as an unambiguously positive value. In most cases, securitization is something to be avoided. While casting an issue as one of "security" may help elevate its position on the political agenda, it also risks placing that issue within the logic of threat and decision, and potentially within the contrast of friend and enemy.34 "Security,"accordingly, is something to be invoked with great care and, in general, minimized rather than expanded-a movement that should be sought in the name of stability, tolerance, and political negotiation, not in opposition to it. "Desecuritization" involves precisely this process; a moving of issues off the "security" agenda and back into the realm of public political discourse and "normal" political dispute and accommodation. The transformation of many elements of European security as part of the end of the Cold War stands as a key example (Waever, Buzan, Kelstrup, and Lemaitre, 1993). Similarly, the concept of "asecurity" designates a (probably optimal) situation in which relations are so firmly "politicized" that there is little chance of them becoming re-securitized, a case that Waever argues is illustrated by the Nordic countries whose relations with each other constitute an "asecurity community" rather than a "security community" in the more conventional sense (Waver, 1998b). 32 See, for example, the direct discussion of-and partial contrast to-Schmitt's use of enmity in the construction of sovereignty in Waver (1995: fn. 63); Schmitt also figures in the analysis of religion as a "referent object" pursued in Bagge Lausten and Waver (2000:726, 733). 33 Here, too, the links to classical Realism are strong, for as William Scheuerman (1999) has brilliantly illustrated, this was precisely the tack adopted by Hans Morgenthau in his extended critical engagement with Schmitt. 34 Recognizing this particular Schmittian legacy hopefully also helps clarify the dispute between the Copenhagen School and those who think its scepticism toward the word and concept of "security" is politically debilitating. 523 Words, Images, Enemies: Securitization and International Politics As a contribution to political practice, the sociological analysis of the Copenhagen School attempts to provide tools whereby these transformative processes can be fostered. By exposing the limits imposed by the securitization of specific issues, it provides resources for challenging these limitations. In presenting security as a speech-act, the Copenhagen School is doing more than developing a sociological thesis: it is presenting a political ethic. This does not mean that securitizations will always be forced to enter the realm of discursive legitimation. Indeed, part of the power of securitization theory lies in its stress on how "security" issues are often or usually insulated from this process of public debate: they operate in the realm of secrecy, of "national security," of decision. Equally, relations may be "sedimented" to such a degree that discursive ethics and tactics of social negotiation are unlikely to succeed and need to be subordinated (at least in the short term) to more traditional mechanisms of (relatively fixed) interest manipulation and material power balancing.35 These are key elements of any analysis of security policy. But the limitations should also not be overstated. As resistant as they may be, these security policies and relationships are susceptible to being pulled back into the public realm and capable of transformation, particularly when the social consensus underlying the capacity for decision is challenged, either by questioning the policies, or by disputing the threat, or both.36

### 5

#### Text: Major League Baseball should repeal the Kuhn directive, amend Rule 4(a) and Rule 3(a)(1) to permit the drafting of Cuban players, and allow these newly drafted players to sign contracts with the teams that draft them, and impose a moderate tax on teams that sign Cuban players – the proceeds of which will be used to support Cuban baseball.

#### Kuhn repeal solves US-Cuba

Greller 2k (Matthew, JD from the American University Washington College of Law, “Give Me Your Tired, Your Poor, Your Fastball Pitchers Yearning for Strike Three: n1 How Baseball Diplomacy Can Revitalize Major League Baseball and United States-Cuba Relations,” 14 Am. U. Int'l L. Rev. 1647, Lexis)

To facilitate changes in Cuban baseball player immigration, MLB, Cuba, and the United States must first abandon their policies of exclusion. For this to occur, MLB must abandon former Commissioner Kuhn's 1977 Directive, which prevents MLB teams from scouting or signing Cuban players. 2 ' Such a change will bring MLB closer to Kuhn's ultimate goal of utilizing baseball to improve bilateral relations between Cuba and the United States. 2 2 1 In addition, Castro must remove the 1960 ban on Cubans competing in professional sports, which discourages Cuban participation in MLB.

#### Draft inclusion boosts baseball diplomacy

Greller 2k (Matthew, JD from the American University Washington College of Law, “Give Me Your Tired, Your Poor, Your Fastball Pitchers Yearning for Strike Three: n1 How Baseball Diplomacy Can Revitalize Major League Baseball and United States-Cuba Relations,” 14 Am. U. Int'l L. Rev. 1647, Lexis)

To remain close to the Cuban government's desire to respect the principles of Cuban sports 2 2 6 and to bolster the competitive balance within MLB, Baseball Diplomacy requires further proactive efforts. Accordingly, MLB must implement a system that exposes Cuban players who desire to play in MLB to the June Draft, instead of allowing these players to follow the "El Duque" model." Drafting Cuban players will comply with Kuhn's desire to establish an orderly system that allows for the fair distribution of Cuban players. " 2 Such a change will spread the rich Cuban talent around the thinning MLB rosters, and instill pride in the hearts of Cubans throughout the northem hemisphere. 9 Moreover, draffing Cuban players will allow poorer MLB teams to acquire some of the best international talent that they currently cannot obtain.2 - 0 Consequently, drafting Cuban players will provide the opportunity for these teams to enjoy increased fan support, media interest, attendance levels, and television and radio ratings that can buoy their financial solvency. 2 3 ' To do so, MLB must amend both Rule 4(a) and Rule 3(a)(1) to permit the drafting of Cuban players, and allow these newly drafted players to sign contracts with the teams that draft them. An amended Rule 4(a) should read, "For purposes of this Rule 4, the term 'United States' shall mean the 50 States of the United States of America, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and any other Commonwealth, Territory or Possession of the United States of America. Additionally, for the purposes of this Rule 4, a player may be eligible to sign if said player resides within the Republic of Cuba. 2 3 2 Moreover, Rule 3(a)(1)'s provisions for the First-Year Draft should include this amended language to enable the signing of Cuban players. 2 3 3 Drafting Cuban baseball players, however, will not deprive these players of the ability to command large contracts. In fact, the amendments will allow Cuban players to be treated like all the other MLB players who are entitled to salary arbitration after three years of service within MLB, and who can obtain free agency after six years with the same team. 2 " 4 The drafted Cuban baseball players will receive these conditions as well. Drafting Cuban players, therefore, will allow Baseball Diplomacy to move halfway towards its goals, and advance to Second Base.

### Relations

#### No bioterror threat

**Mueller, 05** (John, Professor of Political Science at OhioState. May 2005. International Studies Perspectives, Volume 6 Issue 2 Page 208-234, Simplicity and Spook: Terrorism and the Dynamics of Threat Exaggeration)

Properly developed and deployed, biological weapons could indeed, if thus far only in theory, kill hundreds of thousands, perhaps even millions, of people. The discussion remains theoretical because biological weapons have scarcely ever been used even though the knowledge about their destructive potential as weapons goes back decades, even centuries in some respects (the English, e.g., made some efforts to spread smallpox among American Indians in the French and Indian War) (Christopher, Cieslak, Pavlin, and Eitzen, 1997:412).Belligerents have eschewed such weapons with good reason: biological weapons are extremely difficult to deploy and to control. Terrorist groups or rogue states may be able to solve such problems in the future with advances in technology and knowledge, but the record thus far is unlikely to be very encouraging to them. For example, Japan reportedly infected wells in Manchuria and bombed several Chinese cities with plague-infested fleas before and during the Second World War. These ventures may have killed thousands of Chinese, but they apparently also caused thousands of unintended casualties among Japanese troops and seem to have had little military impact.18 In the 1990s, Aum Shinrikyo, a Japanese cult that had some 300 scientists in its employ and an estimated budget of $1 billion, reportedly tried at least nine times over 5 years to set off biological weapons by spraying pathogens from trucks and wafting them from rooftops, hoping fancifully to ignite an apocalyptic war. These efforts failed to create a single fatality—in fact, nobody even noticed that the attacks had taken place.

#### No impact to cyber-terror---won’t cause military conflict

Thomas P.M. Barnett 13, special assistant for strategic futures in the U.S. Defense Department's Office of Force Transformation from 2001 to 2003, is chief analyst for Wikistrat, March/April 2013, “Think Again: The Pentagon,” Foreign Policy, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2013/03/04/the\_pentagon?page=full

As for cyber serving as a stand-alone war-fighting domain, there you'll find the debates no less theological in their intensity. After serving as senior managing director for half a dozen years at a software firm that specializes in securing supply chains, I'm deeply skeptical. Given the uncontrollable nature of cyberweapons (see: Stuxnet's many permutations), I view them as the 21st century's version of chemical weapons -- nice to have, but hard to use. Another way to look at it is to simply call a spade a spade: Cyberwarfare is nothing more than espionage and sabotage updated for the digital era. Whatever cyberwar turns out to be in the national security realm, it will always be dwarfed by the industrial variants -- think cyberthieves, not cyberwarriors. But you wouldn't know it from the panicky warnings from former Defense Secretary Leon Panetta and the generals about the imminent threat of a "cyber Pearl Harbor."¶ Please remember amid all this frenetic scaremongering that the Pentagon is never more frightened about our collective future than when it's desperately uncertain about its own. Given the rising health-care costs associated with America's aging population and the never-ending dysfunction in Washington, we should expect to be bombarded with frightening scenarios of planetary doom for the next decade or two. None of this bureaucratic chattering will bear any resemblance to global trends, which demonstrate that wars have grown increasingly infrequent, shorter in duration, and diminished in lethality. But you won't hear that from the next-warriors on the Potomac.

#### No environment impact

**Stossel, 07** Journalist, winner of the Peabody Award, anchors ABC News, 07 [John, “Environmental Alarmists Have It Backwards”, <http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2007/04/how_about_economic_progress_da.html>]

Watching the media coverage, you'd think that the earth was in imminent danger -- that human life itself was on the verge of extinction. Technology is fingered as the perp. Nothing could be further from the truth. John Semmens of Arizona's Laissez Faire Institute points out that Earth Day misses an important point. In the April issue of [The Freeman magazine](http://www.fee.org), Semmens says the environmental movement overlooks how hospitable the earth has become -- thanks to technology. "The environmental alarmists have it backwards. If anything imperils the earth it is ignorant obstruction of science and progress. ... That technology provides the best option for serving human wants and conserving the environment should be evident in the progress made in environmental improvement in the United States. Virtually every measure shows that pollution is headed downward and that nature is making a comeback." (Carbon dioxide excepted, *if* it is really a pollutant.) Semmens describes his visit to historic Lexington and Concord in Massachusetts, an area "lush with trees and greenery." It wasn't always that way. In 1775, the land was cleared so it could be farmed. Today, technology makes farmers so efficient that only a fraction of the land is needed to produce much more food. As a result, "Massachusetts farmland has been allowed to revert back to forest." Human ingenuity and technology not only raised living standards, but also restored environmental amenities. How about a day to celebrate that? Yet, Semmens writes, the environmental movement is skeptical about technology and is attracted to three dubious principles: sustainable development, the precautionary principle, and stakeholder participation. The point of sustainable development, Semmens says, "is to minimize the use of nonrenewable natural resources so there will be more left for future generations." Sounds sensible -- who is for "unsustainable" development? But as the great economist [Julian Simon](http://www.juliansimon.com/) often pointed out, resources are manmade, not natural. [Jed Clampett](http://timstvshowcase.com/beverlyh.html) cheered when he found oil on his land because it made him rich enough to move to Beverly Hills. But his great-grandfather would have cursed the disgusting black gunk because Canadian geologist Abraham Gesner hadn't yet discovered that kerosene [could be distilled from it](http://www.sjgs.com/history.html#ancient_to_present). President Bush chides us for our "addiction to oil." But under current conditions, using oil makes perfect sense. Someday, if we let the free market operate, someone will find an energy source that works better than oil. Then richer future generations won't need oil. So why deprive ourselves and make ourselves poorer with needless regulation now? Anyway, it's not as if we're running out of oil. That's one of the myths I expose in my new book, ["Myths, Lies and Downright Stupidity"](http://www.amazon.com/Myths-Lies-Downright-Stupidity-Shovel-Why/dp/0786893931/ref%3Dsr_1_1/002-5041762-3701609?ie=UTF8&s=books&qid=1176851054&sr=8-1). If the price of a barrel of oil stays high, entrepreneurs will find better ways to suck oil out of the ground. At $50 a barrel, it's even profitable to recover oil that's stuck in the tar sands in Alberta, Canada. Those tar sands alone contain enough oil to meet our needs for a *hundred* years. The precautionary principle, popular in Europe, is the idea that no new thing should be permitted until it has been proved harmless. Sounds good, except as Ron Bailey of Reason writes, it basically means, "Don't ever do anything for the first time." Stakeholder participation means that busybodies would be permitted to intrude on private transactions. Semmens's example is DDT, which for years would have saved children from deadly malaria, except that "'stakeholders' from the environmental quarter have prevailed on governments to ban the trade in this product." The first victims of these principles are the poor. We rich Westerners can withstand a lot of policy foolishness. But people in the developing world live on the edge, so anything that retards economic progress -- including measures to arrest global warming -- will bring incredible hardship to the most vulnerable on the planet. If we care about human life, we should celebrate Economic Progress Day.

#### No keystone species impact

Doremus, 2K (Holly, Professor of Law at UC Davis Washington & Lee Law Review, Winter 57 Wash & Lee L. Rev. 11, lexis)

In recent years, this discourse frequently has taken the form of the ecological horror story . That too is no mystery. The ecological horror story is unquestionably an attention-getter, especially in the hands of skilled writers [\*46] like Carson and the Ehrlichs. The image of the airplane earth, its wings wobbling as rivet after rivet is carelessly popped out, is difficult to ignore. The apocalyptic depiction of an impending crisis of potentially dire proportions is designed to spur the political community to quick action . Furthermore, this story suggests a goal that appeals to many nature lovers: that virtually everything must be protected. To reinforce this suggestion, tellers of the ecological horror story often imply that the relative importance of various rivets to the ecological plane cannot be determined. They offer reams of data and dozens of anecdotes demonstrating the unexpected value of apparently useless parts of nature. The moth that saved Australia from prickly pear invasion, the scrubby Pacific yew, and the downright unattractive leech are among the uncharismatic flora and fauna who star in these anecdotes. n211 The moral is obvious: because we cannot be sure which rivets are holding the plane together, saving them all is the only sensible course. Notwithstanding its attractions, the material discourse in general, and the ecological horror story in particular, are not likely to generate policies that will satisfy nature lovers. The ecological horror story implies that there is no reason to protect nature until catastrophe looms. The Ehrlichs' rivet-popper account, for example, presents species simply as the (fungible) hardware holding together the ecosystem. If we could be reasonably certain that a particular rivet was not needed to prevent a crash, the rivet-popper story suggests that we would lose very little by pulling it out. Many environmentalists, though, would disagree. Reluctant to concede such losses, tellers of the ecological horror story highlight how close a catastrophe might be, and how little we know about what actions might trigger one. But the apocalyptic vision is less credible today than it seemed in the 1970s. Although it is clear that the earth is experiencing a mass wave of extinctions, the complete elimination of life on earth seems unlikely. Life is remarkably robust. Nor is human extinction probable any time soon. Homo sapiens is adaptable to nearly any environment. Even if the world of the future includes far fewer species, it likely will hold people. One response to this credibility problem tones the story down a bit, arguing not that humans will go extinct but that ecological disruption will bring economies, and consequently civilizations, to their knees. But this too may be overstating the case. Most ecosystem functions are performed by multiple species. This functional redundancy means that a high proportion of species can be lost without precipitating a collapse.

#### No impact to Russian economy

**Blackwill, 09** – former associate dean of the Kennedy School of Government and Deputy Assistant to the President and Deputy National Security Advisor for Strategic Planning (Robert, RAND, “The Geopolitical Consequences of the World Economic Recession—A Caution”, http://www.rand.org/pubs/occasional\_papers/2009/RAND\_OP275.pdf, WEA)

Now on to Russia. Again, five years from today. Did the global recession and Russia’s present serious economic problems substantially modify Russian foreign policy? No. (President Obama is beginning his early July visit to Moscow as this paper goes to press; nothing fundamental will result from that visit). Did it produce a serious weakening of Vladimir Putin’s power and authority in Russia? No, as recent polls in Russia make clear. Did it reduce Russian worries and capacities to oppose NATO enlargement and defense measures eastward? No. Did it affect Russia’s willingness to accept much tougher sanctions against Iran? No. Russian Foreign Minister Lavrov has said there is no evidence that Iran intends to make a nuclear weapon.25 In sum, Russian foreign policy is today on a steady, consistent path that can be characterized as follows: to resurrect Russia’s standing as a great power; to reestablish Russian primary influence over the space of the former Soviet Union; to resist Western eff orts to encroach on the space of the former Soviet Union; to revive Russia’s military might and power projection; to extend the reach of Russian diplomacy in Europe, Asia, and beyond; and to oppose American global primacy. For Moscow, these foreign policy first principles are here to stay, as they have existed in Russia for centuries. 26 None of these enduring objectives of Russian foreign policy are likely to be changed in any serious way by the economic crisis.

### Baseball Diplomacy

#### No impact to US-EU relations

The Hindu, 04 (Card is no longer available online, if you need it, please e-mail me, Friday April 30th 2004, May 21st 2010, KONTOPOULOS)

It is one of the Europea Union's most cherished ambitions to play a bigger and more coherent role on the world stage. But taking in 10 new members to create a club of 25 countries is likely - in the short term at least - to make achieving that more difficult. Not that the E.U. aspires to compete militarily with an unassailably powerful US. Defence budgets are shrinking and few countries are prepared to pool much sovereignty in this sensitive area. Yet if 450 million Europeans living in the world's largest single market - many already sharing the same currency - want to be able to punch at their weight, something is going to have to change. Europeans may then no longer be derided as playing wimps' to American warriors' and develop some clout in West Asia, North Korea and beyond. The chances do not look good. One Brussels Ambassador warned: On the big foreign policy issues, there is a real risk that after enlargement it will be harder rather than easier to forge consensus.''

#### Diplomacy has limited utility – can’t be effectively practiced by the government

**Wolf and Rosen, 04** (Charles Jr. Wolf - Senior Economic Adviser and Corporate Fellow in International Economics at RAND, and Brian Rosen - Doctoral Fellow at the RAND Corporation, “Public Diplomacy: How to Think about and improve it,” www.rand.org/pubs/occasional\_papers/2004/RAND\_OP134.pdf)

Still, a reformed and enhanced public diplomacy should be accompanied by limited expectations about what it can realistically accomplish. U.S. policies—notably in the Israel-Palestine dispute as well as in Iraq—inevitably and inherently will arouse in the Middle East and Muslim worlds opposition and deafness to the public diplomacy message that the United States wishes to transmit. While these policies have their own rationale and logic, the reality is that they do and will limit what public diplomacy can or should be expected to accomplish. The antipathy for the United States that some U.S. policies arouse is yet another argument that supports outsourcing some aspects of public diplomacy. The message America is trying to sell about pluralism, freedom, and democracy need not be delivered by the U.S. government. The message itself may be popular among potential constituents who view the United States unfavorably, but if the government delivers the message, the message may go unheard. Nevertheless, even if outsourcing proves more effective, expectations should be limited. While outsourcing may put some distance between a potentially favorable message (pluralism, freedom, and democracy) and an unfavorable messenger (the United States government), inevitably the two will be linked.

NO impact to baseball diplomacy

Briley 10 – Ron Briley, History Network News, July 12, 2010, “Baseball and Foreign Policy--Yes There is a History Here,” online: http://www.thecuttingedgenews.com/index.php?article=12375&pageid=&pagename=

Elias concludes, however, the decision to cast its lot with American Empire has cost the sport dearly. As the international critics of American empire grow more strident, baseball‘s reputation and place in the world have suffered. Organized Baseball has sought a special relationship with American empire, and as a business it has often prospered at the expense of the sport. Elias. who loves the game, urges baseball to separate itself from militarism and empire by championing the principles of equal opportunity contained in the promise of the Declaration of Independence and American dream.