# 1nc

### 1nc

#### Engagement is the lynchpin of neoliberal expansion into Cuba

**Wenston & Woods ’08** – Trotskyist political theorist and author and leading members of the International Marxist Tendency (Fred & Alan, “[Vultures hovering over Cuba after Fidel Castro steps down](http://www.cjournal.info/2008/02/20/vultures-hovering-over-cuba-after-fidel-castro-steps-down/)”, http://www.cjournal.info/2008/02/20/vultures-hovering-over-cuba-after-fidel-castro-steps-down/)//VP

They all pretend to be democrats when it comes to Cuba. In reality they are like vultures waiting for the day they can get their beaks and claws into the flesh of Cuba. What they are after is the end of the economic system brought into being by the Cuban revolution. They want capitalism to return to Cuba. That is what they mean by “democracy”! Another fashionable term these days is “engagement”. While Bush sticks to his guns and insists on the embargo being stepped up, the more intelligent bourgeois, both in the USA and Europe are raising the need for “engagement”, i.e. on removing the embargo and opening up trade channels. Does this wing of the bourgeois have different interests or aims? No, they simply understand better than Bush and his obtuse circle of friends that the best way to re-introduce capitalism into Cuba is to lift the embargo, begin trading, flood Cuba with cash and let the process unfold.¶ That is why it is even more disgusting when we hear some reformist elements on the left advocating such “engagement”. What they are actually doing is giving the bourgeois advice on how to remove this thorn in their side.¶ All this talk of democracy is in fact a cover for the real aims of imperialism. Not so long ago the Financial Times was giving more sober advice. They were suggesting a “Chinese road” for Cuba accompanied by a lifting of the US-sponsored embargo. The Chinese model would envisage an opening up of Cuba to capitalism accompanied by a firm grip on state power at the top.

#### Neoliberalism causes extinction through ecological destruction and resource wars

**Darder, 10** – Professor Antonia Darder, Distinguished Professor of Education, University of Illinois, Urbana Champaign (“Preface” in *Critical Pedagogy, Ecoliteracy, & Planetary Crisis: The Ecopedagogy Movement* by Richard V. Kahn, 2010, pp. x-xiii)//VP

GENDER MODIFIED

It is fitting to begin my words about Richard Kahn’s Critical Pedagogy, Ecoliteracy, and Planetary Crisis: The Ecopedagogy Movement with a poem. The direct and succinct message of The Great Mother Wails cuts through our theorizing and opens us up to the very heart of the book’s message—to ignite a fire that speaks to **the ecological crisis** at hand; a crisis orchestrated by the inhumane greed and economic brutality of the wealthy. Nevertheless, as is clearly apparent, none of us is absolved from complicity with the devastating destruction of the earth. As members of the global community, we are all implicated in this destruction by the very manner in which we define ourselves, each other, and all living beings with whom we reside on the earth. Everywhere we look there are glaring signs of political systems and social structures that propel us toward **unsustainability and extinction**. In this historical moment, the planet faces some of the most horrendous forms of “[hu]man-made” devastation ever known to humankind. Cataclysmic “natural disasters” in the last decade have sung the environmental hymns of planetary imbalance and reckless environmental disregard. A striking feature of this ecological crisis, both locally and globally, is the **overwhelming concentration of wealth** held by the ruling elite and their agents of capital. This environmental malaise is characterized by the staggering loss of livelihood among working people everywhere; gross inequalities in educational opportunities; an absence of health care for millions; an unprecedented number of people living behind bars; and trillions spent on fabricated wars fundamentally tied to the control and domination of the planet’s resources. The Western ethos of mastery and supremacy over nature has accompanied, to our detriment, the unrelenting expansion of capitalism and its unparalleled domination over all aspects of human life. This hegemonic worldview has been unmercifully imparted through a host of public policies and practices that conveniently gloss over gross inequalities as commonsensical necessities for democracy to bloom. As a consequence, the liberal democratic rhetoric of “we are all created equal” hardly begins to touch the international pervasiveness of racism, patriarchy, technocracy, and economic piracy by the West, all which have fostered the erosion of civil rights and the unprecedented ecological exploitation of societies, creating conditions that now threaten our peril, if we do not reverse directions. Cataclysmic disasters, such as Hurricane Katrina, are unfortunate testimonies to the danger of ignoring the warnings of the natural world, especially when coupled with egregious governmental neglect of impoverished people. Equally disturbing, is the manner in which ecological crisis is vulgarly exploited by unscrupulous and ruthless capitalists who see no problem with turning a profit off the backs of ailing and mourning oppressed populations of every species—whether they be victims of weather disasters, catastrophic illnesses, industrial pollution, or inhumane practices of incarceration. Ultimately, these constitute ecological calamities that speak to the inhumanity and tyranny of material profiteering, at the expense of precious life. The arrogance and exploitation of neoliberal values of consumption dishonor the contemporary suffering of poor and marginalized populations around the globe. Neoliberalism denies or simply mocks (“Drill baby drill!”) the interrelationship and delicate balance that exists between all living beings, including the body earth. In its stead, values of individualism, competition, privatization, and the “free market” systematically debase the ancient ecological knowledge of indigenous populations, who have, implicitly or explicitly, rejected the fabricated ethos of “progress and democracy” propagated by the West. In its consuming frenzy to gobble up the natural resources of the planet for its own hyperbolic quest for material domination, the exploitative nature of capitalism and its burgeoning technocracy has dangerously deepened the structures of social exclusion, through the destruction of the very biodiversity that has been key to our global survival for millennia. Kahn insists that this devastation of all species and the planet must be fully recognized and soberly critiqued. But he does not stop there. Alongside, he rightly argues for political principles of engagement for the construction of a critical ecopedagogy and ecoliteracy that is founded on economic redistribution, cultural and linguistic democracy, indigenous sovereignty, universal human rights, and a fundamental respect for all life. As such, Kahn seeks to bring us all back to a formidable relationship with the earth, one that is unquestionably rooted in an integral order of knowledge, imbued with physical, emotional, intellectual, and spiritual wisdom. Within the context of such an ecologically grounded epistemology, Kahn uncompromisingly argues that our organic relationship with the earth is also intimately tied to our struggles for cultural self-determination, environmental sustainability, social and material justice, and global peace. Through a carefully framed analysis of past disasters and current ecological crisis, Kahn issues an urgent call for a critical ecopedagogy that makes central explicit articulations of the ways in which societies construct ideological, political, and cultural systems, based on social structures and practices that can serve to promote ecological sustainability and biodiversity or, conversely, lead us down a disastrous path of unsustainability and extinction. In making his case, Kahn provides a grounded examination of the manner in which consuming capitalism manifests its repressive force throughout the globe, disrupting the very ecological order of knowledge essential to the planet’s sustainability. He offers an understanding of critical ecopedagogy and ecoliteracy that inherently critiques the history of Western civilization and the anthropomorphic assumptions that sustain patriarchy and the subjugation of all subordinated living beings—assumptions that continue to inform traditional education discourses around the world. Kahn incisively demonstrates how a theory of multiple technoliteracies can be used to effectively critique the ecological corruption and destruction behind mainstream uses of technology and the media in the interest of the neoliberal marketplace. As such, his work points to the manner in which the sustainability rhetoric of mainstream environmentalism actually **camouflages** wretched neoliberal policies and practices that left unchecked **hasten the annihilation of the globe’s ecosystem**. True to its promise, the book cautions that any anti-hegemonic resistance movement that claims social justice, universal human rights, or global peace must contend forthrightly with the deteriorating ecological crisis at hand, as well as consider possible strategies and relationships that rupture the status quo and transform environmental conditions that threaten disaster. A failure to integrate ecological sustainability at the core of our political and pedagogical struggles for liberation, Kahn argues, is to blindly and misguidedly adhere to an anthropocentric worldview in which emancipatory dreams are deemed solely about human interests, without attention either to the health of the planet or to the well-being of all species with whom we walk the earth.

#### The alternative is to reject the 1ac to interrogate neoliberal economic engagement with latin America from the starting point of knowledge production- that is a prerequisite to breaking down neoliberalism

**Walsh, 12** – Estudios Culturales Latinoamericanos de la Universidad Andina Simón Bolívar (Catherine, “The Politics of Naming”, Cultural Studies, 26.1, Project Muse)//VP

Cultural Studies, in our project, is constructed and understood as more than a field of ‘study’. It is broadly understand as a formation, a field of possibility and expression. And it is constructed as a space of encounter between disciplines and intellectual, political and ethical projects that seek to combat what Alberto Moreiras called the impoverishment of thought driven by divisions (disciplinary, epistemological, geographic, etc.) and the socio-political-cultural fragmentation that increasingly makes social change and intervention appear to be divided forces (Moreiras 2001). As such, Cultural Studies is conceived as a place of plural-, inter-, transand in-disciplinary (or undisciplined) critical thinking that takes as major concern the intimate relationships between culture, knowledge, politics and economics mentioned earlier, and that sees the problems of the region as both local and global. It is a space from which to search for ways of thinking, knowing, comprehending, feeling and acting that permit us to intervene and influence: a field that makes possible convergence and articulation, particularly between efforts, practices, knowledge and projects that focus on more global justice, on differences (epistemic, ontological, existential, of gender, ethnicity, class, race, nation, among others) constructed as inequalities within the framework of neo-liberal capitalism. It is a place that seeks answers, encourages intervention and engenders projects and proposals. It is in this frame of understanding and practice in our Ph.D. programme in Latin-American Cultural Studies at the Universidad Andina Simo´n Bolı´var, that this broad description-definition continues to take on more concrete characteristics. Here I can identify three that stand out: the inter-cultural, the inter-epistemic and the de-colonial. The inter-cultural has been and still is a central axis in the struggles and processes of social change in the Andean region. Its critical meaning was first affirmed near the end of the 1980s in the Ecuadorian indigenous movement’s political project. Here inter-culturality was positioned as an ideological principal grounded in the urgent need for a radical transformation of social structures, institutions and relationships, not only for indigenous peoples but also for society as a whole. Since then, inter-culturality has marked a social, political, ethical project and process that is also epistemological;6 a project and a process that seek to re-found the bases of the nation and national culture, understood as homogenous and mono-cultural. Such call for re-founding does not to simply add diversity to what is already established, but rather to rethink, rebuild and inter-culturalize the nation and national culture, and with in the terrains of knowledge, politics and life-based visions. It is this understanding of the inter-cultural that is of interest. Concretely, we are interested in the spaces of agency, creation, innovation and encounter between and among different subjects, knowledges, practices and visions. Referring to our project of Cultural Studies as (inter)Cultural Studies, enables and encourages us to think from this region, from the struggles, practices and processes that question Eurocentric, colonial and imperial legacies, and work to transform and create radically different conditions for thinking, encountering, being and coexisting or co-living. In a similar fashion, the inter-epistemic focuses on the need to question, interrupt and transgress the Euro-USA-centric epistemological frameworks that dominate Latin-American universities and even some Cultural Studies programmes. To think with knowledges produced in Latin America and the Caribbean (as well as in other ‘Souths’, including those located in the North) and by intellectuals who come not only from academia, but also from other projects, communities and social movements are, for us, a necessary and essential step, both in de-colonization and in creating other conditions of knowledge and understanding. Our project, thus, concerns itself with the work of inverting the geopolitics of knowledge, with placing attention on the historically subjugated and negated plurality of knowledge, logics and rationalities, and with the political-intellectual effort to create relationships, articulations and convergences between them. The de-colonial element is intimately related to the two preceding points. Here our interest is, on one hand, to make evident the thoughts, practices and experiences that both in the past and in the present have endeavoured to challenge the colonial matrix of power and domination, and to exist in spite of it, in its exterior and interior. By colonial matrix, we refer to the hierarchical system of racial civilizational classification that has operated and operates at different levels of life, including social identities (the superiority of white, heterosexual males), ontological-existential contexts (the dehumanization of indigenous and black peoples), epistemic contexts (the positioning of Euro-centrism as the only perspective of knowledge, thereby disregarding other epistemic rationalities), and cosmological (the control and/or negation of the ancestral-spiritual-territorial-existential bases that govern the life-systems of ancestral peoples, most especially those of African Diaspora and of Abya Yala) (see Quijano 1999). At the centre or the heart of this matrix is capitalism as the only possible model of civilization; the imposed social classification, the idea of ‘humanity’, the perspective of knowledge and the prototype life-system that goes with it defines itself through this capitalistic civilizational lens. As Quijano argues, by defending the interests of social domination and the exploitation of work under the hegemony of capital, ‘the ‘‘racialization’’ and the ‘‘capitalization’’ of social relationships of these models of power, and the ‘‘eurocentralization’’ of its control, are in the very roots of our present problems of identity,’ in Latin America as countries, ‘nations’ and States (Quijano 2006). It is precisely because of this that we consider the de-colonial to be a fundamental perspective. Within our project, the de-colonial does not seek to establish a new paradigm or line of thought but a critically-conscious understanding of the past and present that opens up and suggests questions, perspectives and paths to explore. As such, and on the other hand, we are interested in stimulating methodologies and pedagogies that, in the words of Jacqui Alexander (2005), cross the fictitious boundaries of exclusion and marginalization to contribute to the configuration of new ways of being and knowing rooted not in alterity itself, but in the principles of relation, complement and commitment. It is also to encourage other ways of reading, investigating and researching, of seeing, knowing, feeling, hearing and being, that challenge the singular reasoning of western modernity, make tense our own disciplinary frameworks of ‘study’ and interpretation, and persuade a questioning from and with radically distinct rationalities, knowledge, practices and civilizational-life-systems. It is through these three pillars of the inter-cultural, the inter-epistemic and the de-colonial that we attempt to understand the processes, experiences and struggles that are occurring in Latin America and elsewhere. But it is also here that we endeavour to contribute to and learn from the complex relationships between culture-politics-economics, knowledge and power in the world today; to unlearn to relearn from and with perspectives otherwise. Practices, experiences and challenges In this last section, my interest is to share some of the particularities of our doctorate programme/project, now in its third cycle; its achievements and advancements; and the challenges that it faces in an academic context, increasingly characterized regionally and internationally, by disciplinarity, depolitization, de-subjectivation, apathy, competitive individualism and nonintervention. Without a doubt, one of the unique characteristics of the programme/ project is its students: all mid-career professionals mainly from the Andean region and from such diverse fields as the social sciences, humanities, the arts, philosophy, communication, education and law. The connection that the majority of the students have with social and cultural movements and/or processes, along with their dedication to teaching or similar work, helps to contribute to dynamic debate and discussion not always seen in academia and post-graduate programmes. Similarly, the faculty of the programme stand out for being internationally renowned intellectuals, and, the majority, for their commitment to struggles of social transformation, critical thinking and the project of the doctorate itself. The curriculum offering is based on courses and seminars that seek to foment thinking from Latin American and with its intellectuals in all of their diversity comprehend, confront and affect the problems and realities of the region, which are not only local but global. The pedagogical methodological perspective aforementioned works to stimulate processes of collective thought and allow the participants to think from related formations, experiences and research topics and to think with the differences disciplinary, geographical, epistemic and subjective thereby fracturing individualism by dialoguing, transgressing and inter-crossing boundaries. Trans-disciplinarity, as such, is a fundamental position and process in our project. The fact that the graduate students come from an array of different backgrounds provides a plurality in which the methodologicalpedagogical practice becomes the challenge of collectively thinking, crossing disciplinary backgrounds and creating new positions and perspectives, conceived and formed in a trans-disciplinary way. The majority of courses, seminars and professors, also assume that this is a necessary challenge in today’s world when no single discipline and no single intellectual is capable alone of analyzing, comprehending or transforming social reality. Nevertheless, trans-disciplinary gains continue to be a point of criticism and contention, especially given the present trend to re-discipline the LatinAmerican university. As Edgardo Lander has argued (2000a), this tendency reflects the neo-liberalization of higher education, as well as the increasing conservatism of intellectuals, including those that previously identified as or to continue to identify themselves as progressives and/or leftists. To establish oneself in a discipline or presume truth through a discipline, a common practice today, is to reinstall the geopolitics of knowing. This, in turn, strengthens Euro-USA-centrism as ‘the place’ of theory and knowledge. As such, the subject of dispute is not simply the trans-disciplinary aspect of Cultural Studies but also its ‘indisciplinary’ nature, that is, the effort central to our project to include points of view that come from Latin America and thinkers who are not always connected to academia (see Walsh et al. 2002). Our interest is not, as some claim, to facilitate the agendas or cultural agency of subaltern groups or social movements, promote activism or simply include other knowledge forms, but instead to build a different political-intellectual project a political-intellectual project otherwise. Such project gives centrality to the need to learn to think from, together and with Latin American reality and its actors, thereby stimulating convergences, articulations and inter-culturalizations that aim at creating an academia that is committed to life itself. Such a perspective does not eliminate or deny knowledge conceived in Europe or North America usually named as ‘universal’ or its proponents and thinkers. Instead, it incorporates such knowledge as part of a broader canon and worldview that seeks pluriversality, recognizing the importance of places and loci of enunciation. For our project, all of this serves to highlight the doubly complicated situation that is still in flux. On one hand, there is the negative association with trans-disciplinarity and the academic suppositions that accompany it, particularly in the area of research; this requires that our theses be doubly rigorous. And, on the other hand, there is the geopolitical limitation not only of disciplines but also of academic disciplining. To argue, as we do, that knowledge and thought are also produced outside of universities and, in dialogue with Hall, that political movements also produce and provoke theoretic moments and movements, is to question and challenge the academic logic and the authority of a universal and singular reasoning and science. We will, through such questioning and challenges, always be marginalized, placed on the fringe, under a microscope, criticized and disputed. Because of this, the challenges that we have encountered have been many. On one hand, there are those challenges that many face in the Latin-American academic context: the real difficulties of financing, infrastructure and research support. On the other hand, are the challenges that come with the traditional academic disciplinary structure, its de-politization and de-subjectification. Here the challenge is to transgress the established norms of neutrality, distance and objectivity. It is also to confront the standards that give little relevance to historically subjugated groups, practices and knowledges, and to the interlinking of race, ethnicity, gender and sexuality with the structures and models of power and knowledge. It is to make evident past and present struggles that give real meaning to the arguments of heterogeneity, decoloniality and inter-culturality. Here the criticism and dispute comes from many sides: from those who describe these efforts as too politicized (and, as such, supposedly less ‘academic’), uni-paradigmatic (supposedly limited to only one ‘line of thought’), fundamentalist (supposedly exclusionary of those subjects not marked by the colonial wound) and as obsessed with conflict (and therefore far from the tradition of ‘culture’, its letters and object of study). These challenges together with the tensions, criticisms and disputes that they mark often times make the path more difficult. Still, and at the same time, they allow us to clarify the distinctive and unique aspects of our project and its motivations to continue with its course of construction, insurgence and struggle. Our concern here is not so much with the institutionalizing of Cultural Studies. Better yet, and in a much broader fashion, we are concerned with epistemic inter-culturalization, with the de-colonialization and pluriversalization of the ‘university’, and with a thinking from the South(s). To place these concerns, as argued here, within a perspective and a politics of naming: ‘(inter)Cultural Studies in de-colonial code,’ is to open, not close, paths. Conclusion In concluding the reflections I have presented here, it is useful to return to a fundamental point touched by Stuart Hall: ‘intervention’. In particular and with Hall, I refer to the will to intervene in and transform the world, an intervention that does not simply relate to social and political contexts and fields, but also to epistemology and theory. That is to an intervention and transformation in and a de-colonization of the frameworks and logics of our thinking, knowing and comprehending. To commit oneself in mind, body and spirit as Frantz Fanon argued. To consider Cultural Studies today a project of political vocation and intervention is to position and at the same time build our work on the borders of and the boundaries between university and society. It is to seriously reflect on whom we read and with whom we want and/or need to dialogue and think, to understand the very limits or our knowledge. And precisely because of this, it is to act on our own situation, establishing contacts and exchanges of different kinds in a pedagogicalmethodological zeal to think from and think with, in what I have elsewhere called a critical inter-culturality and de-colonial pedagogy (Walsh 2009). In universities and societies that are increasingly characterized by nonintervention, auto-complacency, individualism and apathy, intervention represents, suggests and promotes a position and practice of involvement, action and complicity. To take on such a position and practice and to make it an integral part of our political-intellectual project is to find not only ethical meaning in work on culture and power, but also to give this work some heart. That is to say, to focus on the ever-greater need and urgency of life. To call these Cultural Studies or critical (inter)Cultural Studies is only one of our options, and part of the politics of naming.
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#### A. Interpretation - Economic Engagement is defined as expanding economic ties with a country to change its behavior – this means they have to be gov to gov

**Kahler, 6** - Graduate School of International Relations and Pacific Studies, University of California, San Diego (M., “Strategic Uses of Economic Interdependence: Engagement Policies on the Korean Peninsula and Across the Taiwan Strait” in Journal of Peace Research (2006), 43:5, p. 523-541, Sage Publications)

Economic engagement - a policy of deliberately expanding economic ties with an adversary in order to change the behavior of the target state and improve bilateral political relations

####  ‘Its’ is a possessive pronoun showing ownership

**Glossary of English Grammar Terms, 2005** – (“Term: Possessive Pronoun,”

http://www.usingenglish.com/glossary/possessive-pronoun.html)

Mine, yours, his, hers, its, ours, theirs are the possessive pronouns used to substitute a noun and to show possession or ownership.

EG. This is your disk and that's mine. (Mine substitutes the word disk and shows that it belongs to me.)

#### **B. Violation – the plan only lifts sanctions – that’s distinct**

#### **C. Voting Issue**

#### **1. Limits – a government limit is the only way to keep the topic manageable – otherwise they could use any 3rd party intermediary, lift barriers to private engagement, or target civil society – it makes topic preparation impossible**

#### **2. Negative ground – formal governmental channels are key to predictable relations disads and counterplans that test ‘engagement’**

#### **3. effects topicality is a voter – the aff could claim advantages off any part of the internal link chain that makes them topical – kills predictability and limits**
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#### Debt ceiling will be raised now – PC key and GOP stand-off doesn’t matter

**Roberts, 9/26** – Reporter for the Guardian (Dan, “Obama stands firm on healthcare in face of escalating Republican stand-off”, 2013, Politico, http://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/sep/26/obama-healthcare-standoff-boehner-congress)//VP

Barack Obama refused to blink on Thursday in the escalating stand-off over his healthcare reforms, insisting he would not heed Republican calls to negotiate over their twin threats to shut down the government and force a debt default.¶ "They are threatening steps that would badly hurt our economy," the president said in his first big speech of the latest budgetary stand-off. "That's not going to happen as long as I'm president. The Affordable Care Act is here to stay."¶ Minutes earlier, Republican leaders in the House of Representatives upped the ante by announcing a new set of demands in exchange for extending the US debt ceiling when it expires in mid-October.¶ In addition to postponing the implementation of the Affordable Care Act, also known as Obamacare, they are now demanding a host of broader political concessions, including tax reform and energy deregulation, in exchange for agreeing to allow further federal borrowing.¶ House speaker John Boehner also refused to give any indication how he might resolve the separate clash over the so-called continuing resolution (CR), which would authorise government spending to carry on after the current authorisation expires on Monday night.¶ The initial Republican plan to link this crucial budget motion with their demands for defunding Obamacare is fast unravelling in the Senate, where a majority of Democrats are shortly expected to pass a so-called "clean" bill, shorn of any threat to healthcare reform.¶ But a cryptic Boehner press conference left open the possibility that Republicans would drop this demand at the last minute and pursue their demands by threatening the debt ceiling instead.¶ Asked by a reporter, "will you now accept a clean CR from the Senate to avoid a government shutdown," Boehner replied: "I do not see that happening."¶ Many commentators took this to mean that Boehner could continue to frustrate passage of the bill, by sending it back to the Senate with new demands attached. "If that's the case, what do you plan on sending back to the Senate to avoid that happening?" Boehner was asked.¶ Raising his eyebrows theatrically, Boehner suggested it was the government shutdown he did not see happening. "I have made it clear for months and months that we have no interest in seeing a government shutdown," he said. There will be options available to us but there is not going to be any speculation about what we might do or not until the Senate passes the continuing resolution."¶ Other Republican leaders called on the White House to help them out of what look increasingly looks to be a tactical cul-de-sac.¶ "The president does not call to say 'let's sit over this', he calls to say he will not negotiate," complained House majority whip Kevin McCarthy. "That's not the same message he gives to world leaders."¶ Obama gave no ground however during a speech to community groups in Baltimore that was intended to focus attention back on the benefits of his healthcare reforms to the 50 million Americans without medical insurance. "Sometimes you just need to escape Beltway politics," Obama said, dismissing what he called "the antics going on in Congress right now".¶

#### Liberalizing policy towards Cuba costs capital – Congress will upset other items on the agenda

**LeoGrande 12**

William, School of Public Affairs @ American University, Fresh Start for a Stale Policy: Can Obama Break the Stalemate in U.S.-Cuban Relations?, 2012, http://www.american.edu/clals/upload/LeoGrande-Fresh-Start.pdf

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

#### Failure collapses the economy – goes global and past events don’t disprove

**Davidson 9/10**

Adam, co-founder of NPR’s “Planet Money,” Our Debt to Society, New York Times, 9/10/13, http://www.nytimes.com/2013/09/15/magazine/our-debt-to-society.html?pagewanted=all

If the debt ceiling isn’t lifted again this fall, some serious financial decisions will have to be made. Perhaps the government can skimp on its foreign aid or furlough all of NASA, but eventually the big-ticket items, like Social Security and Medicare, will have to be cut. At some point, the government won’t be able to pay interest on its bonds and will enter what’s known as sovereign default, the ultimate national financial disaster achieved by countries like Zimbabwe, Ecuador and Argentina (and now Greece). In the case of the United States, though, it won’t be an isolated national crisis. If the American government can’t stand behind the dollar, the world’s benchmark currency, then the global financial system will very likely enter a new era in which there is much less trade and much less economic growth. It would be, by most accounts, the largest self-imposed financial disaster in history.¶ Nearly everyone involved predicts that someone will blink before this disaster occurs. Yet a small number of House Republicans (one political analyst told me it’s no more than 20) appear willing to see what happens if the debt ceiling isn’t raised — at least for a bit. This could be used as leverage to force Democrats to drastically cut government spending and eliminate President Obama’s signature health-care-reform plan. In fact, Representative Tom Price, a Georgia Republican, told me that the whole problem could be avoided if the president agreed to drastically cut spending and lower taxes. Still, it is hard to put this act of game theory into historic context. Plenty of countries — and some cities, like Detroit — have defaulted on their financial obligations, but only because their governments ran out of money to pay their bills. No wealthy country has ever voluntarily decided — in the middle of an economic recovery, no less — to default. And there’s certainly no record of that happening to the country that controls the global reserve currency.¶ Like many, I assumed a self-imposed U.S. debt crisis might unfold like most involuntary ones. If the debt ceiling isn’t raised by X-Day, I figured, the world’s investors would begin to see America as an unstable investment and rush to sell their Treasury bonds. The U.S. government, desperate to hold on to investment, would then raise interest rates far higher, hurtling up rates on credit cards, student loans, mortgages and corporate borrowing — which would effectively put a clamp on all trade and spending. The U.S. economy would collapse far worse than anything we’ve seen in the past several years.¶ Instead, Robert Auwaerter, head of bond investing for Vanguard, the world’s largest mutual-fund company, told me that the collapse might be more insidious. “You know what happens when the market gets upset?” he said. “There’s a flight to quality. Investors buy Treasury bonds. It’s a bit perverse.” In other words, if the U.S. comes within shouting distance of a default (which Auwaerter is confident won’t happen), the world’s investors — absent a safer alternative, given the recent fates of the euro and the yen — might actually buy even more Treasury bonds. Indeed, interest rates would fall and the bond markets would soar.¶ While this possibility might not sound so bad, it’s really far more damaging than the apocalyptic one I imagined. Rather than resulting in a sudden crisis, failure to raise the debt ceiling would lead to a slow bleed. Scott Mather, head of the global portfolio at Pimco, the world’s largest private bond fund, explained that while governments and institutions might go on a U.S.-bond buying frenzy in the wake of a debt-ceiling panic, they would eventually recognize that the U.S. government was not going through an odd, temporary bit of insanity. They would eventually conclude that it had become permanently less reliable. Mather imagines institutional investors and governments turning to a basket of currencies, putting their savings in a mix of U.S., European, Canadian, Australian and Japanese bonds. Over the course of decades, the U.S. would lose its unique role in the global economy.¶ The U.S. benefits enormously from its status as global reserve currency and safe haven. Our interest and mortgage rates are lower; companies are able to borrow money to finance their new products more cheaply. As a result, there is much more economic activity and more wealth in America than there would be otherwise. If that status erodes, the U.S. economy’s peaks will be lower and recessions deeper; future generations will have fewer job opportunities and suffer more when the economy falters. And, Mather points out, no other country would benefit from America’s diminished status. When you make the base risk-free asset more risky, the entire global economy becomes riskier and costlier.

#### Nuclear war

**Friedberg and Schoenfeld 8**

Aaron, Prof. Politics. And IR @ Princeton’s Woodrow Wilson School and Visiting Scholar @ Witherspoon Institute, and Gabriel, Senior Editor of Commentary and Wall Street Journal, “The Dangers of a Diminished America” <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB122455074012352571.html>

Then there are the dolorous consequences of a potential collapse of the world's financial architecture. For decades now, Americans have enjoyed the advantages of being at the center of that system. The worldwide use of the dollar, and the stability of our economy, among other things, made it easier for us to run huge budget deficits, as we counted on foreigners to pick up the tab by buying dollar-denominated assets as a safe haven. Will this be possible in the future? Meanwhile, traditional foreign-policy challenges are multiplying. The threat from al Qaeda and Islamic terrorist affiliates has not been extinguished. Iran and North Korea are continuing on their bellicose paths, while Pakistan and Afghanistan are progressing smartly down the road to chaos. Russia's new militancy and China's seemingly relentless rise also give cause for concern. If America now tries to pull back from the world stage, it will leave a dangerous power vacuum. The stabilizing effects of our presence in Asia, our continuing commitment to Europe, and our position as defender of last resort for Middle East energy sources and supply lines could all be placed at risk. In such a scenario there are shades of the 1930s, when global trade and finance ground nearly to a halt, the peaceful democracies failed to cooperate, and aggressive powers led by the remorseless fanatics who rose up on the crest of economic disaster exploited their divisions. Today we run the risk that rogue states may choose to become ever more reckless with their nuclear toys, just at our moment of maximum vulnerability. The aftershocks of the financial crisis will almost certainly rock our principal strategic competitors even harder than they will rock us. The dramatic free fall of the Russian stock market has demonstrated the fragility of a state whose economic performance hinges on high oil prices, now driven down by the global slowdown. China is perhaps even more fragile, its economic growth depending heavily on foreign investment and access to foreign markets. Both will now be constricted, inflicting economic pain and perhaps even sparking unrest in a country where political legitimacy rests on progress in the long march to prosperity. None of this is good news if the authoritarian leaders of these countries seek to divert attention from internal travails with external adventures.

### 1nc

#### Text: Congress should delegate the authority to end the economic embargo on Cuba to The Department of State. The Department of State should pursue and enact the congressional delegation.

#### Counterplan solves the aff and doesn’t link to politics.

**Epstein and O’Hallaron 99** (David Epstein- Department of Political Science and Stanford Graduate School of Business, Columbia and Stanford University, and Sharyn O’Hallaron- Department of Political Science and the School of International and Public Affairs and Hoover Institution, Columbia and Stanford University, January 1999 (“The Nondelegation Doctrine and the Separation of Powers” – Cardozo Law Review) p. lexis

Our institutional analysis begins with the observation that there are two alternative modes for specifying the details of public policy. Policy can be made through the typical legislative process, in which a committee considers a bill and reports it to the floor of the chamber, and then a majority of the floor members must agree on a policy to enact. Alternatively, Congress can pass a law that delegates authority to regulatory agencies, allowing them to fill in some or all of the details of policy. The key is that, given a fixed amount of policy details to be specified, these two modes of poli [\*962] cymaking are substitutes for each other. To the degree that one is used more, the other will perforce be used less. Note also that it is Congress who chooses where policy is made. Legislators can either write detailed, exacting laws, in which case the executive branch will have little or no substantive input into policy, they can delegate the details to agencies, thereby giving the executive branch a substantial role in the policymaking process, or they can pick any point in between. Since legislators' primary goal is reelection, it follows that policy will be made so as to maximize legislators' reelection chances. Thus, delegation will follow the natural fault lines of legislators' political advantage. In making this institutional choice, legislators face costs either way. Making explicit laws requires legislative time and energy that might be profitably spent on more electorally productive activities. After all, one of the reasons bureaucracies are created is for agencies to implement policies in areas where Congress has neither the time nor expertise to micro-manage policy decisions, and by restricting flexibility, Congress would be limiting agencies' ability to adjust to changing circumstances. This tradeoff is captured well by Terry Moe in his discussion of regulatory structure: The most direct way [to control agencies] is for today's authorities to specify, in excruciating detail, precisely what the agency is to do and how it is to do it, leaving as little as possible to the discretionary judgment of bureaucrats - and thus as little as possible for future authorities to exercise control over, short of passing new legislation... Obviously, this is not a formula for creating effective organizations. In the interests of public protection, agencies are knowingly burdened with cumbersome, complicated, technically inappropriate structures that undermine their capacity to perform their jobs well. n40 Where oversight and monitoring problems do not exist, legislators would readily delegate authority to the executive branch, taking advantage of agency expertise, conserving scarce resources of time, staff, and energy, and **avoiding the logrolls, delays, and informational inefficiencies** associated with the committee system. Consider, for example, the issue of airline safety, which is characterized on the one hand by the need for technical expertise, and on the other hand by an almost complete absence of potential political benefits. That is, policymakers will receive little credit if airlines run well and no disasters occur, but they will have to with [\*963] stand intense scrutiny if something goes wrong. n41 Furthermore, legislative and executive preferences on this issue would tend to be almost perfectly aligned - have fewer accidents as long as the costs to airlines are not prohibitive. The set of individuals receiving benefits, the public who use the airlines, is diffused and ill organized, while those paying the costs of regulation, the airline companies, are well-organized and politically active. Furthermore, keeping in mind that deficiencies in the system are easily detectable, delegated power is relatively simple to monitor. For all these reasons, even if legislators had unlimited time and resources of their own (which they do not), delegation to the executive branch would be the preferred mode of policymaking.

### 1nc

#### Counterplan Text: The United States federal government should end the economic blockade against Cuba

**We compete textually - we use the word blockade instead of embargo.**

#### An embargo is distinct from a blockade – the word “embargo” is an imperialist rhetoric that conceals America’s illegal, non-declared war against Cuba caused by the blockade

**Bravo 96** (Olga Miranda Bravo. Doctor of Legal Sciences. “Cuba-USA: Nationalization and Blockade”. Social Sciences Editorial. 1996. http://emba.cubaminrex.cu/Default.aspx?tabid=22631)//JuneC//

Despite the “embargo” expression, that group of coercive and economically aggressive measures, are in fact an illegal blockade imposed by the United States against Cuba, therefore, such criminal behavior against the Island cannot be hidden behind legal figures unable to typify its real nature. The figure “embargo” is used by the US government to conceal the applying of wartime measures to Cuba, which are no less than a non-declared war against the Cuban people. The blockade against Cuba is the utmost expression of a genocide behavior aimed at intentionally provoke extremely hard living conditions for Cubans seeking to inflict total or partial physical damages that eventually led to weaken their decision of fighting and defeat any adversary. Although it wasn’t until February 7, 1962, that the total blockade against Cuba was formally implemented by the US government, different blockade policies were being applied since 1959. The sugar quota, prime and almost sole support of the Island economy and finances was suppressed while the US oil companies, which monopolized the energetic activity in the country, decided to suspend oil supplies and refused to refine the crude with the evident purpose of undermining key points of Cuban defense and economy able to paralyze the country. A sly boycott to any purchase of spare parts for a Cuban industry totally manufactured in the United States was added to the before mentioned measures with the same fruitless purpose. But when the US government realized that a partial blockade was not enough to make the Cuban people give in, a total blockade against the Island starting on February 7, 1962 midnight, was declared by the then US President John F. Kennedy, complying with the order given to him by the US Congress through the 620a Section of the Foreign Aid Act of September, 1961. The obvious purpose of the blockade sets up against the Cuban people human right to exert their self-determination, a right consecrated not only in the United Nations Charter, but in the Declaration on Human Rights and in number one articles of the International Treaty on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the Treaty on Civil and Political Rights. Who violates the human rights of the Cuban people indeed? The aggression actions have been condemned by many UN resolutions. Let us quote only the 2625 Resolution of October 24, 1970, approved by the 25th Period of Sessions of the United Nations General Assembly, where the sovereign equality of the States, peoples’ self-determination and all the States obligation of no interfering in the internal affairs of other States, are established. Likewise, that Resolution establishes that “No State, seeking to obtain advantages from any other one, can apply or promote the use of economic, politic or any other kind of measures, to coerce another State, in order to make it subordinate the exercise of its sovereign rights. Each State has the inalienable right of choosing its political, economic, social and cultural system, without any kind of interference on the part of any other State”. Since 1992, the Resolution entitled “Necessity to put an end to the economic, commercial and financial blockade imposed by the United States of America against Cuba” has been approved by the United Nations General Assembly during 8 years in a row and with a growing majority. While reaffirming, among others, the principles of sovereign equality, no interference in the internal affairs of other States, as well as international freedom of trade and navigation, the Resolution expressed the concern of the international juridical community for the applying of measures aimed at strengthening and worsening the blockade as well as for the negative effects both on the Cuban population and on Cubans residing abroad. Deaf ears and total contempt was the answer of the US government, which, far from lifting the blockade and all the legislations that make it up, has passed new Acts, as the Torricelli and the Helms-Burton ones, whose extraterritorial regulations affected the sovereignty of other States and the legitimate interests of entities or persons under their jurisdiction. The 1999 vote, where 158 States backed the Resolution, is without the least doubt, a worldwide rejection and condemn to the blockade. The blockade imposed to Cuba by the US government is a brutal and genocide action, whose final purpose is the disappearance of the Cuban State and the destruction of its fundamental basis as a nation.

#### Language shapes reality – evaluating the meanings behind the words of an action is a priori to the action

**Edelman 85** (Murray Edelman. American political scientist in University of Wisconsin. “Political Language and Political Reality”. American Political Science Association. Winter 1985. JSTOR. http://www.jstor.org/stable/418800?seq=1&uid=3739560&uid=2&uid=4&uid=3739256&sid=21102185169611)//JuneC//

The most incisive twentieth century students of language converge from different premises on the conclusion that language is the key creator of the social worlds people experience, and they agree as well that language cannot usefully be understood as a tool for describing an objective reality. For the later Wittgenstein there are no essences, only language games. Chomsky analyzes the sense in which grammar is generative. For Derrida all language is performative, a form of action that undermines its own presuppositions. Foucault sees language as antedating and constructing subjectivity. The "linguistic turn" in twentieth century philosophy, social psychology, and literary theory entails an intellectual ferment that raises fundamental questions about a great deal of mainstream political science, and especially about its logical positivist premises. While the writersjust mentioned analyze various senses in which language use is an aspect of creativity, those who focus upon specifically political language are chiefly concerned with its capacity to reflect ideology, mystify, and distort. The more perspicacious of them deny that an undistorting language is possible in a social world marked by inequalities in resources and status, though the notion of an undistorted language can be useful as an evocation of an ideal benchmark. The emphasis upon political language as distorting or mystifying is a key theme in Lasswell and Orwell, as it is in Habermas, Osgood, Ellul, Vygotsky, Enzensberger, Bennett, and Shapiro. The critical element in political maneuver for advantage is the creation of meaning: the construction of beliefs about the significance of events, of problems, of crises of policy changes, and of leaders. The strategic need is to immobilize opposition and mobilize support. While coercion and intimidation help to check resistance in all political systems, the key tactic must always be the evocation of meanings that legitimize favored courses of action and threaten or reassure people so as to encourage them to be supportive or to remain quiescent. Allocations of benefits must themselves be infused with meanings. Whose well being does a policy threaten and whose does it enhance? lt is language about political events and developments that people experience; even events that are close by take their meaning from the language used to depict them. So political language is political reality; there is no other so far as the meaning of events to actor and spectators is concerned.

#### Imperialist rhetoric causes imperialism, racism and dehumanization

**Kim 4** (Soonsik Kim. Professor in the English Department al Myongji University in Seoul. Korea. Ph.D. in compulsive literature from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. “Colonial and Postcolonial Discourse in the Novels of Yŏm Sang-sŏp, Chinua Achebe, and Salman Rushdie”, Pg. 3-4. Peter Lang. 2004. Google Books. http://books.google.com/books?id=wzXbv13XucUC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs\_ge\_summary\_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false)//JuneC//

Early stages of colonial discourse in a broad sense are usually documentary accounts of cultural contacts, Satisfying one’s curiosity on other exotic lands and their people. The idea of the “Noble Savage" is an example of white men’s psychological and romantic projection of their cultural dissatisfaction onto the Other. And yet, implied is the notion of progress, that is, civilized versus primitive. Nevertheless early (self-centered) accounts of the west about the Other were relatively based on mutual respect. Montaigne’s essay “On Cannibals," for example, has deep sentiments of respect and wonder towards “primitive” cultures. Despite the numerous descriptions of savage (barbaric) customs and primitive dwelling conditions he had heard from other, Montaigne’s wise reflexivity places emphasis ultimately on the Other's cultural merits found in the metaphysical realm not in the material world. He used the Other and their positive Othemess to warn demoralization of his own civilization. By the end of the nineteenth century, the remoteness of the Other in the early colonial discourse had been replaced by realistic necessities of economic and political interests, which brought the massive and systematic exploitation of non-whites along with strong racial biases. The romantic projection to the Other found in the eighteenth and early nineteenth century literature was replaced by wide-spread debasement and dehumanization of non-white races. Thus, racial consciousness or curiosity of earlier contact with the Other changed into serious “racism." Colonial discourse reflects not only contemporary ideology but also sociopolitical situations. The narrative voice in literary works about the Other usually carries a negative judgment about them, and it perpetuates the West’s superiority complex and the Other’s inferiority complex. The ideology of imperialism or colonialism is actually cultural discourse, which rationalizes inequality as it systematically distorts and devalues the Other and the Other’s culture. In creating a false conception of the Other, colonial discourse reveals the truth about power structures. The West has been the voice of the powerful. The political dominance all over the globe might be a kind of infallible evidence for supremacy of the western civilization during the period of imperialism. Imperialist rhetoric of the time served as an important tool to exploit and manipulate the Other through psychological dominance as well as political and military dominance. Literary works contributed to the perpetuation of such colonial or imperial attitudes.

### Rels

#### Latin America relations high

**Duddy and Mora ‘13** – U.S. ambassador to Venezuela from 2007 until 2010 and is senior lecturer at Duke University; director of the Latin American and Caribbean Center at Florida International University [Patrick and Frank, “Latin America: Is U.S. influence waning?”, http://www.miamiherald.com/2013/05/01/3375160/latin-america-is-us-influence.html//cc]

Is U.S. influence in Latin America on the wane? It depends how you look at it. As President Obama travels to Mexico and Costa Rica, it’s likely the pundits will once again underscore what some perceive to be the eroding influence of the United States in the Western Hemisphere. Some will point to the decline in foreign aid or the absence of an overarching policy with an inspiring moniker like “Alliance for Progress” or “Enterprise Area of the Americas” as evidence that the United States is failing to embrace the opportunities of a region that is more important to this country than ever. The reality is a lot more complicated. Forty-two percent of all U.S. exports flow to the Western Hemisphere. In many ways, U.S. engagement in the Americas is more pervasive than ever, even if more diffused. That is in part because the peoples of the Western Hemisphere are not waiting for governments to choreograph their interactions. A more-nuanced assessment inevitably will highlight the complex, multidimensional ties between the United States and the rest of the hemisphere. In fact, it may be that we need to change the way we think and talk about the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean. We also need to resist the temptation to embrace overly reductive yardsticks for judging our standing in the hemisphere. As Moises Naim notes in his recent book, The End of Power, there has been an important change in power distribution in the world away from states toward an expanding and increasingly mobile set of actors that are dramatically shaping the nature and scope of global relationships. In Latin America, many of the most substantive and dynamic forms of engagement are occurring in a web of cross-national relationships involving small and large companies, people-to-people contact through student exchanges and social media, travel and migration. Trade and investment remain the most enduring and measurable dimensions of U.S. relations with the region. It is certainly the case that our economic interests alone would justify more U.S. attention to the region. Many observers who worry about declining U.S. influence in this area point to the rise of trade with China and the presence of European companies and investors. While it is true that other countries are important to the economies of Latin America and the Caribbean, it is also still true that the United States is by far the largest and most important economic partner of the region and trade is growing even with those countries with which we do not have free trade agreements. An area of immense importance to regional economies that we often overlook is the exponential growth in travel, tourism and migration. It is commonplace to note the enormous presence of foreign students in the United States but in 2011, according to the Institute of International Education, after Europe, Latin America was the second most popular destination for U.S. university students. Hundreds of thousands of U.S. tourists travel every year to Latin America and the Caribbean helping to support thousands of jobs. From 2006-2011 U.S. non-government organizations, such as churches, think tanks and universities increased the number of partnerships with their regional cohorts by a factor of four. Remittances to Latin America and the Caribbean from the United States totaled $64 billion in 2012. Particularly for the smaller economies of Central America and the Caribbean these flows can sometimes constitute more than 10 percent of gross domestic product.

#### 4. Soft power impacts are limited by security concerns.

**Blechman 5** – founder and president of DFI International Inc., a research and consulting company in Washington, DC, frequent consultant to the US Government (Barry, Political Science Quarterly, “Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics,” Winter 2004/2005, Vol. 119, Iss 4; pg. 680-681, proquest, accessed 07/10/07)

Joe Nye is correct. Soft power contributes importantly to the nation's ability to achieve its goals in the world. But I don't think Professor Nye would disagree that soft power also has its limitations. U.S. attractiveness to others will never be shaped fundamentally by the government, nor can it be tapped for use in particular situations. Nor will soft power be a dominant consideration in situations in which there are real differences of interest and perspective. In these cases, harder forms of national strength will continue to dominate policy choices.

#### Many terminal alt causes to relations

**Shifter, 8** – Professor of Latin American Studies at Georgetown (Micheal, “U.S.-Latin American Relations: Recommendations for the New Administration”, Inter-American Dialogue, October 27, 2008, http://www.thedialogue.org/page.cfm?pageID=32&pubID=1625)

As if any further proof were needed, the ongoing financial crisis highlights the already diminished capacity of the United States to shape developments in the rest of the world. With its own house in disorder, the United States will struggle to get back on track as a responsible member of the international community.¶ Still, though the United States may be considerably chastened, it remains a superpower, whose decisions and actions have a huge global impact. When it falls to the next US administration to deal with the rapidly changing situation in the Middle East, Europe, Asia, or even Africa, it will likely reassess US interests and frame strategic choices in light of new realities.¶ But if the United States seriously undertakes such an effort for neighboring Latin America, it will mark the first time it has done so. For reasons of geography, history and power disparity, Latin America has typically been treated as a discrete compartment, separate from interest-based foreign relations.¶ Regardless of how one comes down on the issues of Cuba, immigration, drugs, and trade, the paternalistic impulse on the part of the United States has been unmistakable. Latin Americans find this tutorial attitude extremely irritating, and their objections have prompted a more collegial tone from the United States in certain cases. Unfortunately, it is still manifest in a variety of ways, from the overall diplomatic style to specific policies like drug cooperation decertification or suspending military training for countries that do not sign agreements that exempt US soldiers from prosecution under the International Criminal Court.¶ While domestic politics is never completely divorced from foreign policy, it has an inordinate and particularly distorting influence on Latin American policy. Hardliners and liberals alike rarely consider the effects policies and statements will have on US-Latin American relations or the ultimate impact for US interests. The decision to build a “wall” along the US-Mexico border, for example, may have been politically expedient but was deeply insulting, not only to Mexico, but to the entire region.¶ This ingrained reflex to dismiss Latin America as the “backyard” of the United States may have been understandable in a distant era, but today the region is wildly varied and defies lazy, superficial generalizations (e.g. “inflation is out of control” or “democracy is starting to take root”). Whether or not the United States recognizes it, the fact is that different parts of Latin America are moving in markedly different directions simultaneously.

#### Improving relations is impossible without reforming the entire foreign policy apparatus

**Gvosdev, 12** - former editor of the National Interest, and a frequent foreign policy commentator in both the print and broadcast media. He is currently on the faculty of the U.S. Naval War College (Nikolas, “To Reset Latin America Policy, U.S. Must Think Big,” 4/20, World Politics Review, http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/11867/the-realist-prism-to-reset-latin-america-policy-u-s-must-think-big)

More generally, Obama’s Latin America policy is suffering from a lack of what George H.W. Bush famously called “the vision thing,” compounded by how the administration organizes the U.S. foreign policy apparatus. The president had an initial opening at his first Summit of the Americas in Trinidad, in 2009, to reset what had become a very problematic relationship between the United States and most of the rest of the hemisphere during the George W. Bush administration. Most regional leaders also made it clear they understood that, given the global financial crisis and the challenges of winding down America’s involvement in two Middle Eastern wars, Obama could not immediately pivot U.S. foreign policy to the region. ¶ But as I noted two years ago, “There was insufficient follow-up to take advantage of the momentum generated by the Trinidad meeting.” Just as candidate George W. Bush’s rhetoric about the importance of Latin America understandably evaporated after Sept. 11, the Obama administration, in continuing to react to a series of crises elsewhere in the world, has also put the Western Hemisphere on the back burner.¶ As a result, according to Sean Goforth, America’s relations with the region appear to be adrift. “Many countries want and deserve a serious partnership with Washington. But President Obama is an unconvincing partner. . . . He has stalled on trade treaties with Latin American countries that still want preferred access to the U.S. market, and he’s made it clear that his strategic priority is a ‘pivot’ toward Asia.”¶ Worse still, no senior official within the administration, starting with the president himself, has articulated a clear, compelling and convincing vision for what a Western Hemispheric partnership would look like, beyond the expected bromides about peace, democracy and prosperity. What is the desired end state? There is no lack of compelling possibilities to choose from: free circulation for people, goods and capital from the Yukon to Tierra del Fuego; a greater push for regional independence, in terms of manufactured goods, services and energy; an arrangement that mimics the pre-Maastricht European Community.

#### Warming is natural

**Carter et. Al 12–** Robert, PhD, Adjuct Research Fellow, James Cook University, Craig Idso, PhD, Chairman at the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, Fred Singer, PhD, President of the Science and Environmental Policy Project, Susan Crockford, evolutionary biologist with a specialty in skeletal taxonomy , paleozoology and vertebrate evolution, Joseph D’Aleo, 30 years of experience in professional meteorology, former college professor of Meteorology at Lyndon State College, Indur Goklany, independent scholar, author, and co-editor of the Electronic Journal of Sustainable Development, Sherwood Idso, President of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, Research Physicist with the US Department of Agriculture, Adjunct Professor in the Departments of Geology, Botany, and Microbiology at Arizona State University, Bachelor of Physics, Master of Science, and Doctor of Philosophy, all from the University of Minnesota, Madhav Khandekar, former research scientist from Environment Canada and is an expert reviewer for the IPCC 2007 Climate Change Panel, Anthony Lupo, Department Chair and Professor of Atmospheric Science at the University of Missouri, Willie Soon, astrophysicist at the Solar and Stellar Physics Division of the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics, Mitch Taylor (Canada) (February 2012, “Eight Centuries of Climate Change in Northeast Spain” <http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2012/feb/8feb2012a3.html>

According to Morellon *et al*. (2011), "in the context of present-day global warming, there is increased interest in documenting climate variability during the last millennium," since "it is crucial to reconstruct pre-industrial conditions to discriminate anthropogenic components (i.e., greenhouse gases, land-use changes) from natural forcings (i.e., solar variability, volcanic emissions)." Against this backdrop, Morellon *et al*. conducted a multi-proxy study of several short sediment cores they recovered from Lake Estanya (42°02'N, 0°32'E) in the Pre-Pyrenean Ranges of northeast Spain, which "provides a detailed record of the complex environmental, hydrological and anthropogenic interactions occurring in the area since medieval times." More specifically, they say that "the integration of sedimentary facies, elemental and isotopic geochemistry, and biological proxies (diatoms, chironomids and pollen), together with a robust chronological control, provided by AMS radiocarbon dating and 210Pb and 137Cs radiometric techniques, enabled precise reconstruction of the main phases of environmental change, associated with the Medieval Warm Period (MWP), the Little Ice Age (LIA) and the industrial era." And what did they find? The thirteen researchers identified the MWP as occurring in their record from AD 1150 to 1300, noting that their pollen data reflect "warmer and drier conditions," in harmony with the higher temperatures of the Iberian Peninsula over the same time period that have been documented by Martinez-Cortizas *et al*. (1999), the higher temperatures of the Western Mediterranean region found by Taricco *et al*. (2008), and the global reconstructions of Crowley and Lowery (2000) and Osborn and Briffa (2006), which "clearly document warmer conditions from the twelfth to fourteenth centuries," which warmth, in the words of Morellon *et al*. is "likely related to increased solar irradiance (Bard *et al*., 2000), persistent La Niña-like tropical Pacific conditions, a warm phase of the Atlantic Multidecadal Oscillation, and a more frequent positive phase of the North Atlantic Oscillation (Seager *et al*., 2007)." Following hard on the heels of the MWP, Morellon *et al*. note the occurrence of the LIA, which they recognize as occurring from AD 1300 to 1850. And here they report that, on the Iberian Peninsula, "lower temperatures (Martinez-Cortizas *et al*., 1999) characterize this period," which "coincided with colder North Atlantic (Bond *et al*., 2001) and Mediterranean sea surface temperatures (Taricco *et al*., 2008) and a phase of mountain glacier advance (Wanner *et al*., 2008)." And following the LIA they identify the transition period of AD 1850-2004 that takes the region into the Current Warm Period. In discussing all three of these distinctive periods, they say that "a comparison of the main hydrological transitions during the last 800 years in Lake Estanya and solar irradiance (Bard *et al*., 2000) reveals that lower lake levels dominated during periods of enhanced solar activity (MWP and post-1850 AD) and higher lake levels during periods of diminished solar activity (LIA)." And *within* the LIA, they note that periods of higher lake levels or evidence of increased water balance occurred during the solar minima of Wolf (AD 1282-1342), Sporer (AD 1460-1550), Maunder (AD 1645-1715) and Dalton (AD 1790-1830). In light of these several observations it would appear that the multi-centennial climate oscillation uncovered by Morellon *et al*. has been driven by a similar oscillation in solar activity, as well as by multi-decadal solar activity fluctuations superimposed upon that longer-period oscillation. And these relationships suggest that there is no compelling need to attribute 20th-century global warming to the concomitant increase in the air's CO2 content. Natural variability appears quite capable of explaining it all.

**Ice age coming --- causes extinction and outweighs warming since we can adapt --- co2 solves**

**Marsh ‘8** (Gerald E. Marsh, Retired Physicist from the Argonne National Laboratory and a former consultant to the Department of Defense on strategic nuclear technology and policy in the Reagan, Bush, and Clinton Administration, “The Coming of a New Ice Age,” February 24, 2008, <http://www.winningreen.com/site/epage/59549_621.htm>)//a-berg

CHICAGO — Contrary to the conventional wisdom of the day, **the real danger facing humanity is not** global **warming, but more likely the coming of a** **new Ice Age.** What we live in now is known as an interglacial, a relatively brief period between long ice ages. Unfortunately for us, most interglacial periods last only about ten thousand years, and that is how long it has been since the last Ice Age ended. How much longer do we have before the ice begins to spread across the Earth’s surface? Less than a hundred years or several hundred? We simply don’t know. **Even if all the temperature increase over the last century is attributable to human activities, the rise has been relatively modest one of a little over one degree Fahrenheit — an increase well within natural variations over the last few thousand years. While an enduring temperature rise of the same size over the next century would cause humanity to make some changes, it would undoubtedly be within our ability to adapt**. **Entering a new ice age**, however, **would be catastrophic for the continuation of** modern **civilization.** One has only to look at maps showing the extent of the great ice sheets during the last Ice Age to understand what a return to ice age conditions would mean. Much of Europe and North-America were covered by thick ice, thousands of feet thick in many areas and the world as a whole was much colder. The last “little” Ice Age started as early as the 14th century when the Baltic Sea froze over followed by unseasonable cold, storms, and a rise in the level of the Caspian Sea. That was **followed by** the **extinction** of the Norse settlements in Greenland and the loss of grain cultivation in Iceland. Harvests were even severely reduced in Scandinavia And this was a mere foreshadowing of the miseries to come. By the mid-17th century, glaciers in the Swiss Alps advanced, wiping out farms and entire villages. In England, the River Thames froze during the winter, and in 1780, New York Harbor froze. Had this continued, history would have been very different. Luckily, the decrease in solar activity that caused the Little Ice Age ended and the result was the continued flowering of modern civilization. There were very few Ice Ages until about 2.75 million years ago when Earth’s climate entered an unusual period of instability. **Starting** about **a million years ago cycles of ice ages lasting** about **100,000 years, separated by relatively short interglacial periods, like the one we are now living in became the rule.** Before the onset of the Ice Ages, and for most of the Earth’s history, it was far warmer than it is today. Indeed, the Sun has been getting brighter over the whole history of the Earth and large land plants have flourished. Both of these had the effect of dropping carbon dioxide concentrations in the atmosphere to the lowest level in Earth’s long history. Five hundred million years ago, carbon dioxide concentrations were over 13 times current levels; and not until about 20 million years ago did carbon dioxide levels dropped to a little less than twice what they are today. It is possible that moderately **increased carbon dioxide concentrations could extend the current interglacial period**. **But we have not reached the level required yet, nor do we know the optimum level to reach.** So, rather than call for arbitrary limits on carbon dioxide emissions, perhaps the best thing the UN’s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and the climatology community in general could do is spend their efforts on determining the optimal range of carbon dioxide needed to extend the current interglacial period indefinitely. **NASA has predicted that the solar cycle peaking in 2022 could be one of the weakest in centuries and should cause a very significant cooling of Earth’s climate.** Will this be the trigger that initiates a new Ice Age? We ought to carefully consider this possibility before we wipe out our current prosperity by spending trillions of dollars to combat a perceived global warming threat that may well prove to be only a will-o-the-wisp.

#### No extinction

**Carter et. Al 11–** Robert, PhD, Adjuct Research Fellow, James Cook University, Craig Idso, PhD, Chairman at the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, Fred Singer, PhD, President of the Science and Environmental Policy Project, Susan Crockford, evolutionary biologist with a specialty in skeletal taxonomy , paleozoology and vertebrate evolution, Joseph D’Aleo, 30 years of experience in professional meteorology, former college professor of Meteorology at Lyndon State College, Indur Goklany, independent scholar, author, and co-editor of the Electronic Journal of Sustainable Development, Sherwood Idso, President of the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Global Change, Research Physicist with the US Department of Agriculture, Adjunct Professor in the Departments of Geology, Botany, and Microbiology at Arizona State University, Bachelor of Physics, Master of Science, and Doctor of Philosophy, all from the University of Minnesota, Madhav Khandekar, former research scientist from Environment Canada and is an expert reviewer for the IPCC 2007 Climate Change Panel, Anthony Lupo, Department Chair and Professor of Atmospheric Science at the University of Missouri, Willie Soon, astrophysicist at the Solar and Stellar Physics Division of the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics, Mitch Taylor (Canada) (March 8th, “[Surviving](../../../../Marc/Desktop/Surviving) the Unpreceented Climate Change of the IPCC” <http://www.nipccreport.org/articles/2011/mar/8mar2011a5.html>) Jacome

On the other hand, they indicate that some biologists and climatologists have pointed out that "many of the predicted increases in climate have happened before, in terms of both magnitude and rate of change (e.g. Royer, 2008; Zachos *et al*., 2008), and yet biotic communities have remained remarkably resilient (Mayle and Power, 2008) and in some cases thrived (Svenning and Condit, 2008)." But they report that those who mention these things are often "placed in the 'climate-change denier' category," although the purpose for pointing out these facts is simply to present "a sound scientific basis for understanding biotic responses to the magnitudes and rates of climate change predicted for the future through using the vast data resource that we can exploit in fossil records." Going on to do just that, Willis *et al*. focus on "intervals in time in the fossil record when atmospheric CO2 concentrations increased up to 1200 ppm, temperatures in mid- to high-latitudes increased by greater than 4°C within 60 years, and sea levels rose by up to 3 m higher than present," describing studies of past biotic responses that indicate "the scale and impact of the magnitude and rate of such climate changes on biodiversity." And what emerges from those studies, as they describe it, "is evidence for rapid community turnover, migrations, development of novel ecosystems and thresholds from one stable ecosystem state to another." And, most importantly in this regard, they report "there is very little evidence for broad-scale extinctions due to a warming world." In concluding, the Norwegian, Swedish and UK researchers say that "based on such evidence we urge some caution in assuming broad-scale extinctions of species will occur due solely to climate changes of the magnitude and rate predicted for the next century," reiterating that "the fossil record indicates remarkable biotic resilience to wide amplitude fluctuations in climate.

### Rights

#### Do not evaluate their value system without first assessing the consequences of its actual implementation. Viewing ethics in isolation is irresponsible & complicit with the evil they criticize.

**Issac** **2002**.,( Jeffery C. Professor of political science at Indiana-Bloomington & Director of the Center for the Study of Democracy and Public Life. PhD Yale University. From “Ends, Means, and Politics.” Dissent Magazine. Volume 49. Issue # 2. Available online @ subscribing institutions using Proquest. Herm

As a result, the most important political questions are simply not asked. It is assumed that U.S. military intervention is an act of "aggression," but no consideration is given to the aggression to which intervention is a response. The status quo ante in Afghanistan is not, as peace activists would have it, peace, but rather terrorist violence abetted by a regime--the Taliban--that rose to power through brutality and repression. This requires us to ask a question that most "peace" activists would prefer not to ask: What should be done to respond to the violence of a Saddam Hussein, or a Milosevic, or a Taliban regime? What means are likely to stop violence and bring criminals to justice? Calls for diplomacy and international law are well intended and important; they implicate a decent and civilized ethic of global order. But they are also vague and empty, because they are not accompanied by any account of how diplomacy or international law can work effectively to address the problem at hand. The campus left offers no such account. To do so would require it to contemplate tragic choices in which moral goodness is of limited utility. Here what matters is not purity of intention but the intelligent exercise of power. Power is not a dirty word or an unfortunate feature of the world. It is the core of politics. Power is the ability to effect outcomes in the world. Politics, in large part, involves contests over the distribution and use of power. To accomplish anything in the political world, one must attend to the means that are necessary to bring it about. And to develop such means is to develop, and to exercise, power. To say this is not to say that power is beyond morality. It is to say that power is not reducible to morality. As writers such as Niccolo Machiavelli, Max Weber, Reinhold Niebuhr, and Hannah Arendt have taught, an unyielding concern with moral goodness undercuts political responsibility. The concern may be morally laudable, reflecting a kind of personal integrity, but it suffers from three fatal flaws: (1) It fails to see that the purity of one's intention does not ensure the achievement of what one intends. Abjuring violence or refusing to make common cause with morally compromised parties may seem like the right thing; but if such tactics entail impotence, then it is hard to view them as serving any moral good beyond the clean conscience of their supporters; (2) it fails to see that in a world of real violence and injustice, moral purity is not simply a form of powerlessness; it is often a form of complicity in injustice. This is why, from the standpoint of politics--as opposed to religion--pacifism is always a potentially immoral stand. In categorically repudiating violence, it refuses in principle to oppose certain violent injustices with any effect; and (3) it fails to see that politics is as much about unintended consequences as it is about intentions; it is the effects of action, rather than the motives of action, that is most significant. Just as the alignment with "good" may engender impotence, it is often the pursuit of "good" that generates evil. This is the lesson of communism in the twentieth century: it is not enough that one's goals be sincere or idealistic; it is equally important, always, to ask about the effects of pursuing these goals and to judge these effects in pragmatic and historically contextualized ways. Moral absolutism inhibits this judgment. It alienates those who are not true believers. It promotes arrogance. And it undermines political effectiveness.

#### Lifting embargo empowers Castro, causes HR violations

**López 12** (Juan J. Lopez, Ph.D. Director of Research @ Research Office (College of Arts & Sciences) at Florida International University) Implication of the US Economic embargo for a Political Transition in Cuba. Endowment for Cuban American Studies of the Cuban American National Foundation, 1998. (<http://www.ascecuba.org/publications/proceedings/volume7/pdfs/Lopez.pdf>) (HT)

An alternative to maintaining the embargo is to lift it. It is an illusion to believe that ending the embargo will lead to greater respect for human rights in Cuba or encourage a negotiated political transition under the Castro regime. The failure of normal international relations between Cuba and countries in Latin America and Western Europe to achieve political liberalization or respect for human rights supports this conclusion. The foremost goal of the ruling elite is to perpetuate itself in power. The strategy of the dictatorship apparently is to obtain enough foreign exchange from its international transactions to muddle through while refusing to allow political liberalization. The Castro government is not willing to pay the price of respect for human rights for better international economic relations. Lifting the embargo would not mean that the Castro government would allow significant market-oriented economic reforms nor that there would be a dramatic improvement in economic performance. The Cuban government has refused to move beyond quite limited market reforms while engaging in economic relations with countries other than the United States. Yet lifting the embargo would help the Castro regime to survive. Besides handling a political victory to the Cuban government, the end of the embargo would increase the financial resources available to the regime with which to ease the pressures it confronts arising from Cuba’s economic situation. The end of the embargo would make a political transition less likely. The likelihood that Fidel would die of natural causes while in office would be greater. The current regime could last for an additional decade. Under the best outcome in this scenario, after Fidel dies a different type of regime could emerge in which a negotiated transition becomes possible. But the emergence of such a regime is not assured after the death of Fidel. It is possible that his younger brother, Raúl, the second in command in Cuba, could be able to maintain the current regime. In any event, anyone willing to bet on helping the Castro regime survive for the sake of a possible negotiated transition at some point in the distant future must not lose sight of the fact that people in Cuba have been living in hell for a long time.

#### Economic sanctions boost human rights – not the cause of violations

Baek 8 - J.S.D. candidate, Cornell Law School (Buhm Suk, “Economic Sanctions Against Human Rights Violations”, Cornell Law Library, April 14 2008, <http://scholarship.law.cornell.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1039&context=lps_clacp)//CB>

Undeniably, these economic sanctions have had some negative effects on the targeted states. In numerous reports and articles, scholars and human rights advocates have constantly argued that economic sanctions hurt large numbers of innocent civilians in the targeted states not only by limiting the availability of food and medicine, but also by disrupting the whole economy, depriving civilians of essential income, and reducing the national capacity for water treatment, electrical systems and other infrastructure critical for health and life. The cases discussed, however, demonstrate that the sanctions forced the targeted states to accept international treaty obligations including human rights norms and modestly change their human rights policies. In most of the cases, the targeted state entered into a comprehensive agreement including the protection of human rights with the international community in order to have the sanctions ultimately lifted. What is more, economic sanctions cannot be the sole cause of civilian suffering in the targeted states. The targeted states should bear the heavy burden of responsibility for this suffering. It is undeniable that economic sanctions have inherent flaws. However, they should not be abolished because of these flaws and negative effects. The problem is not in the sanctions themselves, but in their effect. Therefore, the criticism on economic sanctions should focus on finding a way to decrease their negative effects, rather than arguing against the use of economic sanctions without providing a better alternative. In addition, in order to reduce the negative impact of broad economic sanctions on civilian populations in the targeted states, the Security Council, the U.S. and the E.U. have actively discussed a way of mitigating any negative humanitarian impact.

#### HR double standards hurt soft power and future rights endeavors

Mertus 04 (Julie Mertus, Professor School of International Service @ American University) “Bait and Switch Human Rights and US Foreign Policy” 2004. P1-3 (<http://www.doc88.com/p-672121731835.html>) (HT)

The United States is in fact still leading the world on human rights, but in the wrong direction, promoting short-term instrumentalism over long-term ethical principles, double standards instead of fair dealing, and a fearful view of human nature over a more open one. An increasingly sophisticated array of nongovernmental organizations (NUOs) and other leaders in civil society continue to demand that human rights ideas be more fully incorporated into U.S. foreign policy. To some extent. these advocates have succeeded in framing public policy choices in human rights terms, but too often competing interests eclipse human rights considerations. Human rights talk has not been accompanied by human rights behaviors. This is not the book I set out to write. When I began this project in the fall of 2000, I intended to test the thesis that human rights norms had a significant impact on both the White House and the Pentagon because they had become "deeply embedded," or, if you prefer, "institutionalized." I thought I would find that human rights norms had, in Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink's words, "become so widely accepted that they [had been] internalized by actors and achieved a 'taken-for-granted' quality that [made] compliance...almost automatic." 3 I was particularly interested in analyzing how human rights norms shape the identity, interests, expectations, and behaviors of Americans who make, implement, and influence decisions concerning military intervention and other forms of American involvement across state borders. I had high hopes of finding human rights deeply embedded in - U.S. foreign policy. I discovered that human rights norms had shaped identities, but that human rights were not a taken-for-granted factor in shaping behavior. In particular, I discovered that the American public would tolerate and even participate in behavior running contrary to human rights tenets. The events following September 1l assured me of my failed thesis, but the interviews I conducted in and around Washington, D.C., long before then had already tipped me off that something is seriously awry with the way the United States "does" human rights. Policy makers may talk about human rights now more than ever, but the talk does not lead to consistent human rights abiding behaviors and decisions. The manner in which human rights have been understood and applied threatens to strip human rights ideas of their central content. While many of the government policy makers and military officers I interviewed for this book genuinely identified with being "on the side of human rights," their vision of human rights accommodated double standards: one for the United States, and another for the rest of the world. In other words, human rights are something the United States encourages for other countries, whereas the same international standards do not apply in the same manner in the United States. In the course of my research, I discovered that when I said "human rights" and when many of the governmental actors I was studying said "human rights," we were referring to two different things. I was referring to an understanding of human rights that, as explained below, incorporates three fundamental principles] the equality principle, the human dignity principle, and the moral worth principle. In contrast, the people and institutions that I was studying were most likely referring to a short list of American values, to be projected and applied to others in line with American national interests. By explicitly or implicitly understanding human rights as something done "out there" and to "other people," and in failing to apply human rights norms to the United States on equal terms, they were undercutting the core nature of human rights. Although the rhetoric on human rights has changed from presidential administration to administration, manifestations of American exceptionalism appear in every presidency. Harold Hongju Koh, assistant secretary of state for democracy, human rights, and labor during part of the Clinton administration 0998-2004 .stresses that some forms of American exceptionalism present little danger to the future of human rights, 4 For example, that the United States has a distinctive rights culture and often uses distinctive legal terminology is not troubling. Indeed, the distinctiveness of the United States may benefit human rights claimants. However, the use of a double standard may be devastating both for U.S. human rights foreign policy and for the future of human rights. Koh points to at least four problems with a double-standard approach to human rights: (1) the undercutting of U.S. ability to pursue an affirmative human rights agenda; (2) the cooptation of the United States into condoning or defending other countries' human rights abuses; (3) the weakening of the United States' claim to lead globally through moral authority; and (4) the undermining of the legitimacy of human rights norms.

# 2nc

#### Cuba means the states

**The Free Dictionary – No Date**. The Free Dictionary is an online compilation of print dictionaries. “Cuba” http://www.thefreedictionary.com/Cuba

Cuba - a communist state in the Caribbean on the island of Cuba

#### Engagement towards a government must be conditional, the plan isn’t.

**Haass and O’Sullivan, 2k** - \*Vice President and Director of Foreign Policy Studies at the Brookings Institution AND \*\*a Fellow with the Foreign Policy Studies Program at the Brookings Institution (Richard and Meghan, “Terms of Engagement: Alternatives to Punitive Policies” Survival,, vol. 42, no. 2, Summer 2000, <http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/articles/2000/6/summer%20haass/2000survival.pdf>

Many different types of engagement strategies exist, depending on who is engaged, the kind of incentives employed and the sorts of objectives pursued. Engagement may be conditional when it entails a negotiated series of exchanges, such as where the US extends positive inducements for changes undertaken by the target country. Or engagement may be unconditional if it offers modifications in US policy towards a country without the explicit expectation that a reciprocal act will follow. Generally, conditional engagement is geared towards a government; unconditional engagement works with a country’s civil society or private sector in the hopes of promoting forces that will eventually facilitate cooperation.

#### 1. Education – delegation versus congressional implementation is a core question of policy – certain agents are more able to solve particular policies than others. It’s impossible to determine whether the plan is valuable without looking to the branch of government implementing it.

**Komesar, 94** (Neil, professor of law at the University of Wisconsin, Imperfect Alternatives: Choosing Institutions in Law, Economics, and Public Policy, p. 4-5)

My belief in the importance of institutional choice and comparative institutional analysis is not universally shared, however. There are, in fact, dramatic anomalies in the study of law and public policy when it comes to the subject of deciding who decides. For example, one would assume that the central issue of constitutional law is the choice of who decides—the choice between alternative social decision-makers such as the executive, the legislative, and the judiciary—and that, therefore, constitutional scholarship would be replete with sophisticated analyses of these alternatives. In turn, one would assume that, when economic analysts of law—usually non-constitutional law—consider the issue of who decides, these high priests of trade-offs and opportunity costs would know that one cannot decide who decides by examining only one alternative. Yet most constitutional scholars ignore the issue of who decides or at most treat it with superficial maxims. And when economic analysts of law address the subject of who decides, they often focus their attention on the attributes of only one alternative. Constitutional law and the economic approach to law are important enough aspects of legal study that such anomalies standing alone would justify searching inquiry. But, in fact, these anomalies are only dramatic examples of a pervasive problem in the analysis of law and, more generally, of public policy. Although important and controversial decisions about who decides are buried in every law and public policy issue, they often go unexamined, are treated superficially, or, at best, are analyzed in terms of the characteristics of one alternative. Most existing theories of law and public policy focus attention on social goals and values. The economic approach to legal analysis is cast in terms of a single social goal—resource allocation efficiency. Its critics attack that goal as insufficient both normatively and descriptively, while its proponents defend its validity. Constitutional law analysis is largely a debate about social goals and values such as resource allocation efficiency, Rawlsian justice, or Lockean protection of property. Although the choice among social goals or values is an important ingredient in understanding and evaluating law and public policy outcomes, analysis of goal and value choices, standing alone, tells us virtually nothing about these outcomes—what they are or what they should be. Upon close inspection, each social goal bandied about in analyses of law and public policy is generally consistent with virtually any law or public policy outcome. In other words, a given goal can be seen as consistent with liability or no liability, regulation or no regulation, constitutional right no constitutional right. Goal Choice may be necessary to the determination of law and public policy, but its is far from sufficient. A link is missing—an assumption overlooked—in analyses that suppose that a given law or public policy analysis that ostensibly depends solely on goal choice is the judgment, often unarticulated, that the goal in question is best varied out by a particular institution. Given the goal of protecting property, for example, the case for recognizing a constitutional right involves the implicit judgment that the adjudicative process protects property better than the political process. In turn, given the goal of promoting safety, the case for removing tort liability involves the implicit judgment that the market or government regulation promote safety better than the adjudicative process. Goal choice and institutional choice are both essential for law and public policy. They are inextricably related. On the one hand, institutional performance and, therefore, institutional choice can not be assessed except against the bench mark of some social goal or set of goals. On the other, because in the abstract any goal can be consistent with a wide range of public policies, the decision as to who decides determines how a goal shapes public policy. It is institutional choice that connects goals with their legal or public policy results. Institutional choice is difficult as well as essential. The choice is always a choice among highly imperfect alternatives. The strengths and weaknesses of one institution versus another vary from one set of circumstances to another. For example, whether the adjudicative process is the best protector of property rights or the worst determiner of safety is by no means obvious. Sometimes the courts will be the best protectors of private property, and sometimes that task will be better assigned to the political process. Sometimes the courts will be the best determiners of safety, and sometimes the courts will be the best determiners of safety, and sometimes that task will be better assigned to the political process or the market

#### 2. It’s also key to decision making

**Heminway 5** (Joan MacLeod, Associate Professor – U Tennessee Law, 10 Fordham J. Corp. & Fin. L. 225)

This article offers a model for comparative institutional choice specifically for use in the context of federal corporate governance reforms. It also, however, constitutes part of the larger academic movement advocating comparative institutional analysis. Comparative institutional analysis is critically important to the work of scholars and other proponents of law reform. These rule proponents should not suggest changes in legal rules without also suggesting the vehicle for the suggested reforms. The determination of the appropriate rulemaking body should be accomplished by employing some rigorous form of comparative institutional analysis. In this regard, the framework included in this article is intended to endorse in full the views of Professor Neil Komesar when he says: [\*384] Unless we do better with the difficult issues of institutional choice, any reforms, changes and proposals will remain illusory or cosmetic. We will continue to cycle through the same proposals with the same arguments. Today's policy will always have feet of clay and be replaced by yesterday's rejected panacea, which somehow reappears (without blemishes) as tomorrow's solution. Attempts to fashion proposals and programs cannot stop until we fully understand institutional choice. That understanding will be long in coming and is more likely to occur if judges, lawyers and law reformers seriously struggle with the subject as they make their decisions and proposals. It is that struggle that I hope for. I want those who make or seek to change law to seriously confront and address institutional choice and comparison. I recognize that, to do so, they will often have to rely on intuition and guesses. It is the responsibility of legal academics to provide deeper understanding of these central issues and, therefore, to improve the ability of those who struggle with these decisions. **[581](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?_m=16518a298add952a0f03577e642a610e&csvc=le&cform=byCitation&_fmtstr=FULL&docnum=1&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVtz-zSkAB&_md5=c1ddd8803059cf6fa69a502691427c4f" \l "n581" \t "_self)** That is the essential purpose of this article: to entrust to rule proponents the elements of a proposed analytical model as a potential means of improving their ability to engage in jurisprudential decisionmaking and discourse in connection with federal corporate governance reform. Without models promoting a rational basis for institutional choice, rule proponents may as well rely on a game of Rock, Paper, Scissors in choosing the right vehicle for federal corporate governance initiatives.

#### 4. Kills policy debate and solvency – 90% of the plan is based off implementation

Elmore 80, Professor of Public Affairs at University of Michigan, Polysci Quarterly Pages 79-80

Analysis of Policy choices matters very little if the mechanism for implementing those choices is poorly understood. In the Normal Case, it was about 10%, leaving 90% in the realm of Implementation.

#### Delegation shifts blame with no risk to solvency

**Almendares’ 12** (Nicholas Almendares – Professor of politics @ NYU, “Blame-Shifting, Judicial Review, and Public Welfare”, 2012) MaxL

Delegating authority to bureaucrats raises two principal concerns. The first is how to ensure that the bureaucrats use this authority to serve the best interests of the public. The second is how to prevent the legislature, namely Congress, from using delegation to promote its own interests to the detriment of the public’s. This latter phenomenon is referred to as blameshifting: rather than enacting an unpopular policy itself, Congress enacts a vague or broad delegation, shifting responsibility and blame onto the agency for the policy. On the conventional account, blame-shifting is thought to enable policies that make the public worse off, allowing for more special interest legislation that benefits a select group at the public’s expense, which has led to calls for a strengthened nondelegation doctrine to bar the sorts of delegations that make blame-shifting possible. I argue that the conventional account of blame-shifting is founded on inconsistent premises. For example, it has not adequately explained how it is that voters are able to punish legislators for passing statutes they dislike while being seemingly incapable of punishing delegations about which they feel the same. In its place, I propose a reconstructed account of delegation where such broad delegations of policymaking authority are part of a strategy that allows the public to take advantage of the agency’s expertise. While something resembling blame-shifting can occur within this reconstructed account, these broad delegations of authority overall make the public better off. Contrary to the conventional account, then, I find little reason to institute a stricter nondelegation doctrine. With this new account of delegation in mind, I then consider the potential benefits of judicial review of agency policy. In particular, I find that hard look review, where the courts evaluate the merits of the agency’s policy, makes the public better off only under demanding conditions that are unlikely to be met. In some cases, it can make the public worse off especially when the legislature delegates broad, relatively unconstrained authority to the agency. This conclusion is somewhat counterintuitive, as we might expect judicial review of agency policymaking to be most important in cases of broad delegation, and a result of the limited technical information available to the court

#### And, here’s proof of distinction between the CP and the Plan.

**Schoenbrod 93**, David- Professor of Law, New York Law School, Adjunct Scholar, Cato Institute, Former Staff Attorney and Co-director, Project on Urban Transportation, Natural Resources Defense Council, Former Director of Program Development, Bedford Stuyvesant Restoration Corporation, Former Staff Attorney, Association of the Bar, City of New York Committee on Electric Power and the Environment, Former Professor, Yale Law School, and Member, American Tree Farmers’ Association, (Power Without Responsibility) p. 9-10

Understanding how such pervasive consequences flow from a seemingly technical change in the lawmaking process requires defining the fine but fundamental difference between a statute that makes law and one that delegates. According to the Oxford English Dictionary, a law is "a rule of conduct imposed by authority"; therefore, a statute makes law when it states a rule of conduct. For example, a statute that prohibits power plants from emitting pollution above a certain rate or that prohibits orange growers from shipping more than a certain pro-portion of their crop makes law, because the statute itself defines what conduct is illegal. In contrast, a statute delegates when it empowers an agency to state the rules governing such emissions or shipments, even if the statute instructs the agency in some detail about what goals to achieve or what procedures to follow in making the rules. Even though all statutory laws require some interpretation, statutes that state laws differ in a critical way from statutes that delegate. In making laws, Congress has to allocate both rights and duties in the very course of stating what conduct it prohibits, and so must make manifest the benefits and costs of regulation.

#### The means all parts

**Merriam-Websters, 8** [Online Collegiate Dictionary, http://www.m-w.com/cgi-bin/dictionary]

4 -- used as a function word before a noun or a substantivized adjective to indicate reference to a group as a whole <the elite>

#### “Federal Government” is all three branches

**Truman Library, No Date** (Harry S. Truman: Library and Museum- One of thirteen presidential libraries, “Three Branches of Government”, <http://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/teacher_lessons/3branches/1.htm>) MaxL

Our federal government has three parts. They are the Executive, (President and about 5,000,000 workers) Legislative (Senate and House of Representatives) and Judicial (Supreme Court and lower Courts).

#### Immigration and counternarcotics undermines relations

**Inter-American Dialogue 12** - the Inter-American Dialogue is the leading US center for policy analysis, exchange, and communication on issues in Western Hemisphere affairs(“Remaking the Relationship The United States and Latin America”, April 2012, http://www.thedialogue.org/PublicationFiles/IAD2012PolicyReportFINAL.pdf)

Some enduring problems stand squarely in the way of partnership and effective cooperation . The inability of Washington to reform its broken immigration system is a constant source of friction between the United States and nearly every other country in the Americas . Yet US officials rarely refer to immigration as a foreign policy issue . Domestic policy debates on this issue disregard the United States’ hemispheric agenda as well as the interests of other nations.¶ Another chronic irritant is US drug policy, which most Latin Americans now believe makes their drug and crime problems worse . Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, while visiting Mexico, acknowledged that US anti-drug programs have not worked . Yet, despite growing calls and pressure from the region, the United States has shown little interest in exploring alternative approaches . Similarly, Washington’s more than half-century embargo on Cuba, as well as other elements of United States’ Cuba policy, is strongly opposed by all other countries in the hemisphere . Indeed, the US position on these troublesome issues—immigration, drug policy, and Cuba—has set Washington against the consensus view of the hemisphere’s other 34 governments. These issues stand as obstacles to further cooperation in the Americas. The United States and the nations of Latin America and the Caribbean need to resolve them in order to build more productive partnerships.

#### Snowden crushes any chance at diplomacy and cooperation

**Llorente**, June 24, 20**13** [Elizabeth, “Edward Snowden Scandal Could Create A Rift In U.S.-Latin American Relations”, http://latino.foxnews.com/latino/politics/2013/06/24/edward-snowden-could-be-political-weapon-for-ecuador-against-us/#ixzz2XMlCZFdq//cc]

¶ What has become a nightmare for the U.S. government could be a godsend to nations, such as Ecuador, that welcome opportunities to shame the superpower, experts said.¶ The foreign minister of Ecuador – a country that has cracked down on government critics and journalists under President Rafael Correa -- said that the South American nation is considering granting asylum to former U.S., National Security Agency contractor Edward Snowden, wanted in the U.S. for revealing state secrets.¶ Snowden has been on the run since he revealed that the United States has collected data on the telephone calls and emails of its citizens. The United States has filed espionage charges against the 29-year-old Snowden, and is demanding his extradition.¶ At a press conference on Monday, Ecuador Foreign Minister Ricardo Patiño said his nation’s decision to give consideration to Snowden’s asylum request "has to do with freedom of expression and with the security of citizens around the world."¶ Patiño said weighing asylum for Snowden was more important than whatever ramifications it would face in U.S.-Ecuador relations. Ecuador has allowed Wikileaks founder Julian Assange, to whom it granted political asylum, to remain at its embassy in London for months. “Ecuador puts its principles above its economic interests,” Patiño said.¶ Experts on U.S.-Latin America relations said Ecuador is being opportunistic in taking a shot at the U.S.¶ “The chance to needle the United States is almost too irresistible,” said Michael Shifter, president of the Inter-American Dialogue, a political think tank in Washington D.C. ¶ “This is a tremendous temptation for countries like Ecuador, Cuba and Venezuela. It’s a way they can expose double standards, hypocrisy, a way to say 'the U.S. criticizes us because of clamping down on the press, but look at what the U.S. is doing.’”¶ Various published reports said that Snowden, who had been in Hong Kong, then traveled to Russia, was to leave for Havana on Monday. But he was not on the flight that was expected to take him to Cuba.¶ Reports said that he was going to go to Cuba, then Venezuela and possibly end up in Ecuador with hope of receiving asylum and being allowed to live there. Now reports say Snowden may travel to Cuba on Tuesday.¶ Political leaders in Cuba and Venezuela routinely have harsh words for the United States; former Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez, who died earlier this year, bolstered his international standing among nations that are adversaries of the United States by condemning and often mocking U.S. officials.¶ Chavez's successor, Nicolas Maduro, has continued the anti-U.S. barbs, even going so far as to accuse the United States of being somehow involved in the death of Hugo Chavez.¶ Cuban leader Fidel Castro, whose brother Raul succeeded him as president after he fell ill, often assailed U.S. lawmakers and said the U.S.-Cuba embargo amounted to terrorism.¶ Cuba has no diplomatic relations with the United States, and Havana airport officials often do not stamp traveling documents of Americans who go there in violation of the U.S. embargo and travel restrictions.¶ Snowden's fate may rest with one of these countries willing to take the political risk and open their doors to him.¶ “He [Snowden] doesn’t have a lot of choices,” said Robert Anello, a New York attorney who handles extradition cases and white collar crimes. “He’s a political hot potato for other countries. My sense is that it wasn’t his decision to leave Hong Kong. He’s left with those countries that see something to be gained from the political points he can offer them right now.”¶ And although Cuba and Venezuela may allow him in temporarily, and aid in his transport, they too may not be willing to offer him refuge and deal with long-term consequences, experts said.¶ Officials of both nations have been in recent talks with U.S. officials about improving aspects of their relations.¶ Cuba and the United States have been discussing direct mail service, as well as their migration policies.¶ And U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry, on his first trip to Latin America since taking office, met with Venezuela's foreign minister Elías José Jaua earlier this month to discuss restoring ambassador-level relations and ending more than a decade of steadily deteriorating ties.¶ Kerry said he was hopeful that a rapprochement could be achieved. The meeting, which came at Venezuela's request, took place just hours after Venezuela released from prison an American filmmaker who had been jailed on espionage charges, removing an immediate irritant in the relationship.¶ “If Snowden came to Venezuela, they would not hand him over to the United States, they would give him safe haven,” said David Smilde, a researcher with the Washington Office on Latin America, a political think tank.¶ “But if they gave him [permanent] safe haven, that would seriously harm improved relations.”¶ Some U.S. lawmakers assailed Snowden for seeking refuge in countries that are sworn enemies of the United States.¶ “It would not be surprising if the NSA leaker finds safe haven in Cuba or Venezuela, two regimes that have a longstanding history of giving refuge to fugitives from U.S. law," said U.S. Rep. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen in a statement. "Let us not forget that Phillip Agee, former CIA agent, leaked classified information about CIA personnel and fled the U.S. to seek refuge until he passed away in 2008 in Cuba."¶ "The cruel irony is that there are no press freedoms in either Cuba or Venezuela, yet Snowden who supposedly stands for transparency in government seeks refuge in police states like these two countries," the congresswoman said. "Those who misrule over Cuba and Venezuela, Raul Castro and Nicolas Maduro, do not allow independent free press, do not cooperate on terrorism related issues, disregard due process and an independent judicial system."¶ Kerry, indeed, warned about serious consequences for any nation that gives Snowden asylum or aids in his transport and evasion of extradition.¶ Giving Snowden support, said Shifter of the Inter-American Dialogue, would not do much to bolster the popularity of Raul Castro or Correa inside their own nations.¶ Correa, in particular, already is very popular in his country, having won reelection by a landslide.¶ “It’s basically about taking on a cause that puts the United States, from their point of view, in a questionable light,” he said. “And it’s trying to associated themselves with what they see as heroes, whistleblowers.”¶ That said, however, Smilde argued that the United States itself may not want to keep a bright spotlight on the Snowden saga for the long-run.¶ “Right now there’s a lot of bravado,” said Smilde in a telephone interview from Caracas, where he is conducting research. “Once he gets safe passage, given asylum by some country, this will die down.”¶ Plus, one must remember that the U.S. State Department is also walking a political tightrope right now, considering the damaging information Snowden revealed.¶ “This is not flattering to the United States,” said Smilde. “It defends democracy all over the world, and here is someone who has revealed extensive surveillance by the U.S. government of its citizens. They’ll want this to go away.”

#### Lack of a high level policy coordinator for Latin America prevents improving relations

**Gvosdev, 12** - former editor of the National Interest, and a frequent foreign policy commentator in both the print and broadcast media. He is currently on the faculty of the U.S. Naval War College (Nikolas, “To Reset Latin America Policy, U.S. Must Think Big,” 4/20, World Politics Review, http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/11867/the-realist-prism-to-reset-latin-america-policy-u-s-must-think-big)

Nor has the administration been willing to empower a senior official to act as an overall coordinator or special envoy for the region, with clear authority to begin the slow and tedious process of laying the foundation for closer ties. As a result, the careful nurturing that it will take to solidify and expand partnerships -- starting with Brazil, which is still skittish about U.S. regional influence -- is not taking place. And while some progress occurred in the Obama-Rousseff summit, notably in the area of trade and in creating a system for regular consultation between the two countries’ defense establishments, there is no game-changing initiative -- the equivalent of the U.S.-India nuclear deal -- on the horizon for U.S.-Brazilian relations.¶ Goforth argues that the president, despite his disappointing summit in Cartagena, should complement his recently unveiled domestic energy plan with a call for a regional energy partnership. “The geoeconomics are straightforward: Latin America is just beginning to tap into a fresh oil and natural-gas bonanza. . . . The technology of U.S. energy companies is absolutely necessary if Brazil is to recover its vast offshore oil reserves; U.S. industry will also be needed if Argentina and Mexico are to tap their shale-gas reserves, estimated to be the third- and fourth-largest in the world, respectively.” According to Goforth, such a regional energy partnership could allow the U.S. to eliminate Middle Eastern oil imports over the next 10 years.¶ It is an ambitious plan, one that would require empowering a senior official to oversee and coordinate the interagency process so as to navigate the inevitable roadblocks. Energy Secretary Steven Chu does not seem interested, nor does he have the traction within the U.S. national security bureaucracy required for moving forward. However, if Obama is elected to a second term, and if Secretary of State Hillary Clinton steps down, the president could insist that a new appointee at State make this a top priority for U.S. foreign policy. Alternatively, as I have advocated on several occasions, this could be a project run through the vice president’s office.

#### Low relations is a decision by the U.S. – the plan might make the U.S. palatable to Latin America but it doesn’t change the indifference in U.S. policy

**Cárdenas 11** – former assistant administrator for Latin America at the U.S. Agency for International Development (José R., “The U.S. is MIA in Latin America” , Foreign Policy, December 29 2011, http://shadow.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2011/12/29/the\_us\_is\_mia\_in\_latin\_america) //WNM

An end-of-the-year assessment of U.S. policy towards Latin America could possibly qualify for the world's shortest blog. For a President who has clearly established that foreign policy is not something that gets him up in the morning (or appears to keep him awake at night), Latin America must rank just above Antarctica in descending areas of interest.¶ This uneven, sporadic focus on the region has led to only adverse consequences for U.S. interests. What effort the administration does expend seems only directed toward placating a smattering of hostile populist regimes, while ignoring the interests of our friends. Indeed, the predictable response is that we have only emboldened our enemies and despaired those in the hemisphere who share the U.S. vision of open political systems, free markets, and robust trade. ¶ Radical populists in Venezuela, Ecuador, and Bolivia have run roughshod over democratic institutions and the best Washington can come up with is asking for the terms under which a U.S. ambassador would be allowed to return to their capitals. In Nicaragua, Daniel Ortega is likely chuckling at the feeble U.S. response to his recently rigged re-election.¶ It also appears that the administration has lulled itself into complacency over a cancer-stricken Hugo Chávez in Venezuela, ground zero for regional instability, seemingly content to wait and see what happens after Chávez passes from the scene. But even as his circus antics continue, he is leaving behind what my colleague Roger Noriega calls a mountain of toxic waste that will take years to clean up.¶ Chávez's days may indeed be numbered, but his friends in Iran, Russia, China, and Cuba are certainly taking the long-term view of things. All four have been great beneficiaries of Chávez's political solidarity and oil-fueled largesse and can be counted on to want to maintain that access with or without him in power. In other words, don't count on them to support a democratic transition away from Chavismo, only a succession. Every day, the United States stands idly on the sidelines, the chances they will succeed improve.

#### Worst case it takes 100 years

**Page 11**-Article Cites Study Conducted by the US National Science Foundation, Quotes Anreas Schmitner, Professor @ the College of Earth, Ocean, and Atmospheric Sciences [Lewis, The Register, Free Whitepaper-IBM System Networking RackSwitch G8264, “Global Warming Much Less Serious than Thought-New Science,” 11/25/2011, <http://www.theregister.co.uk/2011/11/25/runaway_warming_unlikely/>]

Climate scientists funded by the US government have announced new research in which they have established that the various doomsday global warming scenarios are in fact extremely unlikely to occur, and that the scenarios considered likeliest - and used for planning by the world's governments - are overly pessimistic. The new study improves upon previous results by including data from the remote past, rather than only examining records from recent times. "Many previous climate sensitivity studies have looked at the past only from 1850 through today, and not fully integrated paleoclimate data, especially on a global scale," says Andreas Schmittner, professor at the College of Earth, Ocean, and Atmospheric Sciences at Oregon State uni. "When you reconstruct sea and land surface temperatures from the peak of the last Ice Age 21,000 years ago – which is referred to as the Last Glacial Maximum – and compare it with climate model simulations of that period, you get a much different picture. "If these paleoclimatic constraints apply to the future, as predicted by our model, the results imply less probability of extreme climatic change than previously thought," Schmittner adds. The baseline assumption of climate science at the moment is that given a doubling of atmospheric CO2 compared to pre-industrial levels the most probable result is that the Earth would see a surface temperature rise average of 3°C - and that there would be a significant chance of much bigger, perhaps fatal rises. Schmittner and his colleagues' analysis says that the planet's climate simply can't be this sensitive to CO2 changes, however, or much more extreme events should have occurred at certain points in the past - and they did not. For instance, if the climate were sensitive enough that doubled CO2 could mean catastrophic warming, the low carbon levels seen 21,000 years ago should have resulted in an equally lifeless iceball planet. "Clearly, that didn't happen," Schmittner says. "Though the Earth then was covered by much more ice and snow than it is today, the ice sheets didn't extend beyond latitudes of about 40 degrees, and the tropics and subtropics were largely ice-free – except at high altitudes. These high-sensitivity models overestimate cooling." According to the new improved analysis, the most probable result as and when double CO2 occurs is actually a rise of just 2.3°C - only just above the 2°C limit which international climate efforts are seeking to stay within. Plainly there's no great need to fear a rise above 450 parts per million (ppm) CO2, as people currently do - in fact there's no likely prospect of getting near a 2°C temperature rise for a century or more at present rates of CO2 increase (rising about about 2 ppm/year at the moment from a level of 390-odd). And Schmittner and his colleagues' results show a much tighter grouping of possible futures, too, so the scope for way-out doomsday scenarios is hugely reduced. The Australian [quotes](http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/health-science/climate-forecasts-exaggerated-science-journal/story-e6frg8y6-1226205464958) Schmittner as saying: "Now these very large changes (predicted for the coming decades) can be ruled out, and we have some room to breathe and time to figure out solutions to the problem." The new study [is published](http://www.sciencemag.org/content/early/2011/11/22/science.1203513.abstract?sid=d47377ad-6df7-4f10-a1d7-ac371826abcf) in top-ranking boffinry journal Science. The research was funded by the US National Science Foundation. ®

#### That means intervening actors and tech solve

**Michaels 7** – Cato senior fellow (Patrick, 2/2, Live with Climate Change, http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=7502)

Consequently, the best policy is to live with some modest climate change now and encourage economic development, which will generate the capital necessary for investment in the more efficient technologies of the future. Fortunately, we have more time than the alarmists suggest. The warming path of the planet falls at the lowest end of today's U.N. projections. In aggregate, our computer models tell us that once warming is established, it tends to take place at a constant, not an increasing, rate. Reassuringly, the rate has been remarkably constant, at 0.324 degrees F per decade, since warming began around 1975. The notion that we must do "something in 10 years," repeated by a small but vocal band of extremists, enjoys virtually no support in the truly peer reviewed scientific literature. Rather than burning our capital now for no environmental gain (did someone say "ethanol?"), let's encourage economic development so people can invest and profit in our more efficient future. People who invested in automobile companies that developed hybrid technology have been rewarded handsomely in the past few years, and there's no reason to think environmental speculators won't be rewarded in the future, too.

#### No data ---their models are flawed

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

Predictions of massive species extinctions due to AGW came into prominence with a January 2004 paper in Nature called Extinction Risk from Climate Change by Chris Thomas et al.. They made the following predictions:

“we predict, on the basis of mid-range climate-warming scenarios for 2050, that 15â€“37% of species in our sample of regions and taxa will be â€˜committed to extinctionâ€™.

Subsequently, three communications appeared in Nature in July 2004. Two raised technical problems, including one by the eminent ecologist Joan Roughgarden. Opinions raged from “Dangers of Crying Wolf over Risk of Extinctions” concerned with damage to conservationism by alarmism, through poorly written press releases by the scientists themselves, and Extinction risk [press] coverage is worth the inaccuracies stating “we believe the benefits of the wide release greatly outweighed the negative effects of errors in reporting”.

Among those believing gross scientific inaccuracies are not justified, and such attitudes diminish the standing of scientists, I was invited to a meeting of a multidisciplinary group of 19 scientists, including Dan Bodkin from UC Santa Barbara, mathematician Matt Sobel, Craig Loehle and others at the Copenhagen base of BjÃ¸rn Lomborg, author of The Skeptical Environmentalist. This resulted in Forecasting the Effects of Global Warming on Biodiversity published in 2007 BioScience. We were particularly concerned by the cavalier attitude to model validations in the Thomas paper, and the field in general:

Of the modeling papers we have reviewed, only a few were validated. Commonly, these papers simply correlate present distribution of species with climate variables, then replot the climate for the future from a climate model and, finally, use one-to-one mapping to replot the future distribution of the species, without any validation using independent data. Although some are clear about some of their assumptions (mainly equilibrium assumptions), readers who are not experts in modeling can easily misinterpret the results as valid and validated. For example, Hitz and Smith (2004) discuss many possible effects of global warming on the basis of a review of modeling papers, and in this kind of analysis the unvalidated assumptions of models would most likely be ignored.

The paper observed that few mass extinctions have been seen over recent rapid climate changes, suggesting something must be wrong with the models to get such high rates of extinctions. They speculated that species may survive in refugia, suitable habitats below the spatial scale of the models.

Another example of an unvalidated assumptions that could bias results in the direction of extinctions, was described in chapter 7 of my book Niche Modeling.

When climate change shifts a species’ niche over a landscape (dashed to solid circle) the response of that species can be described in three ways: dispersing to the new range (migration), local extirpation (intersection), or expansion (union). Given the probability of extinction is correlated with range size, there will either be no change, an increase (intersection), or decrease (union) in extinctions depending on the dispersal type. Thomas et al. failed to consider range expansion (union), a behavior that predominates in many groups. Consequently, the methodology was inherently biased towards extinctions.

One of the many errors in this work was a failure to evaluate the impact of such assumptions.

The prevailing view now, according to Stephen Williams, coauthor of the Thomas paper and Director for the Center for Tropical Biodiversity and Climate Change, and author of such classics as “Climate change in Australian tropical rainforests: an impending environmental catastrophe”, may be here.

Many unknowns remain in projecting extinctions, and the values provided in Thomas et al. (2004) should not be taken as precise predictions. … Despite these uncertainties, Thomas et al. (2004) believe that the consistent overall conclusions across analyses establish that anthropogenic climate warming at least ranks alongside other recognized threats to global biodiversity.

So how precise are the figures? Williams suggests we should just trust the beliefs of Thomas et al. — an approach referred to disparagingly in the forecasting literature as a judgmental forecast rather than a scientific forecast (Green & Armstrong 2007). These simple models gloss over numerous problems in validating extinction models, including the propensity of so-called extinct species quite often reappear. Usually they are small, hard to find and no-one is really looking for them.

#### Experts agree.

**Hsu 10**

Jeremy, Live Science Staff, July 19, pg. <http://www.livescience.com/culture/can-humans-survive-extinction-doomsday-100719.html>

His views deviate sharply from those of most experts, who don't view climate change as the end for humans. Even the worst-case scenarios discussed by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change don't foresee human extinction. "The scenarios that the mainstream climate community are advancing are not end-of-humanity, catastrophic scenarios," said Roger Pielke Jr., a climate policy analyst at the University of Colorado at Boulder. Humans have the technological tools to begin tackling climate change, if not quite enough yet to solve the problem, Pielke said. He added that doom-mongering did little to encourage people to take action. "My view of politics is that the long-term, high-risk scenarios are really difficult to use to motivate short-term, incremental action," Pielke explained. "The rhetoric of fear and alarm that some people tend toward is counterproductive." Searching for solutions One technological solution to climate change already exists through carbon capture and storage, according to Wallace Broecker, a geochemist and renowned climate scientist at Columbia University's Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory in New York City. But Broecker remained skeptical that governments or industry would commit the resources needed to slow the rise of carbon dioxide (CO2) levels, and predicted that more drastic geoengineering might become necessary to stabilize the planet. "The rise in CO2 isn't going to kill many people, and it's not going to kill humanity," Broecker said. "But it's going to change the entire wild ecology of the planet, melt a lot of ice, acidify the ocean, change the availability of water and change crop yields, so we're essentially doing an experiment whose result remains uncertain."

#### Negative feedbacks check back the impacts

**Evans 12** ­–consultant of the Australian Greenhouse Office/Department of Climate Change, main modeler of carbon in Australia’s biosphere 1999-2005, mathematician, engineer with 6 university degrees, Ph.D. from Stanford in electrical engineering (David. M. W., “The Skeptic’s Case”, 2/24/12; < https://mises.org/daily/5892/The-Skeptics-Case>)//Beddow

The serious skeptical scientists have always agreed with the government climate scientists about the direct effect of CO2. The argument is entirely about the feedbacks. The feedbacks dampen or reduce the direct effect of the extra CO2, cutting it roughly in half.[5] The main feedbacks involve evaporation, water vapor, and clouds. In particular, water vapor condenses into clouds, so extra water vapor due to the direct warming effect of extra CO2 will cause extra clouds, which reflect sunlight back out to space and cool the earth, thereby reducing the overall warming. There are literally thousands of feedbacks, each of which either reinforces or opposes the direct-warming effect of the extra CO2. Almost every long-lived system is governed by net feedback that dampens its response to a perturbation. If a system instead reacts to a perturbation by amplifying it, the system is likely to reach a tipping point and become unstable (like the electronic squeal that erupts when a microphone gets too close to its speakers). The earth's climate is long-lived and stable — it has never gone into runaway greenhouse, unlike Venus — which strongly suggests that the feedbacks dampen temperature perturbations such as that from extra CO2. The climate models have been essentially the same for 30 years now, maintaining roughly the same sensitivity to extra CO2 even while they got more detailed with more computer power. How well have the climate models predicted the temperature? Does the data better support the climate models or the skeptic's view? One of the earliest and most important predictions was presented to the US Congress in 1988 by Dr James Hansen, the "father of global warming": Hansen's climate model clearly exaggerated future temperature rises. In particular, his climate model predicted that if human CO2 emissions were cut back drastically starting in 1988, such that by year 2000 the CO2 level was not rising at all, we would get his scenario C. But in reality the temperature did not even rise this much, even though our CO2 emissions strongly increased — which suggests that the **climate models greatly overestimate the effect of CO2 emissions**. A more considered prediction by the climate models was made in 1990 in the IPCC's First Assessment Report:[8] It's 20 years now, and the average rate of increase in reality is below the lowest trend in the range predicted by the IPCC. Ocean Temperatures The oceans hold the vast bulk of the heat in the climate system. We've only been measuring ocean temperature properly since mid-2003, when the Argo system became operational.[9][10] In Argo, a buoy duck dives down to a depth of 2,000 meters, measures temperatures as it very slowly ascends, then radios the results back to headquarters via satellite. Over 3,000 Argo buoys constantly patrol all the oceans of the world. The ocean temperature has been basically flat since we started measuring it properly, and not warming as quickly as the climate models predict. The climate models predict a particular pattern of atmospheric warming during periods of global warming; the most prominent change they predict is a warming in the tropics about 10 km up, the "hotspot." The hotspot is the sign of the amplification in their theory (see figure 1). The theory says the hotspot is caused by extra evaporation, and by extra water vapor pushing the warmer, wetter lower troposphere up into volume previously occupied by cool dry air. The presence of a hotspot would indicate amplification is occurring, and vice versa. We have been measuring atmospheric temperatures with weather balloons since the 1960s. Millions of weather balloons have built up a good picture of atmospheric temperatures over the last few decades, including the warming period from the late 1970s to the late '90s. This important and pivotal data was not released publicly by the climate establishment until 2006, and then in an obscure place.[13] Here it is: In reality there was no hotspot, not even a small one. So in reality there is no amplification — the amplification shown in figure 1 does not exist.[16] The climate models predict that when the surface of the earth warms, less heat is radiated from the earth into space (on a weekly or monthly time scale). This is because, according to the theory, the warmer surface causes more evaporation and thus there is more heat-trapping water vapor. This is the heat-trapping mechanism that is responsible for the assumed amplification in figure 1. Satellites have been measuring the radiation emitted from the earth for the last two decades. A major study has linked the changes in temperature on the earth's surface with the changes in the outgoing radiation. Here are the results: This shows that in reality the earth gives off more heat when its surface is warmer. This is the opposite of what the climate models predict. This shows that the climate models trap heat too aggressively, and that their assumed amplification shown in figure 1 does not exist. **All the data here is impeccably sourced — satellites, Argo, and weather balloons.[**18] The air and ocean temperature data shows that the climate models overestimate temperature rises. The climate establishment suggest that cooling due to undetected aerosols might be responsible for the failure of the models to date, but this excuse is wearing thin — it continues not to warm as much as they said it would, or in the way they said it would. On the other hand, the rise in air temperature has been greater than the skeptics say could be due to CO2. The skeptic's excuse is that the rise is mainly due to other forces — and they point out that the world has been in a fairly steady warming trend of 0.5°C per century since 1680 (with alternating ~30 year periods of warming and mild cooling) where as the vast bulk of all human CO2 emissions have been after 1945. We've checked all the main predictions of the climate models against the best data: Test Climate Models Air temperatures from 1988 Overestimated rise, even if CO2 is drastically cut Air temperatures from 1990 Overestimated trend rise Ocean temperatures from 2003 Overestimated trend rise greatly Atmospheric hotspot Completely missing → no amplification Outgoing radiation Opposite to reality → no amplification The climate models get them all wrong. The missing hotspot and outgoing radiation data both, independently, prove that the amplification in the climate models is not present. Without the amplification, the climate model temperature predictions would be cut by at least two-thirds, which would explain why they overestimated the recent air and ocean temperature increases. Therefore, The climate models are fundamentally flawed. Their assumed threefold amplification by feedbacks does not in fact exist. The climate models overestimate temperature rises due to CO2 by at least a factor of three. The skeptical view is compatible with the data. The data presented here is impeccably sourced, very relevant, publicly available, and from our best instruments. Yet it never appears in the mainstream media — have you ever seen anything like any of the figures here in the mainstream media? That alone tells you that the "debate" is about politics and power, and not about science or truth. This is an unusual political issue, because there is a right and a wrong answer, and everyone will know which it is eventually. People are going ahead and emitting CO2 anyway, so we are doing the experiment: either the world heats up by several degrees by 2050 or so, or it doesn't. Notice that the skeptics agree with the government climate scientists about the direct effect of CO2; they just disagree about the feedbacks. The climate debate is all about the feedbacks; everything else is merely a sideshow. Yet hardly anyone knows that. The government climate scientists and the mainstream media have framed the debate in terms of the direct effect of CO2 and sideshows such as arctic ice, bad weather, or psychology. They almost never mention the feedbacks. Why is that? Who has the power to make that happen?
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