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#### Debt ceiling will pass – Obama political strength and Dem unity means the GOP will cave

**Bolton, 9/14/13** (Alexander, The Hill, “Confident Democrats want separate showdowns on shutdown and debt limit” Read more: http://thehill.com/homenews/senate/322247-confident-democrats-want-separate-showdowns-on-shutdown-and-debt-limit#ixzz2g92IX3s7

Democrats, however, want to force the GOP to debate these issues successively.

“We’re not negotiating on the debt ceiling. We think we have the high ground in both of those fights,” said a senior Senate Democratic aide.

The Senate Democratic strategy over the next several weeks will be to stand pat and refuse to make any significant concessions in exchange for funding the government or raising the debt ceiling.

“If push comes to shove on debt ceiling, I’m virtually certain they’ll blink,” said Sen. Charles Schumer (N.Y.), the third-ranking member of the Senate Democratic leadership. “They know they shouldn’t be playing havoc with the markets.”

Schumer said Republicans are on stronger political ground if there’s a government shutdown, but warned “even on that one, they’re on weak ground because the public sort of is finally smelling that these guys are for obstructing.”

#### Increasing economic engagement splits Congressional Democrats and consumes political capital

Magnus, ‘9

John R. Magnus, trade lawyer in Washington, DC, is President of TradeWins LLC and Of Counsel

at Miller & Chevalier Chartered, ‘9

3. Votes: Will the new government allow any major trade-liberalizing items to come to a vote in the first two years? Conventional wisdom holds that trade votes are bad for the Democratic party -- they split the caucus, demoralize stakeholders, and generally spell trouble for the party’s political majority. Many regard allowing trade initiatives to reach the front of the legislative queue as a blunder of the early Clinton administration. A precious period of unified government was squandered when it could, the argument goes, have been used to enact important Democratic priorities. And then it might have lasted longer -- the 1994 Republican takeover could have been averted! Although questionable in several particulars, this narrative is present in the minds of many Democrats in and out of government today, and they are determined to manage the new period of unified government differently. There will be a strong temptation to use President Obama’s political capital exclusively for initiatives favored by a strong majority of Democrats, to keep trade-liberalizing measures (and related items like Trade Promotion Authority) off the voting agenda for months or even years, and to limit any congressional trade votes to matters like adjustment assistance and enforcement. But, of course, foreign policy concerns, and business community desires, will pull in the opposite direction.

#### It disrupts Obama’s attempt to prioritize the debt ceiling by consuming political capital

**Frumin, 9/21/13 –** reporter for MSNBC (Aliyah, “Bright prospects on foreign agenda; domestic in chaos” <http://tv.msnbc.com/2013/09/21/bright-prospects-for-obama-on-foreign-agenda-domestic-in-chaos/>)

Conservative strategist Keith Appell said having a full plate is just part of being president and his legacy is at risk because his number one priority of improving the economy has not been significantly addressed.

Fixing the economy, he said, could arguable be pegged to how much political capital he has on the issues Obama is currently facing (Syria, Iran, debt ceiling, gun control). “But certainly, if you’re talking about legacy, unless there is an overwhelming foreign policy situation like the Cold War, then it’s all about the economy.”

But Jeanne Zaino, a professor of political science at Iona College and of political campaign management at New York University said “Every time Obama tries to refocus on the economy, there’s these enormous crises that break out. You can just imagine how frustrating that can be and how it’s been difficult for him to prioritize.”

“It’s not only the amount he has on his plate. It’s that he doesn’t’ have the ability to get anything done without Congress,” she added.

#### That takes Obama off-message – it undermines his strategy of constant pressure on the GOP and makes a deal impossible

**Milbank, 9/27/13** – Washington Post Opinion Writer (Dana, “Obama should pivot to Dubya’s playbook” Washington Post, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/dana-milbank-obama-should-try-pivoting-to-george-bushs-playbook/2013/09/27/c72469f0-278a-11e3-ad0d-b7c8d2a594b9_story.html>)

If President Obama can stick to his guns, he will win his October standoff with Republicans.

That’s an awfully big “if.”

This president has been consistently inconsistent, predictably unpredictable and reliably erratic. Consider the events of Thursday morning:

Obama gave a rousing speech in suburban Washington, in defense of Obamacare, on the eve of its implementation. “We’re now only five days away from finishing the job,” he told the crowd.

But before he had even left the room, his administration let slip that it was delaying by a month the sign-up for the health-care exchanges for small businesses. It wasn’t a huge deal, but it was enough to trample on the message the president had just delivered.

Throughout his presidency, Obama has had great difficulty delivering a consistent message. Supporters plead for him to take a position — any position — and stick with it. His shifting policy on confronting Syria was the most prominent of his vacillations, but his allies have seen a similar approach to the Guantanamo Bay prison, counterterrorism and climate change. Even on issues such as gun control and immigration where his views have been consistent, Obama has been inconsistent in promoting his message. Allies are reluctant to take risky stands, because they fear that Obama will change his mind and leave them standing alone.

Now come the budget showdowns, which could define the rest of his presidency. Republican leaders are trying to shift the party’s emphasis from the fight over a government shutdown to the fight over the debt-limit increase, where they have more support. A new Bloomberg poll found that Americans, by a 2-to-1 margin, disagree with Obama’s view that Congress should raise the debt limit without any conditions.

But Obama has a path to victory. That poll also found that Americans think lawmakers should stop trying to repeal Obamacare. And that was before House Republicans dramatically overplayed their hand by suggesting that they’ll allow the nation to default if Obama doesn’t agree to their laundry list of demands, including suspending Obamacare, repealing banking reforms, building a new oil pipeline, easing environmental regulations, limiting malpractice lawsuits and restricting access to Medicare.

To beat the Republicans, Obama might follow the example of a Republican, George W. Bush. Whatever you think of what he did, he knew how to get it done: by simplifying his message and repeating it, ad nauseam, until he got the result he was after.

Obama instead tends to give a speech and move along to the next topic. This is why he is forever making “pivots” back to the economy, or to health care. But the way to pressure Congress is to be President One Note.

In the debt-limit fight, Obama already has his note: He will not negotiate over the full faith and credit of the United States. That’s as good a theme as any; it matters less what the message is than that he delivers it consistently.

The idea, White House officials explained to me, is to avoid getting into a back-and-forth over taxes, spending and entitlement programs. “We’re right on the merits, but I don’t think we want to argue on the merits,” one said. “Our argument is not that our argument is better than theirs; it’s that theirs is stupid.”

This is a clean message: Republicans are threatening to tank the economy — through a shutdown or, more likely, through a default on the debt — and Obama isn’t going to negotiate with these hostage-takers.

Happily for Obama, Republicans are helping him to make the case by being publicly belligerent. After this week’s 21-hour speech on the Senate floor by Sen. Ted Cruz (R-Tex.), the publicity-seeking Texan and Sen. Mike Lee (R-Utah) objected to a bipartisan request to move a vote from Friday to Thursday to give House Republicans more time to craft legislation avoiding a shutdown. On the Senate floor, Sen. Bob Corker (R-Tenn.) accused them of objecting because they had sent out e-mails encouraging their supporters to tune in to the vote on Friday. The Post’s Ed O’Keefe caught Cruz “appearing to snicker” as his colleague spoke — more smug teenager than legislator.

Even if his opponents are making things easier for him, Obama still needs to stick to his message. As in Syria, the president has drawn a “red line” by saying he won’t negotiate with those who would put the United States into default. If he retreats, he will embolden his opponents and demoralize his supporters.

**Default will destroy the U.S. and global economy**

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

If the debt ceiling isn’t lifted again this fall, some serious financial decisions will have to be made. Perhaps the government can skimp on its foreign aid or furlough all of NASA, but eventually the big-ticket items, like Social Security and Medicare, will have to be cut. At some point, the government won’t be able to pay interest on its bonds and will enter what’s known as sovereign default, the ultimate national financial disaster achieved by countries like Zimbabwe, Ecuador and Argentina (and now Greece). In the case of the United States, though, it won’t be an isolated national crisis. If the American government can’t stand behind the dollar, the world’s benchmark currency, then the global financial system will very likely enter a new era in which there is much less trade and much less economic growth. It would be, by most accounts, the largest self-imposed **financial disaster in history.**

Nearly everyone involved predicts that someone will blink before this disaster occurs. Yet a small number of House Republicans (one political analyst told me it’s no more than 20) appear willing to see what happens if the debt ceiling isn’t raised — at least for a bit. This could be used as leverage to force Democrats to drastically cut government spending and eliminate President Obama’s signature health-care-reform plan. In fact, Representative Tom Price, a Georgia Republican, told me that the whole problem could be avoided if the president agreed to drastically cut spending and lower taxes. Still, it is hard to put this act of game theory into historic context. Plenty of countries — and some cities, like Detroit — have defaulted on their financial obligations, but only because their governments ran out of money to pay their bills. No wealthy country has ever voluntarily decided — in the middle of an economic recovery, no less — to default. And there’s certainly no record of that happening to the country that controls the global reserve currency.

Like many, I assumed a self-imposed U.S. debt crisis might unfold like most involuntary ones. If the debt ceiling isn’t raised by X-Day, I figured, the world’s investors would begin to see America as an unstable investment and rush to sell their Treasury bonds. The U.S. government, desperate to hold on to investment, would then raise interest rates far higher, hurtling up rates on credit cards, student loans, mortgages and corporate borrowing — which would effectively put a clamp on all trade and spending. The U.S. economy would collapse **far worse than anything we’ve seen** in the past several years.

#### 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”, 10-28, <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.
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#### A. 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.

#### B. voting issue – for limits and ground – engagement is a huge mechanism; requiring the affirmative to use a predictable mechanism like a quid pro quo is essential for disad links and critiques of attaching strings
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**The plan’s neoliberal policies is the root cause of economic crisis and guarantees inevitable systems collapse**

**Palley 10 –** PhD in economics from Yale (Thomas, MA in IR from Yale, and a BA from Oxford, “AMERICA’S EXHAUSTED PARADIGM: MACROECONOMIC CAUSES OF THE FINANCIAL CRISIS AND GREAT RECESSION”, New School Economic Review, Volume 4(1), 2010: 15-43, ZBurdette)

This paper traces the **roots** of the current financial crisis to a **faulty U.S. macroeconomic paradigm**. One flaw in this paradigm was the neoliberal growth model adopted after 1980 that relied on debt and asset price inflation to drive demand in place of wage growth. A second flaw was the model of U.S. engagement with the global economy that created a **triple economic hemorrhage of spending on imports, manufacturing job losses, and off-shoring of investment.** Financial deregulation and financial excess are important parts of the story, but they are not the ultimate cause of the crisis. These developments contributed significantly to the housing bubble but they were a **necessary** part of the neoliberal model, their function being to fuel demand growth by making ever larger amounts of credit easily available. As **the neoliberal model slowly cannibalized itself** by undermining income distribution and accumulating debt, the economy needed larger speculative bubbles to grow. **The flawed model of global engagement accelerated the cannibalization process**, thereby creating need for a huge bubble that only housing could provide. However, when that bubble burst it pulled down the entire economy because of the bubble’s massive dependence on debt. The old postWorld War II growth model based on rising middle-class incomes has been dismantled, while the new neoliberal growth model has imploded. The United States needs a new economic paradigm and a new growth model, but as yet this challenge has received little attention from policymakers or economists.

**Neoliberal engagement of Latin America results in loss of value to life, political oppression, military intervention, and environmental destruction – makes extinction inevitable**

**Makwana 06 –** (Rajesh, STWR, 23rd November 06, <http://www.stwr.org/globalization/neoliberalism-and-economic-globalization.html>, ZBurdette)

Neoliberalism and Economic Globalization

The goal of neoliberal economic globalization is the removal of all barriers to commerce, and the privatization of all available resources and services. In this scenario, public life will be at the mercy of market forces, as the extracted profits benefit the few, writes Rajesh Makwana.

The thrust of international policy behind the phenomenon of economic globalization is neoliberal in nature. Being hugely profitable to corporations and the wealthy elite, neoliberal polices are propagated through the IMF, World Bank and WTO. Neoliberalism favours the free-market as the most efficient method of global resource allocation. Consequently it favours large-scale, corporate commerce and the privatization of resources.

There has been much international attention recently on neoliberalism. Its ideologies have been rejected by influential countries in Latin America and its moral basis is now widely questioned. Recent protests against the WTO, IMF and World Bank were essentially protests against the neoliberal policies that these organizations implement, particularly in low-income countries.

The neoliberal experiment has **failed to combat extreme poverty**, has **exacerbated global inequality**, and is hampering international aid and development efforts. This article presents an overview of neoliberalism and its effect on low income countries.

Introduction

After the Second World War, corporate enterprises helped to create a wealthy class in society which enjoyed excessive political influence on their government in the US and Europe. Neoliberalism surfaced as a reaction by these wealthy elites to counteract post-war policies that favoured the working class and strengthened the welfare state.

Neoliberal policies advocate market forces and commercial activity as the most efficient methods for producing and supplying goods and services. At the same time they shun the role of the state and discourage government intervention into economic, financial and even social affairs. The process of economic globalization is driven by this ideology; removing borders and barriers between nations so that market forces can drive the global economy. The policies were readily taken up by governments and still continue to pervade classical economic thought, allowing corporations and affluent countries to secure their financial advantage within the world economy.

The policies were most ardently enforced in the US and Europe in the1980s during the Regan–Thatcher–Kohl era. These leaders believed that expanding the free-market and private ownership would create greater economic efficiency and social well-being. The resulting deregulation, privatization and the removal of border restrictions provided fertile ground for corporate activity, and over the next 25 years corporations grew rapidly in size and influence. Corporations are now the most productive economic units in the world, more so than most countries. With their huge financial, economic and political leverage, they continue to further their neoliberal objectives.

There is a **consensus between the financial elite, neoclassical economists and the political classes** in most countries that neoliberal policies will create global prosperity. So entrenched is their position that this view determines the policies of the international agencies (IMF, World Bank and WTO), and through them dictates the functioning of the global economy. Despite reservations from within many UN agencies, neoliberal policies are accepted by most development agencies as the most likely means of reducing poverty and inequality in the poorest regions.

There is a **huge discrepancy** between the measurable result of economic globalization and its proposed benefits. Neoliberal policies have unarguably generated massive wealth for some people, but most crucially, they have been unable to benefit those living in extreme poverty who are most in need of financial aid. Excluding China, annual economic growth in developing countries between 1960 and 1980 was 3.2%. This dropped drastically between 1980 and 2000 to a mere 0.7 %. This second period is when neoliberalism was most prevalent in global economic policy. (Interestingly, China was not following the neoliberal model during these periods, and its economic growth per capita grew to over 8% between 1980 and 2000.)

Neoliberalism has also been unable to address growing levels of global inequality. Over the last 25 years, the income inequalities have increased dramatically, both within and between countries. Between 1980 and 1998, the income of richest 10% as share of poorest 10% became 19% more unequal; and the income of richest 1% as share of poorest 1% became 77% more unequal (again, not including China).

The shortcomings of neoliberal policy are also apparent in the well documented economic disasters suffered by countries in Latin America and South Asia in the 1990s. These countries were left with no choice but to follow the neoliberal model of privatization and deregulation, due to their financial problems and pressure from the IMF. Countries such as Venezuela, Cuba, Argentina and Bolivia have since rejected foreign corporate control and the advice of the IMF and World Bank. Instead they have favoured a redistribution of wealth, the re-nationalization of industry and have prioritized the provision of healthcare and education. They are also sharing resources such as oil and medical expertise throughout the region and with other countries around the world.

The dramatic economic and social improvement seen in these countries has not stopped them from being demonized by the US. Cuba is a well known example of this propaganda. Deemed to be a danger to ‘freedom and the American way of life’, Cuba has been subject to intense US political, economic and military pressure in order to tow the neoliberal line. Washington and the mainstream media in the US have recently embarked on a similar propaganda exercise aimed at Venezuela’s president Chavez. This over-reaction by Washington to ‘economic nationalism’ is consistent with their foreign policy objectives which have not changed significantly for the past 150 years. Securing resources and economic dominance has been and continues to be the USA’s main economic objective.

According to Maria Páez Victor:

“Since 1846 the United States has carried out **no fewer than 50 military invasions** and destabilizing operations involving 12 different Latin American countries. Yet, none of these countries has ever had the capacity to threaten US security in any significant way. The US intervened because of **perceived threats to its economic control** and expansion. For this reason it has also supported some of the region’s most vicious dictators such as Batista, Somoza, Trujillo, and Pinochet.”

As a result of corporate and US influence, the key international bodies that developing countries are forced to turn to for assistance, such as the World Bank and IMF, are major exponents of the neoliberal agenda. The WTO openly asserts its intention to improve global business opportunities; the IMF is heavily influenced by the Wall Street and private financiers, and the World Bank ensures corporations benefit from development project contracts. They all gain considerably from the neo-liberal model.

So influential are corporations at this time that many of the worst violators of human rights have even entered a Global Compact with the United Nations, the world’s foremost humanitarian body. Due to this international convergence of economic ideology, it is no coincidence that the assumptions that are key to increasing corporate welfare and growth are the same assumptions that form the thrust of mainstream global economic policy.

However, there are huge differences between the neoliberal dogma that the US and EU dictate to the world and the policies that they themselves adopt. Whilst fiercely advocating the removal of barriers to trade, investment and employment, The US economy remains one of the most protected in the world. Industrialized nations only reached their state of economic development by fiercely protecting their industries from foreign markets and investment. For economic growth to benefit developing countries, the international community must be allowed to nurture their infant industries. Instead economically dominant countries are ‘kicking away the ladder’ to achieving development by imposing an ideology that suits their own economic needs.

The US and EU also provide huge subsidies to many sectors of industry. These devastate small industries in developing countries, particularly farmers who cannot compete with the price of subsidized goods in international markets. Despite their neoliberal rhetoric, most ‘capitalist’ countries have increased their levels of state intervention over the past 25 years, and the size of their government has increased. The requirement is to ‘do as I say, not as I do’.

Given the tiny proportion of individuals that benefit from neoliberal policies, **the chasm between what is good for the economy and what serves the public good is growing fast**. Decisions to follow these policies are out of the hands of the public, and the national sovereignty of many developing countries continues to be violated, preventing them from prioritizing urgent national needs.

Below we examine the false assumptions of neoliberal policies and their effect on the global economy.

Economic Growth

Economic growth, as measured in GDP, is the yardstick of economic globalization which is fiercely pursued by multinationals and countries alike. It is the commercial activity of the tiny portion of multinational corporations that drives economic growth in industrialized nations. Two hundred corporations account for a third of global economic growth. Corporate trade currently accounts for over 50% of global economic growth and as much as 75% of GDP in the EU. The proportion of trade to GDP continues to grow, highlighting the belief that economic growth is the only way to prosper a country and reduce poverty.

Logically, however, a model for continual financial growth is unsustainable. Corporations have to go to extraordinary lengths in order to reflect endless growth in their accounting books. As a result, finite resources are wasted and the environment is dangerously neglected. The equivalent of two football fields of natural forest is cleared each second by profit hungry corporations.

Economic growth is also used by the World Bank and government economists to measure progress in developing countries. But, whilst economic growth clearly does have benefits, the evidence strongly suggests that these benefits do not trickle down to the 986 million people living in extreme poverty, representing 18 percent of the world population (World Bank, 2007). Nor has economic growth addressed inequality and income distribution. In addition, accurate assessments of both poverty levels and the overall benefits of economic growth have proved impossible due to the inadequacy of the statistical measures employed.

The mandate for economic growth is the perfect platform for corporations which, as a result, have grown rapidly in their economic activity, profitability and political influence. Yet this very model is also the cause of the growing inequalities seen across the globe. The privatization of resources and profits by the few at the expense of the many, and the inability of the poorest people to afford market prices, are both likely causes.

Free Trade

Free trade is the foremost demand of neoliberal globalization. In its current form, it simply translates as greater access to emerging markets for corporations and their host nations. These demands are contrary to the original assumptions of free trade as affluent countries adopt and maintain protectionist measures. Protectionism allows a nation to strengthen its industries by levying taxes and quotas on imports, thus increasing their own industrial capacity, output and revenue. Subsidies in the US and EU allow corporations to keep their prices low, effectively pushing smaller producers in developing countries out of the market and impeding development.

With this self interest driving globalization, economically powerful nations have created a global trading regime with which they can determine the terms of trade.

The North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) between the US, Canada, and Mexico is an example of free-market fundamentalism that gives corporations legal rights at the expense of national sovereignty. Since its implementation it has caused job loss, undermined labour rights, privatized essential services, **increased inequality** and **caused environmental destruction**.

In Europe only 5% of EU citizens work in agriculture, generating just 1.6% of EU GDP compared to more than 50% of citizens in developing countries. However, the European Common Agricultural Policy (CAP) provides subsidies to EU farmers to the tune of £30 billion, 80% of which goes to only 20% of farmers to guarantee their viability, however inefficient this may be.

The General Agreement on Trade and Services (GATS) was agreed at the World Trade Organization (WTO) in 1994. Its aim is to remove any restrictions and internal government regulations that are considered to be "barriers to trade". The agreement effectively abolishes a government’s sovereign right to regulate subsidies and provide essential national services on behalf of its citizens. The Trade Related agreement on International Property Rights (TRIPS) forces developing countries to extend property rights to seeds and plant varieties. Control over these resources and services are instead granted to corporate interests through the GATS and TRIPS framework.

These examples represent modern free trade which is clearly **biased** in its approach. It fosters corporate globalization at the expense of local economies, the environment, democracy and human rights. The primary beneficiaries of international trade are large, multinational corporations who fiercely lobby at all levels of national and global governance to further the free trade agenda.

Liberalization

The World Bank, IMF and WTO have been the main portals for implementing the neoliberal agenda on a global scale. Unlike the United Nations, these institutions are over-funded, continuously lobbied by corporations, and are politically and financially dominated by Washington, Wall Street, corporations and their agencies. As a result, the key governance structures of the global economy have been primed to serve the interests of this group, and market liberalization has been another of their key policies.

According to neoliberal ideology, in order for international trade to be ‘free’ all markets should be open to competition, and market forces should determine economic relationships. But the overall result of a completely open and free market is of course market dominance by corporate heavy-weights. The playing field is not even; all developing countries are at a great financial and economic disadvantage and simply cannot compete.

Liberalization, through Structural Adjustment Programs, forces poorer countries to open their markets to foreign products which largely **destroys local industries**. It **creates dependency upon commodities which have artificially low prices** as they are heavily subsidized by economically dominant nations. Financial liberalization removes barriers to currency speculation from abroad. The resulting rapid inflow and outflow of currencies is often responsible for acute financial and **economic crisis** in many developing countries. At the same time, foreign speculators and large financial firms make huge gains. Market liberalization poses a clear economic risk; hence the EU and US heavily protect their own markets.

A liberalized global market provides corporations with new resources to capitalize and new markets to exploit. Neoliberal dominance over global governance structures has enforced access to these markets. Under WTO agreements, a sovereign country cannot interfere with a corporation’s intentions to trade even if their operations go against domestic environmental and employment guidelines. Those governments that do stand up for their sovereign rights are frequently sued by corporations for loss of profit, and even loss of potential profit. Without this pressure they would have been able to stimulate domestic industry and self sufficiency, thereby reducing poverty. They would then be in a better position to compete in international markets.

**Reject the AFF as a means to create space for alternatives to neoliberal engagement**

**Munck 03 –** professor of Globalization and Social Exclusion(Ronaldo, Department of Sociology, Social Policy & Social Work Studies and Globalisation and Social Exclusion Unit, University of Liverpool, “Neoliberalism, necessitarianism and alternatives in Latin America: there is no alternative (TINA)?”, Third World Quarterly, Vol 24, No 3, pp 495–511, 2003, [http://www-e.uni-magdeburg.de/evans/Journal%20Library/Trade%20and%20Countries/Neoliberalism,%20necessitarianism%20and%20alternatives%20in%20Latin%20America.pdf](http://www-e.uni-magdeburg.de/evans/Journal%20Library/Trade%20and%20Countries/Neoliberalism%2C%20necessitarianism%20and%20alternatives%20in%20Latin%20America.pdf), ZBurdette)

Taking as its point of departure the position that **there are or must be alternatives to neoliberalism**, this article explores the issue in relation to some examples from Latin America. The 2001–02 virtual collapse of the economy of Argentina and the recent victory of Workers Party candidate, Lula, in Brazil highlight, in very different ways, the **need for a viable alternative democratic economic strategy for Latin America**. Many progressive analysts seem to be paralysed by a false ‘necessitarianism’ which grants more coherence and solidity to the neoliberal project than it merits. Argentina puts paid to that illusion. Will the exciting experience of Porto Alegre’s ‘participatory budget’ in Brazil now be scaled up to the national level or does ‘globalisation’ block this option? Do the old questions of imperialism and dependency now come to the fore again after being left dormant under the spell of globalisation? We may not have all the answers yet but Latin America is back in the foreground of thinking and practice around alternative economic theories.

**There is no alternative** (TINA) was an oft-repeated expression of Margaret Thatcher’s, **used to dismiss any plausible alternatives** to her brand of hard-nosed neoliberalism. One imagines that her friend General Pinochet, with whom she shared tea during his enforced stay in London, would agree with her. What is more surprising is the influence the TINA philosophy has had on social science analysis of neoliberalism in Latin America since Pinochet. What I propose is a radically anti-necessitarian approach to neoliberalism, inspired by the work of Roberto Mangabeira Unger. Things are not always how they are because they have to be so. **There is life beyond neoliberalism.** There are alternatives taking shape all the time at all levels of society in Latin America. The so-called Washington Consensus is no longer so consensual even in Washington and there is growing recognition that globalisation requires global governance. We therefore need to return to the rise of neoliberalism and globalisation in a nonnecessitarian spirit and examine the whole horizon of possibilities that is now opening up in Latin America as elsewhere. If the virtual collapse of Argentina in 2001–02 shows that ‘actually existing’ neoliberalism simply **does not work even on its own terms**, the exciting but also challenging prospects now opening up in Brazil under Lula underline the urgency of developing a credible and viable alternative to its policies.

## 1nc – disad

#### Russia’s economic contacts in Latin America are high.

Blank, 10 --- Research Professor of National Security Affairs Strategic Studies Institute U.S. Army War College (4/13/2010, Stephen J., “Russia and Latin America: Motives and Consequences,” https://umshare.miami.edu/web/wda/hemisphericpolicy/Blank\_miamirussia\_04-13-10.pdf, JMP)

However, none of the expanding economic ties should disguise Moscow’s fundamentally geostrategic orientation. Medvedev wants the BRIC countries (Brazil, Russia, India and China) to bring about a genuine multipolarity and weaken U.S. hegemony in international financial institutions and the global economic order.54 He and Argentina’s President Cristina Kirchner advocated reforming international financial institutions, a major thrust of recent Russian foreign policy, and Medvedev urged Argentina to recognize Russia as a market economy.55 Medvedev and subordinate officials have also urged Brazil to coordinate foreign policy with Russia to foster the multipolar world.56 Indeed, in 2006, then-Prime Minister Mikhail Fradkov openly admitted that successful business contacts are crucial to Russia’s geopolitical cooperation with other governments when he said, “I would not set higher targets for geopolitical relations without making a success in the economy first.”57 Similarly, Medvedev conceded that his own trip to Latin America was prompted by serious geopolitical reasons.58 Venezuela and Cuba The dominance of geopolitics emerges quite strongly in Russian foreign policy towards its main partners in Latin America, Venezuela and Cuba. Russia’s interests are fundamentally geostrategic, not economic, and no Latin economy save perhaps Brazil can offer Russia much tangible benefit. Therefore, geopolitical and strategic aims outweigh economic interaction with these states. For example, the BBC reported that Patrushev told Ecuador’s government that Russia wanted to collaborate with its intelligence agency, “to expand Moscow’s influence in Latin America.” 59 Moscow also signed an agreement to sell Ecuador weapons.60 Most probably Russia wants to link Ecuador and Venezuela with Russian weapons and intelligence support against Colombia. Since they are both antagonistic to Colombia, they can then support the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), threaten a U.S. ally and seek to pin Washington down in another dirty war.61 Chávez’s open support of the FARC with Russian weapons strongly suggests that Moscow knows all about his efforts and approves of them. The case of Viktor Bout, the notorious arms dealer who enjoys protection from Russia’s government, reinforces this analysis. In 2008 Bout was arrested in Thailand for offering to deliver weapons to the FARC as part of a sting organized by the United States. It may not be coincidental that Bout’s offers coincide with Russian support for Chávez’s latest clash with Colombia.62 Once Bout was arrested and obliged to undergo an extradition hearing, Moscow brought immense pressure to bear upon Bangkok so that he would not be extradited to the United States and forced to name names, dates, places and people.63 Undoubtedly, Moscow also fully recognizes Chávez’s conversion of Venezuela into a critical transshipment center for narcotics from both Latin America and West Africa, his support for insurgencies and terrorists throughout Latin America and his expansionist and revolutionary dreams about Colombia, and seeks to exploit those factors for its own anti-American purposes.64 Therefore one must treat reports of actual or forthcoming Russian agreements with Nicaragua and Venezuela on counter-drug cooperation with great wariness, as they could be smokescreens for Moscow’s conscious support for drug running into America, Europe and Latin America.65 Indeed, reports from 2003 point to Russian criminal penetration of Mexico’s narcotics gangs.66 More recently, in early 2009, a Russian and a Cuban citizen were both arrested for drug smuggling in Yucatán.67Simultaneously, Russia openly wants to increase cooperation among the BRIC members’ intelligence services and Latin America in general. Clearly Moscow wants to establish permane-nt roots in Latin America and use those contacts as bases for political influence to support those states and potential insurgent movements against the United States. 68 These are only some of the reasons why Moscow’s arms sales to Venezuela, and projected sales to Cuba, are perhaps the only truly dangerous aspects of its policies in Latin America. These sales aim to give Chávez much of what he needs to foment his Bolivarian Revolution throughout Latin America, since Chávez is running or selling weapons to insurgents and left-wing regimes all over the region, and second, because these weapons make no sense unless he is planning an arms race in Latin America. Chilean, Colombian and especially Brazilian reports all raise the alarm about the $5.4 billion in Russian arms sales to Venezuela. These reports raise the specter of Venezuela “detonating” a continental arms race, acquiring the largest Latin American fleet due to its purchase of submarines, the comprehensive arming of Venezuela’s army, fleet and air forces with huge arms purchases, and the acquisition of hundreds of thousands of Kalashnikovs, and an ammunition factory. These reports also point out that since 2003, if not earlier, these automatic rifles and ammunition have migrated from Venezuela to the FARC. This causes great fear that Russian arms will underwrite armed insurgencies and drug running (submarines being excellently equipped for that purpose, as well as to defend Venezuela’s coastline from nonexistent threats).69 The sheer scale of ongoing Russian arms sales to Venezuela since 2004 justifies these alarms, as they make no strategic sense given the absence of any U.S. or other military threat. Even Chávez knows this, for he claims that the air defense missiles he ordered are meant to protect oil derricks!70 Therefore there are purposes beyond the legitimate defense of Venezuela for these weapons. Moscow has sold Venezuela $5.4 billion in weapons since 2004. Those systems include 24 Su-30 fighters, 100,000 Kalashnikov AK-47 rifles, Ak-103 assault rifles, BMP-3 infantry fighting vehicles. Venezuela also bought 53 Mi-17V-s and Mi-35M helicopters. In addition, Russia has helped develop factories in Venezuela that can make parts for the rifles, their ammunition and the fighters, with an announced goal of producing 50,000 rifles a year. Venezuela plans to buy 12 Il-76 and Il-78 tankers and cargo aircraft, or possibly 96-300 military transport planes, Tor-M1 anti-air missiles, a fifth generation anti-air system equally effective against planes, helicopters, UAVs, cruise missiles and high precision missiles, and Igla-S portable SAM systems. In September 2009, Moscow advanced Caracas a $2 billion credit to buy more arms: 92 T-72 main battle tanks, Smerch rocket artillery systems, and the Antey 2500 anti-ballistic missile system.71 Other Russian defense sources said that the tank deal could be expanded to include three diesel-powered submarines “Kilo” class, combat helicopters Mi-28 and armored infantry vehicles BMP-3.72 Venezuela also seeks Mi-28n Hunter high-attack helicopters and is discussing the possible purchase of submarines.73 There were also earlier discussions about selling project 636 submarines (among the quietest subs in the world) to Venezuela during 2011-13, along with torpedo and missile ordnance for Venzuela’s navy. The $2.2 billion loan in 2009 will go for 92 T-70 and T-72 tanks, BMP-3 Infantry Fighting Vehicles, Smerch anti-tank missiles, multiple rocket launchers, S-300, Buk M-2 and Pechora anti-aircraft missiles, all systems usable against Colombia. In return, Russia got access to join Venezuela’s national oil company, Petróleos de Venezuela, S.A. (PDVSA), in exploring oil fields in the Orinoco River basin.74 The signed agreements make it clear that each of the three Russian companies has staked its own bloc in the Orinoco oil belt. Thus, LUKOIL has received permission to explore the Junin-3 block. In effect, it has extended its three-year-long contract with PDSVA on the block's evaluation and certification. The new two-year agreement provides for the bloc's joint exploration and development. Once accomplished, the two companies plan to establish a joint venture to develop the deposit. This will require billions of dollars in investment. The oil from this project could then be sent to an oil refinery in Italy. LUKOIL has just bought 49.9% of its shares. TNK-BP and PDSVA signed an agreement on the joint study of the Ayacucho-2 block in the wake of a framework memo signed last October. As with the LUKOIL agreement, it provides for a second phase - the sale of the produced oil abroad.75 Venezuela’s arms purchases make no sense unless they are intended for purposes of helping the FARC and other similar groups, fighting Colombia, projecting power throughout Latin America, drug running with subs that are protected against air attacks, or providing a temporary base for Russian naval and air forces where they can be sheltered from attacks but threaten North or South America.76 Since Putin has said that permanent bases in Cuba and Venzuela are unnecessary, this leaves the door open to temporary bases, including submarine bases as needed.77 Recently Bolivia, too, has offered its territory as a base in return for arms sales and economic help on energy and other projects.78 Much of what Russia sells to Venezuela is compatible with that idea, as is Putin’s call for restoring Russia’s position in Cuba and ongoing talks between Russian and Cuban military officials (e.g., Sechin’s trips in 2008).79 The following facts are also particularly noteworthy. Chávez is not only arming the FARC; he is also training other Latin American states’ military forces (e.g., Bolivian forces). 80 Venezuela aided Iranian missile sales to Syria, Chávez told Iranian leaders about his desire to introduce “nuclear elements into Venezuela,” (i.e., nuclear weapons) and Russia supports the allegedly peaceful Venezuelan development of nuclear energy and explorations for finding uranium and an alternative nuclear fuel, thorium.81 Iran is now actively helping Venezuela explore for uranium.82 These developments suggest the possiblity of Venezuela functioning as a kind of swing man or pivot for a Russo-Venezuelan-Iranian alliance against the United States. Certainly elements in the Iranian press and government believe that Tehran should further intensify its already extensive efforts here to create the possibility of a “second front” in political or even in military terms against the United States. Hizbollah already raises money and runs drugs in Latin America and many have noted the growing network of ties between Iran and Latin American insurgents and terrorists facilitated by Chávez.83

#### <LINK>

#### Regional foothold is vital to IT cooperation and innovation – precondition to economic stability

Zaitsev 7 – academic advisor at the Russian Engineering Academy (Yuri, “Russia and Latin America: innovation and cooperation”, RIA Novasti, 1/30/17, http://en.rian.ru/analysis/20070130/59930093.html)//SJF

MOSCOW. (Yury Zaitsev for RIA Novosti) - One of Russia's foreign policy priorities is to intensify political dialogue and economic cooperation with Latin America, which has a large market and is a world leader in agricultural raw materials and foodstuffs.

Russia could supply Latin American countries with high tech products and services.

The outlook for Russia's economic cooperation with Latin America is generally good. Today, it accounts for a mere four percent of Russia's total foreign trade, and this figure could be doubled or tripled. Trade with Brazil, for example, is approaching three billion dollars. In the Soviet times, the record was $835 million, but it only lasted for one year - 1983. At that time, machines and equipment amounted to 60% of Soviet exports there. Today, mineral fertilizer makes up three quarters of Russian supplies to Brazil, Argentina, and Mexico. Equipment features prominently only in trade with Cuba, but these are mainly spare parts for Soviet-made machines.

Cooperation in innovation is negligible. With many countries, it simply does not exist. Russia is not on the list of 25 biggest investors in Chile and Peru, and its investment in Mexico is insignificant. The most promising directions of Russia's cooperation with Latin America are fuels and other raw materials, the power industry, metallurgy, the chemical and petrochemical industry, machine-building, transport, and agro-industrial sector.

Cooperation in space deserves special mention in the field of high technologies. Mexico, Chile, and Argentine launch their satellites with Russian carrier rockets. A Brazilian astronaut went to space on a Russian Soyuz; Brazil is building a modern launch system using Russian blueprints at its Alcantara launch site in the state of Maranhao. Russian experts are helping their Brazilian colleagues to develop effective carriers of payloads into space.

In the fuel-and-energy sector, cooperation and transfer of technologies could be oriented to the introduction of modern methods of prospecting for and monitoring of mineral and organic raw materials resources (space facilities could be used for this purpose among others); increasing the level of their recoverability and development; and construction of reliable and environmentally safe transportation systems. For instance, Russian RUSAL has already privatized one of Guyana's biggest bauxite-producing companies, and invested several million dollars into it to supply Russia with two million tons of bauxites every year. This is an impressive figure for Russia, and even more so for Guyana.

The Russian oil giant LUKoil is trying to gain a foothold in the Latin American fuel-and-energy market. In the power industry, innovation policy could focus on the building and use of combined-cycle plants for electric power stations on gaseous fuel and effective steam power plants based on latest technologies of solid fuel combustion. The Russian electric power company Silovye Machiny (former Energomashexport) has won a bid for the supply of equipment for electric power stations in Mexico, Brazil, and Chile.

Through-cycle technologies, which help save the maximum of resources and energy at all stages, are of particular interest for Latin American countries with advanced metallurgical industry. These technologies will also be effective in the chemical, and petrochemical industries.

Russia's experience in automated design and production, high-accuracy machining, and use of advanced methods of control and fault-detection during the manufacture and operation of components could be applied in machine building.

Technological cooperation may develop in upgrading transportation vehicles, and road-building machines and equipment. Uruguay is currently buying Russian Ural trucks for its army. An Avtovaz assembly plant is operating in Ecuador. Russia is selling helicopters and other aircraft to Mexico, Venezuela, Columbia, and Peru.

Russian experts believe that to develop innovation projects, Russia should establish high-tech joint ventures with Latin American countries in order to test pilot models of cooperation and joint science-intensive production, and to put latest Russian developments to commercial use in the region. Importantly, innovation projects will only be effective if they are based on breakthrough fundamental and applied research, and are guided by commercial considerations from the very start.

Vigorous government support for scientific, technical, and innovation cooperation between Russia and Latin America is an important, if not decisive, precondition for its success. The government should back domestic demonstration projects at international exhibitions, expand the licensing of home technologies abroad, and guarantee transparency of technological exports and imports.

For Russia, Latin America is a very interesting and promising trade and economic partner. Brazil, for instance, is the world's fourth producer of aircraft, and the world's leader in the market of regional and medium-haul planes. It owns 45% of this market. Paradoxically, Russia is purchasing these aircraft from the United States, whereas the U.S. is buying them in Brazil.

#### The status quo Russian growth model is unsustainable – IT innovation is vital to reverse this trend

ICD, 10. Institute of Contemporary Development. “Information Technology and Russia's Future,” http://www.riocenter.ru/en/\_priorities/competitive\_economy.

Russia’s extremely strong economic growth is one of the country’s recent major accomplishments. Undoubtedly, the natural resources sector has played a significant role in this achievement. However, economic growth based solely on the natural resources sector is neither sufficient nor sustainable. We are entering the era of the global information society, where knowledge is the core resource and mechanism of accelerated development. Russia’s continued economic growth will depend on the successful development of the innovative industries of the nation’s economy, particularly innovative infrastructure. The advanced development of high-tech industries, including the Information and Communication Technology Sector (ICT), is also a key condition for a strong and growing economy. In most developed countries, ICT represents 8-12% of a country’s GDP and is one of the leading sectors in terms of capitalization of the global economy.

 This sector’s role will only strengthen with time. Alongside oil & gas, Russia’s ICT is one of the two drivers of economic development. Since 2000, this sector has developed four times faster than the average performance of the Russian economy. ICT has demonstrated rapid, steady and stable growth in all of its segments. The implementation of a number of key national projects and other large-scale government programs will also encourage the development of innovative industries.

\*ICT means the Information and Communication Technology Sector

#### Nuclear war

David 99 (Steven, professor of political science at johns hopkins, foreign affairs, jan/feb)

If internal war does strike Russia, economic deterioration will be a prime cause. From 1989 to the present, the GDP has fallen by 50 percent. In a society where, ten years ago, unemployment scarcely existed, it reached 9.5 percent in 1997 with many economists declaring the true figure to be much higher. Twenty-two percent of Russians live below the official poverty line (earning less than $ 70 a month). Modern Russia can neither collect taxes (it gathers only half the revenue it is due) nor significantly cut spending. Reformers tout privatization as the country's cure-all, but in a land without well-defined property rights or contract law and where subsidies remain a way of life, the prospects for transition to an American-style capitalist economy look remote at best. As the massive devaluation of the ruble and the current political crisis show, Russia's condition is even worse than most analysts feared. If conditions get worse, even the stoic Russian people will soon run out of patience. A future conflict would quickly draw in Russia's military. In the Soviet days civilian rule kept the powerful armed forces in check. But with the Communist Party out of office, what little civilian control remains relies on an exceedingly fragile foundation -- personal friendships between government leaders and military commanders. Meanwhile, the morale of Russian soldiers has fallen to a dangerous low. Drastic cuts in spending mean inadequate pay, housing, and medical care. A new emphasis on domestic missions has created an ideological split between the old and new guard in the military leadership, increasing the risk that disgruntled generals may enter the political fray and feeding the resentment of soldiers who dislike being used as a national police force. Newly enhanced ties between military units and local authorities pose another danger. Soldiers grow ever more dependent on local governments for housing, food, and wages. Draftees serve closer to home, and new laws have increased local control over the armed forces. Were a conflict to emerge between a regional power and Moscow, it is not at all clear which side the military would support. Divining the military's allegiance is crucial, however, since the structure of the Russian Federation makes it virtually certain that regional conflicts will continue to erupt. Russia's 89 republics, krais, and oblasts grow ever more independent in a system that does little to keep them together. As the central government finds itself unable to force its will beyond Moscow (if even that far), power devolves to the periphery. With the economy collapsing, republics feel less and less incentive to pay taxes to Moscow when they receive so little in return. Three-quarters of them already have their own constitutions, nearly all of which make some claim to sovereignty. Strong ethnic bonds promoted by shortsighted Soviet policies may motivate non-Russians to secede from the Federation.

 Chechnya's successful revolt against Russian control inspired similar movements for autonomy and independence throughout the country. If these rebellions spread and Moscow responds with force, civil war is likely. Should Russia succumb to internal war, the consequences for the United States and Europe will be severe. A major power like Russia -- even though in decline -- does not suffer civil war quietly or alone. An embattled Russian Federation might provoke opportunistic attacks from enemies such as China. Massive flows of refugees would pour into central and western Europe. Armed struggles in Russia could easily spill into its neighbors. Damage from the fighting, particularly attacks on nuclear plants, would poison the environment of much of Europe and Asia. Within Russia, the consequences would be even worse. Just as the sheer brutality of the last Russian civil war laid the basis for the privations of Soviet communism, a second civil war might produce another horrific regime. Most alarming is the real possibility that the violent disintegration of Russia could lead to loss of control over its nuclear arsenal. No nuclear state has ever fallen victim to civil war, but even without a clear precedent the grim consequences can be foreseen. Russia retains some 20,000 nuclear weapons and the raw material for tens of thousands more, in scores of sites scattered throughout the country. So far, the government has managed to prevent the los of any weapons or much material. If war erupts, however, Moscow's already weak grip on nuclear sites will slacken, making weapons and supplies available to a wide range of anti-American groups and states. Such dispersal of nuclear weapons represents the greatest physical threat America now faces. And it is hard to think of anything that would increase this threat more than the chaos that would follow a Russian civil war.

## 1nc –cp

**Text: The United States federal government should substantially increase its economic engagement towards Venezuela on non-oil free trade if and only if Venezuela ousts narco-kingpins from government, institutes constitutional reform, adopts meaningful economic and electoral reforms, dismantles Iranian and Hezbollah networks in Venezuela, and demonstrates commitment to protecting human rights.**

**CP solves and establishes democracy and stability throughout Latin America.**

Noriega 13 Roger F., former assistant secretary of state under President George W. Bush, is a visiting fellow at the American Enterprise Institute, 3/5/13, http://www.aei.org/article/foreign-and-defense-policy/regional/latin-america/a-post-chvez-checklist-for-us-policymakers/, “A post-Chávez checklist for US policymakers,” ADM

The State Department should set aside any plans that would legitimize a successor regime in Caracas, at least until key demands are met:

* + The ouster of narco-kingpins who now hold senior posts in government;
	+ The respect for a constitutional succession;
	+ The adoption of meaningful electoral reforms to ensure a fair campaign environment and a transparent vote count in expected presidential elections; and
	+ The dismantling of Iranian and Hezbollah networks in Venezuela.

Now is the time for US diplomats to begin a quiet dialogue with key regional powers to explain the high cost of Chávez’s criminal regime, including the impact of chavista complicity with narcotraffickers who sow mayhem in Colombia, Central America, and Mexico. Perhaps then we can convince regional leaders to show solidarity with Venezuelan democrats who want to restore a commitment to the rule of law and to rebuild an economy that can be an engine for growth in South America. As Venezuelan democrats wage that struggle against chavismo, regional leaders must make clear that Syria-style repression will never be tolerated in the Americas. We should defend the right of Venezuelans to struggle democratically to reclaim control of their country and its future. Only Washington can make clear to Chinese, Russian, Iranian, and Cuban leaders that, yes, the United States does mind if they try to sustain an undemocratic and hostile regime in Venezuela. Any attempt to suppress their self-determination with Chinese cash, Russian arms, Iranian terrorists, or Cuban thuggery will be met with a coordinated regional response. US law enforcement and prosecutors can do their part by putting criminal kingpins in jail or, at the very least, on the defensive so they cannot threaten or undermine a reform agenda. US development agencies should work with friends in the region to form a task force of private sector representatives, economists, and engineers to work with Venezuelans to identify the economic reforms, infrastructure investments, security assistance, and humanitarian aid that will be required to stabilize and rebuild that country. Of course, the expectation will be that all the costs of these activities will be borne by an oil sector restored to productivity and profitability. Finally, we need to work with like-minded nations to reinvigorate regional organizations committed to democracy, human rights, anti-drug cooperation, and hemispheric solidarity, which have been neutered by Chávez’s destructive agenda.

**The counterplan establishes a Venezuelan democracy – their solvency advocate concludes neg**

Christy 3-15 (Patrick Christy, senior policy analyst @ the Foreign Policy Initiative, “Obama Must Stand Up for Democracy in Post-Chavez Venezuela,” U.S. News World Report, 3-15-13, http://vip001.usnews.com/opinion/blogs/world-report/2013/03/15/after-chavez-us-must-encourage-democratic-venezuela)

Venezuela's upcoming election to replace the late Hugo Chavez gives the country an important opportunity to break away from over a decade's worth of strongman rule—and move towards better governance, improved internal security and stability, a stronger and more vibrant economy, and a truly constructive role in regional and global affairs. It's critical that the United States do what it can to encourage Venezuela to seize that opportunity. For over a decade, Chavez led ideologically-driven efforts to erode U.S. standing in Latin America and around the globe. The populist leader expanded Venezuela's ties with rogue states such as Cuba and Iran, aided and protected terrorist organizations such as the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), and actively undermined the rule of law in Venezuela and throughout the Americas. In the Western Hemisphere alone, Chavez used record petrol prices to prop up anti-American socialist leaders, most notably in Bolivia, Cuba and Nicaragua. Chavez leaves behind a broken economy, a deeply divided nation and a dysfunctional government, all of which will take years—if not decades—to overcome. Venezuela is plagued with double-digit inflation, mounting budget deficits and rising levels of violence. While the OPEC nation maintains one of the world's largest geological oil reserves, crude exports—which account for roughly 45 percent of federal budget revenues—have declined by nearly half since 1999. The United States imports roughly one million barrels from Venezuela per day. Chavez's protégé Nicolas Maduro, the former vice president who's now acting as Venezuela's interim president, is running to succeed the late strongman, but it's not preordained that he'll win. It remains to be seen the extent to which he can properly unite prior to the election the many competing populist factions that benefited under Chavez for so many years. What is clear is that he will drape himself in the political ideology of chavismo in the run up to April 14 elections, and use—and quite possibly abuse—government institutions and petrodollars in attempt to woo the country's voters. What's perverse is how the Obama administration's move to "reset" relations with Maduro is doing more to legitimize him as the rightful heir to Venezuela's presidency than to resuscitate relations between the two governments. The move showed itself to be even more naive after Maduro accused the United States of plotting to poison Chavez shortly after the strongman's death. Washington must realize that a strategy of engagement alone will not ensure a renewed and improved partnership with Caracas. Failure to realize this will not only undermine whatever influence America has in the months ahead, but also send a troubling signal to Venezuela's increasingly united political opposition. The Obama administration should instead pursue a more principled policy towards a post-Chavez Venezuela. In particular, it should: Pressure Caracas to implement key election reforms. Venezuela's opposition faces formidable obstacles. Interim President Maduro will use the government's near-monopoly control of public airwaves, its established networks of political patronage and last-minute public spending programs to bolster his populist agenda. Washington should stress publicly and privately that any attempts to suppress or intimidate the opposition runs contrary to Venezuela's constitution and the principles defined in the Inter-American Democratic Charter, which was adopted by Venezuela in 2001. To this point, José Cárdenas, a former USAID acting assistant administrator for Latin America, writes, The Venezuelan opposition continues to insist that the constitution (which is of Chavez's own writing) be followed and have drawn up a list of simple electoral reforms that would level the playing field and better allow the Venezuelan people to chart their own future free of chavista and foreign interference. Demand free, fair and verifiable elections. Although Venezuela announced that a special election to replace Chavez will be held next month, it is important to remember that elections alone do not make a democracy. Indeed, Chavez long embraced the rhetoric of democracy as he, in reality, consolidated executive power, undermined Venezuela's previously democratic political system and altered the outcomes of election through corruption, fraud and intimidation. The Obama administration should make clear that free and fair elections, properly monitored by respected international election observers, are essential to Venezuela's future standing in the hemisphere and the world. Likewise, Secretary of State John Kerry should work with regional partners—including (but not limited to) Brazil, Canada, Colombia and Mexico—to firmly encourage Maduro's interim government. A unified regional voice would send a powerful signal to Chavez's cronies in Caracas and longtime enablers in China, Iran and Russia. Condition future diplomatic and economic relations. Corruption and criminality were widespread under the Chavez regime, as high-level government and military officials benefited from close ties to corrupt businesses and international drug traffickers. Yet to date, the Obama administration has done little to hold Venezuela's leaders accountable. Washington should make clear that full diplomatic relations with the United States will be contingent upon Venezuela ending ties to international terrorist groups and rogue regimes like Iran. If Venezuela takes meaningful steps to end these ties and ensure future elections, the United States should work with Caracas and the private sector to reform Venezuela's energy industry and identify key development projects and reforms to improve the country's economic future. The United States can play an important role in shaping Venezuela's post-Chavez future. But to do so, the Obama administration will need to stand with the people of Venezuela by publicly defending democratic principles and the impartial rule of law in Latin America.

**Democracy solves extinction.**

Diamond, 95, Larry, Senior Research Fellow at the Hoover Institute, 1995, Promoting Democracy in the 1990s, Online

Nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons continue to proliferate. The very source of life on Earth, the global ecosystem, appears increasingly endangered. Most of these new and unconventional threats to security are associated with or aggravated by the weakness or absence of democracy, with its provisions for legality, accountability, popular sovereignty, and openness. LESSONS OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY The experience of this century offers important lessons. Countries that govern themselves in a truly democratic fashion do not go to war with one another. They do not aggress against their neighbors to aggrandize themselves or glorify their leaders. Democratic governments do not ethnically "cleanse" their own populations, and they are much less likely to face ethnic insurgency. Democracies do not sponsor terrorism against one another. They do not build weapons of mass destruction to use on or to threaten one another.

## trade

#### Claims of Iranian infiltration are overblown hype

**Goodman 13** (Joshua Goodman, “Iran Influence in Latin America Waning, U.S. Report Says” Bloomberg, June 26 2013, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-06-26/iran-influence-in-latin-america-waning-u-s-report-says.html) MR

The U.S. stepped up its monitoring of Iran’s presence in Latin America in a bid to isolate the country over its nuclear program and after President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad forged closer ties with anti-American allies of the late Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez. While Iran’s outreach bears watching, claims about more sinister activities are unproven, said Christopher Sabatini, senior policy director at the Council of the Americas. “It’s a shame that in such a dynamic hemisphere in which we have so many diplomatic initiatives that for some -- especially Congress -- attention to the region has boiled down to mostly **spurious** charges about Iranian infiltration,” Sabatini said via e-mail. Ahmadinejad made repeated trips to Latin America after taking office in 2005, most recently to Caracas to attend Chavez’s funeral in March and the inauguration of his successor, Nicolas Maduro, a month later. By contrast, Rohani has said little about the region since his surprise victory earlier this month. Instead, he said one of his main foreign policy priorities will be seeking “constructive dialog” with the U.S. and U.K., two nations with which the country has traditionally been at odds. ‘Good Relations’ “We’ll seek to have good relations with all nations, including Latin American states,” Rohani said during his first post-election press conference June 17, in response to a question about the attention he’ll devote to Latin America. Under Ahmadinejad’s watch, Iran added embassies in Latin America and more than doubled trade with Brazil, the region’s biggest economy. With Chavez, Ahmadinejad signed more than 100 accords to support everything from a campaign to build homes in Venezuela to a joint venture to manufacture bicycles, which Chavez jokingly referred to as “atomic” two-wheelers. The two countries also established in Caracas the Banco Internacional de Desarrollo, which together with its main Iranian shareholder, Bank Saderat, is accused by the U.S. of being a vehicle for the Ahmadinejad government’s funding of the Middle Eastern terrorist group Hezbollah. Yet with Iran’s economy crippled by sanctions, many of the projects haven’t gotten off the ground. For example, pledges from 2007 and 2008 to help build a $350 million deep-water port off Nicaragua’s Atlantic coast and an oil refinery in Ecuador have yet to materialize. Nor has it built what former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton warned would be a “huge” embassy in Managua.

#### No iran strikes from Venezuela-- Iran’s ties with Bolivia are replacing its partnership with Venezuela

**Berman 12** (Ilan Berman, “Iran Woos Bolivia For Influence In Latin America” The Daily Beast, May 20 2012, http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2012/05/20/iran-woos-bolivia-for-influence-in-latin-america.html) MR

Iran’s involvement in the ALBA school serves as a microcosm of the Iranian-Bolivian relationship writ large. Since 2007, when Iranian president Mahmoud Ahmadinejad first visited Bolivia, the **ties between Tehran and La Paz have deepened dramatically**. Bolivia, for example, is fast emerging as a source of strategic resources for the Islamic Republic. Iran is now rumored to be mining for uranium in no fewer than 11 locations outside of Santa Cruz, close to where the ALBA school is located. Not coincidentally, rumor also has it that the now-infamous Tehran-Caracas air route operated jointly by Conviasa, Venezuela’s national airline, and Iran’s state airline, Iran Air, could be extended to Santa Cruz in the near future—a sure sign of Iranian interest in the area. Additionally, a series of cooperation agreements concluded in 2010 between La Paz and Tehran have made Iran a “partner” in the mining and exploitation of Bolivia’s lithium, a key strategic mineral with applications for nuclear weapons development. Significantly, the extent of this activity—and of Bolivia’s strategic resource wealth writ large—remains shrouded in mystery. That is because while the mineral deposits of Venezuela, Iran’s most prominent partner in the region, are comparatively well-known, those of Bolivia are not. This, according to regional observers, makes Bolivia a “black box” in terms of its resource potential—and consequently its future importance to the Iranian regime. What is clear is that, at least for the moment, the Islamic Republic has placed **considerable value** on its burgeoning ties to Bolivia. In exchange for access from the Morales government, Iran has proffered hundreds of millions of dollars in loans to the Bolivian government, agreed to $1 billion-worth of joint commercial and industrial projects, and offered to sell warplanes and helicopters to the Bolivian military. (To date, however, most of these economic overtures have not materialized.) Iran’s diplomatic presence in Bolivia has also deepened, with signs that its embassy in La Paz is being expanded under the watchful eye of Bolivia’s federal police. Bolivia has also become a prominent destination for Iran’s latest public diplomacy effort, HispanTV. The television channel, a Spanish-language analogue to the regime’s influential English-language PressTV, was formally launched with considerable fanfare by Iranian president Mahmoud Ahmadinejad earlier this year. Iran is now a partner in the mining and exploitation of Bolivia’s lithium—a key strategic mineral with applications for nuclear weapons development. Significantly, these contacts could be just the beginning. Over the past several years, Venezuela has served as Iran’s most stalwart ally in the Americas—and its gateway into the region. As part of those ties, Tehran and Caracas have made common cause on everything from Iran’s nuclear ambitions to a shared opposition to American influence. **But that partnership is now in considerable flux.**

#### Venezuela doesn’t sponsor dangerous Hezbollah activity – that’s a myth.

Tegel ’13Simeon Tegel is a British journalist based in Peru and is GlobalPost's senior correspondent for South America. He writes about a broad range of themes across Latin America – “American conservatives warn of militant Islam's spread in Latin America. But their claims are hard to prove” – Salon.com – Jan 8, 2013 – http://www.salon.com/2013/01/08/is\_venezuela\_harboring\_hezbollah/

American conservatives warn of militant Islam's spread in Latin America. But their claims are hard to prove Is Venezuela providing operational support to Islamic terrorists? That deadly serious question is increasingly troubling foreign policy and security experts as the South American country and Iran — which funds Hezbollah — move ever closer. Despite deep cultural differences, a shared antagonism toward the US has drawn Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez and his Iranian counterpart, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, into an unlikely political friendship in recent years. “Iran is an example of struggle, resistance, dignity, revolution, strong faith,” Chavez said during one early visit to Tehran. “We are two powerful countries. Iran is a power and Venezuela is becoming one. We want to create a bipolar world. We don’t want a single power [i.e., the US].” Beyond the rhetoric lies a strategic alliance that has seen Caracas, along with Damascus and Havana, vote against United Nations sanctions on Iran over its nuclear program, and increasing Iranian investment in the Venezuelan economy, now worth more than $5 billion. All of that is very public. But, according to critics such as veteran US Republican Latin Americanist Roger Noriega, Venezuela is also providing operational support to Hezbollah, the Lebanese-based organization classified as terrorist by the US, UK and other allies. It even came up in November’s US elections, with the Republicans claiming in their official online party platform: “Venezuela has become a narco-terrorist state, turning it into an Iranian outpost in the Western hemisphere.” “The current regime issues Venezuelan passports or visas to thousands of Middle Eastern terrorists offering safe haven to Hezbollah trainers, operatives, recruiters and fundraisers.” The GOP did not respond to GlobalPost’s requests for comment. But its claim was questioned — and even ridiculed — by several security experts in Israel and South America contacted by GlobalPost. “That is exaggerated. Generally, this kind of activity [terrorism] is conducted by small units. It is political rhetoric,” said Ely Karmon, one of Israel’s top independent counter-terrorism experts. Nicholas Watson, a senior analyst at British firm Control Risks, who specializes in South America, agreed, describing it as “unhelpful.” He added: “That kind of rhetoric, the blatant accusations, doesn’t help the US’ position in the region. It actually plays into Chavez’s hands and strengthens him within Venezuela.” That Hezbollah has been active in Latin America is hardly news. Argentine investigators have linked the group to two deadly bombings in Buenos Aires in the 1990s. Together, the attacks on the Israeli Embassy and a Jewish cultural center killed 114 people. One of five Iranians wanted by Interpol over the second bombing, Ahmad Vahidi, is now Iran’s defense minister. Last year, he had to make a rapid departure during a state visit to Bolivia when Argentine prosecutors requested Bolivian police arrest him. Meanwhile, according to the Council on Hemispheric Affairs, a Washington, DC, nonprofit research group, there’s growing evidence that Hezbollah is infiltrating other parts of Latin America, taking advantage of widespread corruption and drug trafficking to raise funds for its activities in the Middle East. The Buenos Aires attacks took place years before Chavez, now cancer-stricken but recently re-elected, came to power in Venezuela. He was even in jail, awaiting trial for his role in a failed coup, at the time of the first bombing, on the Israeli embassy. Nevertheless, a jigsaw of data, put together by everyone from Karmon to Manhattan District Attorney Robert Morgenthau, paints a disturbing picture of apparent bilateral cooperation in areas such as Iran’s outlawed nuclear ambitions and the Venezuelan military’s adoption of Tehran’s defense doctrine of “asymmetrical” warfare; in other words, guerrilla resistance to a potential US invasion. Now canceled, there was also a secretive weekly flight from Caracas to Tehran, with a stopover in Damascus, operated jointly by Iran Air and Conviasa, the state airlines in Iran and Venezuela respectively. Karmon and others say the passengers did not pass through customs. Meanwhile, Venezuela’s Lebanese-born Interior Minister Tareck El Aissami — who was previously in charge of the country’s passport office, fueling the Republican claim of papers being given to Islamic terrorists — makes no secret of his sympathies. “I’m also the son of Arabs, I’m Palestinian, I’m Iraqi, and today we are the resistance force,” he said at a 2009 event in support of Palestinians in Gaza. “There are Hezbollah supporters in the Venezuelan government. They have been neither investigated nor fired. They have been kept in their jobs,” said Roman D. Ortiz, director of Bogota-based security consultancy Decisive Point. But does that translate into the Chavez government arming or providing training facilities or other logistical support to Hezbollah? “The existence of a Lebanese community [in Venezuela] plus a left-wing populist government plus the anti-American rhetoric does not equal terrorism,” says Control Risks’ Watson. “That is speculation.”

#### No Iran prolif

#### The status quo is no longer threatening — sponsoring terrorism was a Chávez-led doctrine — that dies out with Maduro

Ghitis 13 — independent commentator on world affairs and a World Politics Review contributing editor (Frida Ghitis, *World Politics Review*, 01-10-13, “World Citizen: Will Venezuela-Iran Links Survive Chávez?”, http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/12615/world-citizen-will-venezuela-iran-links-survive-chavez, Accessed 06-30-2013 | AK)

During almost 14 years in office, Chávez made anti-Americanism the cornerstone of his foreign policy, working at every step to antagonize U.S. goals and undermine Washington’s influence. Perhaps the greatest irritant of all was the close relationship he forged with Iran, a country the U.S. and its allies believe is trying to develop nuclear weapons and sponsoring international terrorism. As the U.S. spearheaded efforts to pass United Nations sanctions to stop Iran’s nuclear enrichment, Chávez traveled to Tehran and, along with Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, provocatively announced the creation of what they called an “Axis of Unity” against the U.S. The two countries work together in a number of areas. Of particular interest to the U.S. is Venezuela’s help to Iran in circumventing international sanctions. The question for Washington now is how to maximize the chances that once Chávez leaves the scene, the ties linking Caracas and Tehran, more than 7,000 miles away, will fade. Just before the end of the year, President Barack Obama signed into law the Countering Iran in the Western Hemisphere Act, which instructs the State Department to develop a strategy to “address Iran’s growing hostile presence and activity” in Latin America, and directs the Department of Homeland Security to take measures to protect U.S. borders with Mexico and Canada to keep out “operatives from Iran . . . Hezbollah or any other terrorist organizations.” For Iran and its Lebanese ally Hezbollah, Chávez’s worsening condition could not come at a worse time. Their closest and most crucial ally, Syrian President Bashar al-Assad, is engulfed in a brutal civil war, likely to put an end to his regime and possibly destroy Syria’s ties with Iran and Hezbollah. The headwinds they face in Latin America recently came up in a speech by none other than Hezbollah leader Hassan Nasrallah. Speaking a couple of days after the start of the year, Nasrallah said 2013 would bring a “very dangerous phase” for his organization, citing efforts to add the group to the European Union’s terrorist list and to restrict its movements in Latin America as specific challenges. Before traveling to Cuba for his most recent cancer surgery, Chávez dramatically acknowledged he may not be able to remain in power and anointed Vice President Nicolas Maduro as his chosen successor. Washington has already taken tentative steps, seeking to reach out to Maduro -- as has Tehran. It is not exactly clear what the American strategy is, but there is no indication that the first moves were effective or well-received. The U.S. said that a telephone conversation between Maduro and a top State Department official, Roberta Jacobson, was aimed at improving relations, and there have been reports of other bilateral contacts. However, Maduro lashed out at reports that relations with Washington would improve after Chávez dies, calling it a distortion and manipulation by Washington. At about the same time, Iranian media reported a telephone call between Maduro and Ahmadinejad. The two are already friends. Maduro has strong connections with Tehran, having met in person with top officials on many occasions during visits to Iran and having served as their host when they traveled to Venezuela. Maduro is a favorite to succeed Chávez in both Tehran and Havana, not to mention Caracas. The Venezuelan constitution says if the president dies or cannot take office, the head of the National Assembly would take power temporarily. That position is held by another Chávez loyalist, Diosdado Cabello. After 30 days, a new election would take place. Cabello and Maduro are just two of several Chávez supporters who would vie for power in the factional power struggles to succeed the iconic president. Chávez’s unqualified blessing means that for now Maduro is the country’s most powerful man. He would benefit from an initial surge of support. And there is no question he and the Chavista forces have a firm grip on all the institutions of power. Chávez’s entrenched United Socialist Party of Venezuela (PSUV) will not crumble without its leader. And yet, there is no denying that Chavismo thrived because of Chávez. There is no guarantee it will survive without him in the long term, especially in the face of daunting economic problems, beginning with a budget deficit that stands at an astonishing 20 percent of GDP. For Washington, this means that forging ties with Maduro risks strengthening him against his rivals, helping him quash internal rivals and legitimize his rule at a time when it is unclear just how closely he and other Chavistas plan to follow the constitution. Infighting within the ruling party’s ranks, and the lack of a candidate with strong personal appeal, could open the way for the opposition. Opposition leader Henrique Capriles, who mounted a strong campaign against Chávez in last October’s presidential election, is on record saying he would bring a dramatic change in foreign policy, ending arms purchases from Russia, pulling away from China, reviewing oil deals that strengthen other authoritarian regimes in Latin America -- and rethinking controversial links with Iran. Washington would do well to keep conversations at the lowest possible volume, whether with the opposition or other would-be Chávez successors, while openly urging Venezuela to abide by democratic norms. If, in the event Chávez is unable to serve his term for whatever reason, a fair contest is allowed and enough time passes to loosen the emotional power of grief, the Venezuelan people may wake up to the dismal state of their economy, and discover there are better ways to decrease poverty and build lasting prosperity than Chavismo. A close relationship between Iran and Venezuela has always been a geographic and diplomatic oddity, one made possible only because of Chávez’s own worldview. Chávez’s immediate successor will seek to maintain it, but the intensity and impact will be difficult to preserve for long in a post-Chávez Venezuela.

#### no LA prolif

#### Prolif will be slow – the risk is basically zero

**Tepperman 09 –** [Jonathan, Newsweek International's first Assistant Managing Editor (now Deputy Editor), “Why Obama Should Learn to Love the Bomb” 8-29, http://www.newsweek.com/2009/08/28/why-obama-should-learn-to-love-the-bomb.html, SM]

The risk of an arms race—with, say, other Persian Gulf states rushing to build a bomb after Iran got one—is a bit harder to dispel. Once again, however, history is instructive. "In 64 years, the most nuclear-weapons states we've ever had is 12," says Waltz. "Now with North Korea we're at nine. That's not proliferation; that's spread at glacial pace." Nuclear weapons are so controversial and expensive that only countries that deem them absolutely critical to their survival go through the extreme trouble of acquiring them. That's why South Africa, Ukraine, Belarus, and Kazakhstan voluntarily gave theirs up in the early '90s, and why other countries like Brazil and Argentina dropped nascent programs. This doesn't guarantee that one or more of Iran's neighbors—Egypt or Saudi Arabia, say—might not still go for the bomb if Iran manages to build one. But the risks of a rapid spread are low, especially given Secretary of State Hillary Clinton's recent suggestion that the United States would extend a nuclear umbrella over the region, as Washington has over South Korea and Japan, if Iran does complete a bomb. If one or two Gulf states nonetheless decided to pursue their own weapon, that still might not be so disastrous, given the way that bombs tend to mellow behavior.

#### No impact to heg.

Ikenberry 08 – professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton University (John, “The Rise of China and the Future of the West Can the Liberal System Survive?” Jan/Feb 2008, Foreign Affairs)

Some observers believe that the American era is coming to an end, as the Western-oriented world order is replaced by one increasingly dominated by the East. The historian Niall Ferguson has written that the bloody twentieth century witnessed "the descent of the West" and "a reorientation of the world" toward the East. Realists go on to note that as China gets more powerful and the United States' position erodes, two things are likely to happen: China will try to use its growing influence to reshape the rules and institutions of the international system to better serve its interests, and other states in the system -- especially the declining hegemon -- will start to see China as a growing security threat. The result of these developments, they predict, will be tension, distrust, and conflict, the typical features of a power transition. In this view, the drama of China's rise will feature an increasingly powerful China and a declining United States locked in an epic battle over the rules and leadership of the international system. And as the world's largest country emerges not from within but outside the established post-World War II international order, it is a drama that will end with the grand ascendance of China and the onset of an Asian-centered world order. That course, however, is not inevitable. The rise of China does not have to trigger a wrenching hegemonic transition. The U.S.-Chinese power transition can be very different from those of the past because China faces an international order that is **fundamentally different** from those that past rising states confronted. China does not just face the United States; it faces a Western-centered system that is open, integrated, and rule-based, with wide and deep political foundations. The nuclear revolution, meanwhile, has made war among great powers unlikely -- eliminating the **major tool** that rising powers have used to overturn international systems defended by declining hegemonic states. Today's Western order, in short, is hard to overturn and easy to join. This unusually durable and expansive order is itself the product of farsighted U.S. leadership. After World War II, the United States did not simply establish itself as the leading world power. It led in the creation of universal institutions that not only invited global membership but also brought democracies and market societies closer together. It built an order that facilitated the participation and integration of both established great powers and newly independent states. (It is often forgotten that this postwar order was designed in large part to reintegrate the defeated Axis states and the beleaguered Allied states into a unified international system.) Today, China can gain full access to and thrive within this system. And if it does, China will rise, but the Western order -- if managed properly -- will live on.

**Plan fails –**

**A. Cyberattacks**

**Donahue, 10** – USAF Major (Jack, “CATASTROPHE ON THE HORIZON: A SCENARIO-BASED FUTURE EFFECT OF ORBITAL SPACE DEBRIS,” https://www.afresearch.org/skins/rims/q\_mod\_be0e99f3-fc56-4ccb-8dfe-670c0822a153/q\_act\_downloadpaper/q\_obj\_af691818-359f-4999-be24-f88ca154bd94/display.aspx?rs=enginespage)

Another unpredictable driving force that needs to be considered is adversary exploitation of space vulnerabilities via the cyber domain. Through cyberspace, enemies (both state and non-state actors) will target industry, academia, government, as well as the military in the air, land, maritime, and space domains.86 One of the easiest ways to disrupt, deny, degrade, or destroy the utility of space assets is to attack or sabotage the associated ground segments through cyberspace.87 The ground segment includes telemetry, tracking, and commanding of space assets and space-launch functions. Ground stations are an extremely critical piece of a satellites continued operation. However, many satellite tracking and control stations are lightly guarded and many satellite communications, launch, data reception, and control facilities are described in numerous open-source materials making the ground segment extremely vulnerable to cyber attack.88 An attack on a fixed ground facility can stop data transmission, render launch facilities unusable, and prevent control of satellites.89 Thus, rendering affected orbiting satellites inoperative from the communication disruption and creating a risk to other active satellites and a potential for additional orbital debris. A single incident or a small number of incidents could significantly impact space systems for years.90

**B. ASATS**

**Marshall, 6** - fellow at the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard's Kennedy School of Government and jointly at the Space Policy Institute of George Washington University (William, Boston Globe, “Weapons in outer space”, 7/5, http://www.boston.com/news/globe/editorial\_opinion/oped/articles/2006/07/05/weapons\_in\_outer\_space/)

The problem is that satellites are also vulnerable to elimination by enemies. A Space Commission report chaired by Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld considers the threat so real it warned of a ``Space Pearl Harbor."

Naturally, Americans want to protect these assets, so why not pursue space weapons? The most compelling reason is that they would actually make the situation worse.

This is due to the technical ease of ground-based anti-satellite systems. Adversaries wouldn't need to go to the trouble of building space-based weapons systems. Simple and inexpensive, ground-based systems could shoot these satellites out of the sky. More than 25 nations already have the missile capability to reach the altitude at which the satellites orbit. More significantly, powerful lasers able to kill a satellite in low orbit through heating are available commercially in more than 50 nations. If the United States deploys ground-based anti-satellite technology, or ASATs (which it can do technically now), then others will follow suit. America has the most assets in orbit to lose in such a game.

If the United States deploys space-based weapons -- like interceptors for missile defense (which it is on course to deploy within about 6 years) -- an adversary could simply take them out from the ground. If any security advantage afforded by such a weapon is easily negated, then one is left with the prospect of other nations moving toward developing ground-based ASAT capabilities. This would severely jeopardize America's precious satellites, all of them. Also, the capabilities provided by each proposed space-based weapon can be achieved with ground-based alternatives that are generally 100 to 1,000 times cheaper.

In addition, the United States is planning to release a new National Space Policy within weeks, tweaks to the language of which could give the green light for US deployment of space-based weapons. Instead, the United States should send a sign to other nations by taking space-based weapons off the books once and for all. America can still protect its satellite systems -- in less-threatening ways.

**C. Vulnerable ground based systems**

**Hitchens, 7** - Director of World Security Institute’s Center for Defense Information and the author of “Future Security In Space: Charting a Cooperative Course,” She also leads CDI’s Space Security Project. She serves on the editorial board of The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, and is a member of Women in Security and the International Institute for Strategic Studies (Winter, Theresa, “U.S.-Sino Relations in Space: From ‘War of Words’ to Cold War in Space?” China Security, World Security Institute, pdf)

At the same time, it is unclear that the up-tick in U.S.-Sino tensions spurred by the test will result in an all-out U.S. drive for an arsenal of offensive counter-space weapons – including similarly destructive ASATs. As most space experts recognize, ASATs cannot protect U.S. space assets because there are myriad terrestrially-based ways to threaten space systems including satellites. It is also highly unclear that ASATs would serve to deter potential adversaries from seeking to target U.S. space assets, as most other nations (including China) are not as dependent on space. Certainly, the China test has raised questions about whether U.S. policy to keep its options open regarding space weapons, and to “dissuade or deter others from either impeding [U.S.] rights or developing capabilities intended to do so,” has already failed. On the other hand, U.S. National Space Policy also states that the United States will take action to “deny, if necessary, adversaries the use of space capabilities hostile to U.S. national interests”\_7 – and the Chinese ASAT test seems to be a sign that Beijing intends to do just that, raising the issue of how the United States might opt to implement, and possibly use, counter-space capabilities. The problem for the U.S. Air Force, which is the “keeper of the keys” on this “space control” policy, is that a build up of counter-space weapons will require major investment (not to mention time to develop technology) at a time when the Pentagon budget is under severe pressure from the ongoing costs of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. And as noted above, the first priorities for space are programs to improve space situational awareness and to protect U.S. satellites, commercial and military, from attack. These two factors suggest that funding for development of a counter-space arsenal may be difficult to garner, at least in the short-term.

#### Latin American instability

**Patrick, ‘11** [Stewart, Research Fellow at the Center for Global Development, “Weak Links: Fragile States, Global Threats, and International Security,” Google Books]

The book’s Conclusion makes three main points. First, the relationship between state fragility and transnational threats is more complicated and contingent than the con­ventional wisdom would suggest. It depends on the threat in question, the specific sources of state weakness, and the will of a regime—not simply its inherent capacity—to assume sovereign functions. Globally, most fragile states do not present significant security risks, except to their own people, and the most important spillovers that pre­occupy U.S. national security officials are at least as likely to emanate from stronger developing countries, rather than the world’s weakest countries. Where such linkages do exist, the most salient governance gaps tend to be in the political and security arenas—notably high levels of corruption, weak rule of law, and a history of violent conflict—rather than in the economic and social welfare spheres (such as absence of economic growth or failure to meet basic human needs). And when poor state performance is associated with transnational threats, it often reflects weak commit­ment by the ruling regime to meet obligations to its citizens and the international community, rather than an inherent lack of capability.

## relations

**1. US government can’t interpret data: there’s too much and policymakers don’t care**

**Parthemore and Rogers 8-1-11**, Christine Parthemore and Will Rogers, Christine Parthemore is a Adjunct Professor in Johns Hopkins University's Global Security Studies Program and Fellow at the Center for a New American Security (CNAS), serves on the Council of Advisors for U-Mass Boston's Collaborative Institute for Oceans, Climate and Security. Will Rogers is a Research Associate and the Joseph S. Nye, Jr. Internship Coordinator at the Center for a New American Security (CNAS). “ BLINDED: THE DECLINE OF U.S. EARTH MONITORING CAPABILITIES AND ITS CONSEQUENCES FOR NATIONAL SECURITY” Center for a New American Security http://www.cnas.org/files/documents/publications/CNAS\_Blinded\_ParthemoreRogers\_0.pdf NEH)

iNAdequATe dATA iNTerPreTATioN The U.S. government, due largely to budget constraints, does not fully analyze the data that it already collects – including several decades’ worth of historical remote sensing data and imagery. The U.S. Geological Survey, for example, has extensive digital archives of aerial photographs in storage, but the government has not allocated funds for any agency to make the archives accessible or to use them for policy-relevant analysis. The struggles of the **NPOESS** program also **highlight the difficulty the U.S. government has in interpreting the climate** and environmental **data** it has already paid to collect.

**2. Enviro satellites have a history of failure and politicians don’t want to fund**

**Parthemore and Rogers 8-1-11**, Christine Parthemore and Will Rogers, Christine Parthemore is a Adjunct Professor in Johns Hopkins University's Global Security Studies Program and Fellow at the Center for a New American Security (CNAS), serves on the Council of Advisors for U-Mass Boston's Collaborative Institute for Oceans, Climate and Security. Will Rogers is a Research Associate and the Joseph S. Nye, Jr. Internship Coordinator at the Center for a New American Security (CNAS). “ BLINDED: THE DECLINE OF U.S. EARTH MONITORING CAPABILITIES AND ITS CONSEQUENCES FOR NATIONAL SECURITY” Center for a New American Security http://www.cnas.org/files/documents/publications/CNAS\_Blinded\_ParthemoreRogers\_0.pdf NEH)

Recent technical failures have made the challenges stemming from the gaps in U.S. satellite capabilities even more acute. In 2009, NASA’s Orbiting Carbon Observatory, a satellite designed to map global carbon dioxide levels, crashed into the Pacific Ocean after a protective shroud failed to separate from the rocket, adding extra weight that prevented the satellite from reaching orbit. 12 In March 2011, a similar failure of a protective nose cone caused NASA’s Glory satellite – intended to study the effects of black carbon soot and other atmospheric aerosols – to crash into the Pacific Ocean as well. 13 Additional challenges Four issues compound the challenges posed by the looming gaps in U.S. satellite capabilities. Budget constraints, ineffective communications, inadequate interpretation of data and over-reliance on the Global Earth Observation System of Systems (GEOSS) program all make it harder to generate and analyze the information on which U.S. national security and foreign policy practitioners increasingly rely. budgeT coNSTrAiNTS Budget constraints are likely to continue to severely limit U.S. investments in new satellites and other capabilities, according to government officials in a range of agencies. Funding may become the critical constraint on future earth monitoring capabilities.

**3. ITAR blocks image sharing and cooperation**

**Wigbels et. al, 8** – (July 2008, Lyn Wigbels, senior associate of Technology and Public Policy program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, G. Ryan Faith, CSIS Human Space Exploration Initiative, Vincent Sabathier, senior associate with the CSIS Technology and Public Policy Program, Center for Strategic Studies, “Earth Observations and Global Change,” Sawyer)

Export control regulations are a fundamental disincentive and significant structural impediment to U.S. participation in international systems, to foreign cooperation with the United States, and to the development of GEOSS. Since Earth observations can involve airborne, oceanic, and ground observation and are not limited only to space systems, the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR) legislation does not automatically come into play in every discussion of U.S. cooperation in GEOSS. However, ITAR can make it difficult to even initiate discussions on potential collaboration in many fruitful and obvious areas. ITAR has created real and perceived obstacles to engagement and cooperation. Although ITAR was intended to cover critical, highly sensitive military technologies, in practice the regulations are applied to a much, much wider array of other technologies. In addition, as individuals in the approval process are criminally liable equally for real and perceived mistakes, decisionmakers have a strong incentive to be excessively cautious. Furthermore, ITAR is now being applied to data from space systems, not just the space systems themselves. This has led to a situation where ITAR has forced the international community to develop their own independent capabilities (for example, radar ocean altimetry and Lidar/IMU). As a result, the international community now leads in several technologies, and U.S. firms are losing access to global markets and in some cases have lost the ability to produce such technologies altogether.

**No warming impacts.**

**Burnett, 12** – Sterling, Ph.D., Senior Fellow in Environment and Energy at the National Center for Policy Analysis (NCPA), “Fraud and Heartland: A Scandal for Climate Alarmists, not Skeptics,” 2-22, http://environmentblog.ncpa.org/fraud-and-heartland-a-scandal-for-climate-alarmists-not-skeptics/.

Sadly (for him), Peter Gleick, the researcher at issue, could have obtained a good deal of the information he sought through a request for Heartland’s 990, a tax document that non-profits have to provide to any who request it. Rather than going through legitimate channels to obtain what information he could or, better still, questioning the veracity of the initial document he received — and there were many reasons to question that document, among them the fact that it was delivered to him anonymously — using someone else’s name, a Heartland board member — he requested internal documents. Despite all the sound and fury surrounding this episode over the last week, really, nothing new was learned in the memos. As Time Magazine summed it up: “The alleged memos seem to confirm that the Heartland Institute is trying to push it’s highly skeptical view of climate science into the public sphere, which is only surprising if you’ve paid exactly zero attention to the climate debate over the past decade.” Gleick admits that his actions were wrong and apologized but said he did it out of “frustration.” One has to ask, frustration over what? Is he perhaps frustrated with the fact that he and his fellow climate alarmists have, as of yet, been unable to convince Americans that the scientific case for climate action is settled and stampede them into calling for policies that forcibly restrict energy use? Daily polls show more American’s are coming to doubt the argument that human actions are causing a warming that would result in catastrophic climate change. Or perhaps he is frustrated with the fact that an increasing number of scientists – scientists with **as good or better credentials** and reputations as those who argue that humans are causing warming — continue to highlight the weakness, discrepancies and contradictions that continue to plague global warming theory and demonstrate that the case in far from closed. Perhaps Glieck and his ilk are frustrated because they constantly bray that scientists and think tanks that show skepticism concerning one or another critical point of global warming theory are exceedingly well-funded; when the reality is, and Gleick knows it, these scientists and think tanks are **very modestly funded** when compared to the billions that are spent to on climate research, politics and on politically favored technologies by governments, billionaires and corporations who will benefit from climate policies, and the non-profit foundations and think tanks that want to use fear of global warming to reshape the Western economic system into what they believe would be a more humane, equitable (socialist), global version of society. A society where international bodies, with bureaucracies staffed by “experts” beyond the reach of crass democratic politics and mass opinion will steer the ship of global-state in the direction of the “true” public good. Time magazine notes that if anything, the Heartland memos debunk the idea of a well-funded “. . . vast right-wing conspiracy,” behind global warming skepticism. Who says the Progressive era has passed?

**Amazon is resilient – empirics and studies**

**WCR, 10** – World Climate Report ("Amazon Rainforest Resiliency," WCR, 9-20-10, http://www.worldclimatereport.com/index.php/2010/09/20/amazon-rainforest-resiliency/, SMS)

In 2005, Mother Nature conducted an experiment for us by producing a substantial drought in the Amazon; the drought peaked in intensity during July to September of that year with the hardest hit part of the Amazon occurring in the central and southwestern portions of Amazonia. Saleska et al. used satellite-based measurements and much to their surprise, they found that forest canopy “greenness” over the drought-stricken areas increased at a highly significant rate. They conclude that “These observations suggest that intact Amazon forests may be more resilient than many ecosystem models assume, at least in response to short-term climatic anomalies.” Next up is an article in a recent issue of the Journal of Vegetation Science by seven scientists from Panama, Brazil, and California; the piece is entitled “Long-term variation in Amazon forest dynamics” and therefore must contain horrible news about the state of the rainforest, right? Wrong! Laurance and her team conducted five different surveys of the forest in a protected area 50 miles north of Manaus in the central Amazon; they made these measurements between 1981 and 2003. Getting right to the bottom line, they report that “Forest biomass also increased over time, with the basal area of trees in our plots, which correlate strongly with tree biomass, rising by 4% on average.” They then add “The suite of changes we observed—accelerating tree growth and forest dynamism, and rising biomass—largely accords with findings from other long-term, comparative studies of forest dynamics across the Amazon Basin.” They state “One of the most frequent explanations for such findings is that forest productivity is rising, possibly in response to increasing CO2 fertilization or some other regional or global driver(s), such as increasing irradiance or rainfall variability.” We are partial to the increasing CO2 explanation, and it is worth noting that the first sentence in the “Conclusions” section in their abstract clearly states “The increasing forest dynamics, growth, and basal area observed are broadly consistent with the CO2 fertilization hypothesis.” Our third recent article was written by three scientists from Brazil and Germany and it appeared in Global Biogeochemical Cycles. Lapola et al. begin noting that “Tropical South America vegetation cover projections for the end of the century differ considerably depending on climate scenario and also on how physiological processes are considered in vegetation models.” To investigate the future of the vegetation of the Amazon, the team created a numerical “Potential Vegetation Model” that could be coupled with global climate models. As seen in their figure below (Figure 1), the vegetation model appears to accurately replicate the current vegetation in the region. When they simulated climate change in the future and they included the CO2 fertilization effect, the vegetation was largely unchanged. Without the CO2 fertilization effect, the rainforest all but disappears under their expected change in climate. And if the climate does not change much and the CO2 fertilization effect is realized, the rainforest expands considerably.

**War in the Arctic is impossible – international cooperation checks escalation**

**Kraska 11** – US Navy Commander Chair of Operational Law and member of the International Law Department (Commander James, “Arctic Security in an Age of Climate Change” 2011; <http://books.google.com/books?id=b-U1To97zqsC&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false>)//AB

**Still, armed** conflict in the Arctic is improbable. The National Intelligence Council, for example, suggests, that major war in the Arctic is unlikely, although small-scale conflict- the result of spillover from disputes in other areas gravitating into the Arctic region- is possible. All of the A5 states’ parties in good standing with the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), except the United States- and even Washington observes almost all of the provisions of the convention. At a conference in Moscow in September 2010, Russian Premier Vladimir Putin stressed that **any disagreements in the region can be solves under the framework of UNCLOS, and furthermore that no Russian development projects would proceed in the Arctic without strict measures to ensure the fragile environment is protected. Putin also stated that, although serious geopolitical and economic interests intersect in the Arctic, the prospects were high that the issues could be solved in a spirit of cooperation and partnership.** Scenarios for future war in the Arctic have “nothing to do with reality,” Putin stressed.

**The war won't escalate or cause extinction**

**Dyer 02 –** (5/24, Gwinette, Hamilton Spectator, "Nuclear war a possibility over Kashmir", Lexis, WEA)

For those who do not live in the subcontinent, the most important fact is that the damage would be largely confined to the region. The Cold War is over, the strategic understandings that once tied India and Pakistan to the rival alliance systems have all been cancelled, and no outside powers would be drawn into the fighting. The detonation of a hundred or so relatively small nuclear weapons over India and Pakistan would not cause grave harm to the wider world from fallout. People over 40 have already lived through a period when the great powers conducted hundreds of nuclear tests in the atmosphere, and they are mostly still here.

## solvency

**Venezuela would say no**

**Shifter 13** – president of the Inter-American Dialogue, Michael, 5-3-13, “What Does the Future Hold for U.S.-Venezuela Relations?” http://www.thedialogue.org/page.cfm?pageID=32&pubID=3297

Q: The future of U.S.-Venezuela relations remains uncertain in the early days of the Nicolás Maduro administration. Maduro has voiced a desire for "respectful relations" with the United States, though Washington has still not recognized his government. The United States has denied that it is considering sanctions against Venezuela, and Venezuelan authorities recently arrested a U.S. citizen on accusations of attempting to spark social unrest. The State Department has denied any efforts to destabilize the Venezuelan government. Will U.S.-Venezuela relations be better or worse under Maduro than they were under Hugo Chávez? What do Maduro's cabinet picks portend about the future of bilateral relations? Should businesses be more worried about political risk in Venezuela now than they were when Chávez was alive?¶ A: Michael Shifter, president of the Inter-American Dialogue: "The prospects for improved relations between the United States and Venezuela under the Maduro administration now appear rather dim. Maduro's rhetoric directed at Washington has been notably tough and aggressive, as he seeks to shore up support among the Chavista base. Arresting a U.S. citizen and accusing him of stirring up trouble in Venezuela is a vintage Chávez tactic, aimed at diverting attention from the country's myriad, fundamental problems. Lacking Chávez's political skills and common touch, Maduro is in a particularly shaky position, compounded by questions of legitimacy following the April 14 elections. To date, personnel picks and policy signals coming out of the administration have been confusing and mixed. Some in Maduro's team are hardliners, while others, such as Calixto Ortega--the recently appointed representative in Washington--are more open and moderate. Ortega, for example, was very active in the so-called Boston Group, an effort that sought to facilitate dialogue between Chavista and opposition lawmakers. As long as Maduro's political standing remains precarious, he will be severely constrained in his ability to pursue closer ties with the United States. There is no appetite or interest in Washington to adopt punitive measures and apply sanctions against Venezuela. In light of Maduro's confrontational rhetoric and actions--and disturbing incidents of violence--no one is calling for a rapprochement. Still, assuming that things begin to settle down, and given that other governments have already recognized Maduro, it would be surprising if Washington didn't eventually come around and deal with the practical reality."
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## perm do cp

**Perm do the CP is severance**

**1. Time Frame – counterplan requires 5 more policies to be implemented before the aff – ‘Resolved’ means to enact a policy by law**

Words and Phrases 64 (Permanent Edition)

Definition of the word “resolve,” given by Webster is “to express an opinion or determination by resolution or vote; as ‘it was resolved by the legislature;” It is of similar force to the word “enact,” which is defined by Bouvier as meaning “to establish by law”.

**2. Certainty of the plan – the counterplan plays off the probability of massive Venezuelan appeasement – that’s substantially less than the aff.**

**“Should” is mandatory**

Nieto 9 – Judge Henry Nieto, Colorado Court of Appeals, 8-20-2009 People v. Munoz, 240 P.3d 311 (Colo. Ct. App. 2009)

"Should" is "used . . . to express duty, obligation, propriety, or expediency." Webster's Third New International Dictionary 2104 (2002). Courts [\*\*15] interpreting the word in various contexts have drawn conflicting conclusions, although the weight of authority appears to favor interpreting "should" in an imperative, obligatory sense. HN7A number of courts, confronted with the question of whether using the word "should" in jury instructions conforms with the Fifth and Sixth Amendment protections governing the reasonable doubt standard, have upheld instructions using the word. In the courts of other states in which a defendant has argued that the word "should" in the reasonable doubt instruction does not sufficiently inform the jury that it is bound to find the defendant not guilty if insufficient proof is submitted at trial, the courts have squarely rejected the argument. They reasoned that the word "conveys a sense of duty and obligation and could not be misunderstood by a jury." See State v. McCloud, 257 Kan. 1, 891 P.2d 324, 335 (Kan. 1995); see also Tyson v. State, 217 Ga. App. 428, 457 S.E.2d 690, 691-92 (Ga. Ct. App. 1995) (finding argument that "should" is directional but not instructional to be without merit); Commonwealth v. Hammond, 350 Pa. Super. 477, 504 A.2d 940, 941-42 (Pa. Super. Ct. 1986). Notably, courts interpreting the word "should" in other types of jury instructions [\*\*16] have also found that the word conveys to the jury a sense of duty or obligation and not discretion. In Little v. State, 261 Ark. 859, 554 S.W.2d 312, 324 (Ark. 1977), the Arkansas Supreme Court interpreted the word "should" in an instruction on circumstantial evidence as synonymous with the word "must" and rejected the defendant's argument that the jury may have been misled by the court's use of the word in the instruction. Similarly, the Missouri Supreme Court rejected a defendant's argument that the court erred by not using the word "should" in an instruction on witness credibility which used the word "must" because the two words have the same meaning. State v. Rack, 318 S.W.2d 211, 215 (Mo. 1958). [\*318] In applying a child support statute, the Arizona Court of Appeals concluded that a legislature's or commission's use of the word "should" is meant to convey duty or obligation. McNutt v. McNutt, 203 Ariz. 28, 49 P.3d 300, 306 (Ariz. Ct. App. 2002) (finding a statute stating that child support expenditures "should" be allocated for the purpose of parents' federal tax exemption to be mandatory).

## solves stability

**Only reforms solve stability.**

Vyas and Muñoz, 13 Kejal and Sara, Wall Street Journal, 5/16/13, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887323582904578487460103629982.html, “Caracas Offers Peace to Private Sector,” ADM

The outreach is explained by the deep economic and social problems left behind by Mr. Chávez, who died in March after a nearly two-year cancer battle. Despite years of high oil prices, Venezuela is plagued by shortages, high inflation and weak domestic production after years of nationalizations. The country relies on imports for three-quarters of what it consumes. "Businesses used to meet with people in the government who didn't have power to make decisions of any kind, but now they are meeting in the [president's] office," said Ismael Perez, executive president of the Venezuelan Confederation of Industries, or Conindustria. "It's evident that the government at high levels must have realized that the private sector cannot be shunned in this issue of supplying the country. There are no other alternatives." The government, which is the sole body allowed by law to import raw food materials, promised to deliver all the corn and rice that Polar needs to maintain output, Mr. Mendoza said. "I'm fully confident, with the meetings…of settling the issues through dialogue, mutual respect and exchanging ideas for the benefit of the people," Mr. Mendoza said in comments carried on state television. Some analysts cautioned that the government had to build a bridge with Polar to stem the food crisis, but could remain frosty toward other private enterprises. But there are signs of progress. Finance Minister Nelson Merentes has held meetings with a host of business leaders, including officials from the local unit of Spain's Telefonica SA, TEF.MC +0.60% to discuss currency problems. Improving the economy will be a critical task for Mr. Maduro, who nearly lost April's presidential election despite a huge advantage in resources over the opposition. He has a far weaker mandate than Mr. Chávez and faces an emboldened opposition, which alleges the vote was rigged. Officials are carrying out a partial audit of the election, but have so far refused opposition demands for a more complete recount. Opposition leader Henrique Capriles is threatening to take his demands for a do-over to international tribunals. A monthly central-bank report released last week showed the scarcity index, a measure of products missing from supermarkets, surged to its highest level since at least 2009, reaching 21.3% in April from 20% in March. Even toilet paper has become hard to find. Government officials said this week they plan to immediately import food and 50 million rolls of toilet paper to keep up supplies. Economists say shortages stem from the price caps, as well as state policies that limit access to dollars needed to import raw materials.

**Neoliberal ideology is mutually exclusive with any alternative**

**Wise, Ph.D. in social sciences, 10**—\*Raul Delgado Wise, doctorate in social sciences from the University of Pennsylvania \*\*Humberto Marquez Covarrubias, PhD in Development Studies from the Autonomous University of Zacatecas \*\*\*Rubén Puentes, Executive Director of Development Studies at the Autonomous University of Zacatecas (October 2010, “Reframing the debate on migration, development and human rights: fundamental elements,” http://rimd.reduaz.mx/documentos\_miembros/ReframingtheDebate.pdf, RBatra)

The official discourse of neoliberal globalization rests on the ideology of the free market, the end of history, representative democracy and, more recently, the war on terrorism. In practice, however, **it promotes the interests of large corporations and a single, exclusive mode of thought, nullifying all alternatives.**

While the prevalent discourse exalts the notion of citizenship and citizen rights and opportunities in a democracy with an open economy and full political participation, the latter is constrained to a limited electoral offer and often curtailed by an exclusionary political system. At the same time, fundamental human rights are systematically undermined and subverted by the doctrine of national security and the demands of a market economy at the service of multinational corporate interests, **which turns the vast majority of the population into cheap means of production and objects of consumption**. In addition, the so-called welfare state has been dismantled under the sway of mercantilism, and the satisfaction of most basic needs is conditioned by the market, where communal goods and public services are offered as new spaces for privatization. Labor flexibility, sustained by a massive workforce surplus and the systematic deprivation of labor rights, becomes a mechanism through which to increase business competitiveness and extraordinary profits. All of this, in turn, seriously undermines the social, economic, political and environmental fabric, leading to considerable damage. The advancement of structural reform in peripheral countries has led to increasing social debt, a fact that remains unacknowledged by governments and the entrenched powers.

## Say no

#### Their aff is solved by oil and US engagement in Venezuela is rejected – here’s their only unique solvency advocate in context.

Lilley 13- Sandra Lilley graduated from Brown University with a PhD, 03/06/13, “Friend or Foe? Venezuela – US relations up in the air” [http://nbclatino.com/2013/03/06/friend-or-foe-venezuela-us-relations-up-in-the-air/)//DR](http://nbclatino.com/2013/03/06/friend-or-foe-venezuela-us-relations-up-in-the-air/%29//DR). H

There was no love lost between Venezuelan President Hugo Chávez’ administration and the U.S., and as of now Chavez’ successor is following the same playbook. Vice President Nicolás Maduro already expelled two American officials and alleged the U.S. might have had something to do with Chávez cancer. Today Senior State Department officials said they were “disappointed” by Maduro’s actions and called some of his statements “outrageous”. As the U.S. reviews next steps, it does plan to send a delegation to Chávez’ memorial service, and officials say they want to find a “space” to work things out.

The U.S. and Venezuela have not had Ambassadors in two years. Despite this, the U.S. has had a long relationship with Venezuela, explains Shannon O’Neil, Senior Fellow for Latin America Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations.

“What has been interesting is that for all the rhetorical animosity over the last decade, the oil flows have continued,” says O’Neil. ”For Venezuela, the U.S. is still the most important export market; we’re 40 percent of their exports, and the relationship will continue,” she adds.

Regarding Maduro’s recent comments, University of Illinois Urbana-Champlain political scientist Damaris Canache says this is part of the Venezuelan Vice President’s campaign for the presidency. “Maduro needs to continue keeping his base of support united,” Canache says. It would be too costly politically for Maduro to engage in improving U.S. relations now. ”That will have to wait until after the elections,” says Canache.

So the question is, how does the U.S. begin to form relations with the new government? U.S. officials say the most important thing moving forward is that elections, expected in 30 days, are fair and democratic. Democratic Senator Robert Menendez, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations committee, said Chávez’ passing has left a political void, “that we hope will be filled peacefully and through a constitutional and democratic process, grounded in the Venezuelan constitution and adhering to the Inter-American Democratic Charter.”

But as Venezuela gears up for elections in the next few weeks, the U.S. is better off standing back a bit, according to O’Neil. ”There is not a lot the U.S. can do actively that would not be counterproductive,” she says. Neighboring countries like Colombia and Brazil, who have a big stake in the stability of Venezuela, could encourage free and fair elections in a way which might be more difficult for the U.S., O’Neil explains.

Republican Senator Marco Rubio said the U.S. should keep a “watchful eye” on the security situation in Venezuela. State Department officials, however, said they have no reason to think there are any security threats to American personnel and the mourning in the country has been quiet and peaceful.

#### 2. Snowden

Sanchez ’13 - W. Alex Sanchez, Research Fellow, Council on Hemispheric Affairs – “Asylum for Snowden? Why are Venezuela, Nicaragua, others in Latin America doing this?” – Matisak Blog – July 7th – http://matisak.wordpress.com/2013/07/07/asylum-for-snowden-why-are-venezuela-nicaragua-others-in-latin-america-doing-this/

It wouldn’t be outrageous to assume that if Venezuela or Nicaragua accept Snowden, Washington may want to apply soft power/soft pressure as some kind of “punishment,” this may mean calling back ambassadors and diplomatic staff (though at this point I’m amazed there are any U.S. diplomats in Venezuela after the Chavez era), expelling diplomatic staff from these nations from the U.S., or maybe Washington could cancel some trade deals or impose some kind of trade embargo. For example Ecuador withdrew from the ATPDEA treaty at the same time that it was considering to accept Snowden. But that treaty was going to expire soon anyways and it seemed unlikely that the U.S. would want to renew it (especially if the Quito had accepted Snowden). When it comes to Venezuela, it seems clear that Maduro has little interest in strengthening trade or diplomatic relations with the U.S., so any kind of “punishment” from Washington. With that said, I am slightly surprised about Nicaragua. Certainly, Ortega was no friend of the U.S. during the Cold War, but modern-day Nicaragua-U.S. relations are not particularly bad, or as bad as U.S.-Venezuela relations at least. Recently, SOUTHCOM donated parachutes and some other military equipment to Nicaragua’s special forces (this happened in late June), so some military cooperation between the two governments does exist. I think Nicaragua potentially stands to lose a lot if Snowden does touch Nicaraguan soil, as compared if the American ends up in Venezuela.

#### 3. Samantha Power

NYT 7/20 – New York Times, (July 20, 2013, “Venezuela Stops Efforts to Improve U.S. Relations”, http://www.nytimes.com/2013/07/21/world/americas/venezuela-stops-efforts-to-improve-us-relations.html?\_r=1&)//HH

CARACAS, Venezuela — Venezuela announced late Friday that it was stopping the latest round of off-again-on-again efforts to improve relations with the United States in reaction to comments by the Obama administration’s nominee for United Nations ambassador.

The nominee, Samantha Power, speaking before a Senate committee on Wednesday, said part of her role as ambassador would be to challenge a “crackdown on civil society” in several countries, including Venezuela. President Nicolás Maduro had already lashed out on Thursday at Ms. Power for her remarks, and late on Friday the Foreign Ministry said it was terminating efforts to improve relations with the United States.

#### 4. **Military** aggression

**FNA 8/25** – Iran’s leading independent news agency, quotes Maduro, (Farsnews Agency, August 25, 2013, “Venezuela Blasts US Threats Against Syria”, http://english.farsnews.com/newstext.aspx?nn=13920603000933

"We condemn the campaign hatched against Syria which aims to justify the aggression on Syria and the threats against the Syrian people," Maduro told the Venezuelan TV.

The Venezuelan President expressed strong opposition to the threats of war against Syria, Egypt, and other Muslim nations in the Middle East, and said there is information about a scenario that is being prepared to justify the aggression on Syria.

#### 5. Assassination attempts

Fox News Latino 8/27 – quotes Maduro, (August 27, 2013, “Venezuela's Maduro Demands U.S. Answer To Alleged Assassination Plot”, http://latino.foxnews.com/latino/news/2013/08/27/venezuela-maduro-demands-us-answer-to-assassination-attempt/)//HH

Venezuelan President Nicolás Maduro lashed out at neighboring Colombia, far-right Venezuelans in Miami and his U.S. counterpart Barack Obama in the wake of an alleged assassination attempt on him.

Authorities in Venezuela arrested two foreign nationals who planned to assassinate Maduro in a plot involving former Colombian head of state Alvaro Uribe. Colombian citizens Victor Gueche, 18, and Erik Huertas, 18, were nabbed last Thursday near Caracas carrying rifles "with laser sights," Venezuela's interior minister, Gen. Miguel Angel Rodriguez, told reporters.

Also found were munitions and a photo of Maduro posing with the speaker of the Venezuelan National Assembly, Diosdado Cabello.

Maduro blasted Obama, claiming that the purported plot was either hatched in the U.S. or involved anti-Chavista Venezuelans residing in places like south Florida. Like his ideological mentor and predecessor, Hugo Chávez, Maduro is a fierce critic of U.S. policy in Latin America.

“Is President Obama so weak that decisions are made for him in the United States to kill a Latin American head of state without his knowing it?” Maduro said, according to news agency Agence France Presse..

#### 6. No tolerance

Bercovitch 7/23 – Staff writer for Carcaras, (July 23, 2013, “Venezuela: 'Zero tolerance to gringo aggression' — Maduro ends US talks - See more at: http://www.greenleft.org.au/node/54582#sthash.mKb7dYY8.dpuf”, http://www.greenleft.org.au/node/54582)//HH

The conversations started in June between Venezuela and the United States have definitively ended, Venezuelan President Nicolas Maduro announced on July 20 at an event of the Strategic Regions of Integral Defense (REDI) in Cojedes state.

“My policy is zero tolerance to gringo aggression against Venezuela,” Maduro said. “I'm not going to accept any aggression, whether it be verbal, political, or diplomatic.

“Enough is enough. Stay over there with your empire, don't involve yourselves anymore in Venezuela.”

#### 7. Public statements

BBC News ’13 – Quotes Maduro, “Venezuela 'ends' bid to restore full US ties” – July 20th – http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-latin-america-23387807

Venezuela says it has "ended" steps towards restoring diplomatic ties with the US, after comments by the woman nominated as the next envoy to the UN.¶ Samantha Power said this week she would seek to combat what she called the "crackdown on civil society" in countries including Venezuela.¶ She was speaking at a US Senate confirmation hearing on Wednesday.¶ The remarks prompted an angry response from Venezuela's President Nicolas Maduro.¶ "The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela hereby ends the process... of finally normalising our diplomatic relations," said Venezuela's foreign ministry in a statement.¶ It objected to Ms Power's "interventionist agenda", noting that her "disrespectful opinions" were later endorsed by the state department, "contradicting in tone and in content" earlier statements by Secretary of State John Kerry.
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## 2nc disad overview (:50)

#### Disad outweighs –

#### 1. Quickest impact – the perception of US enchroaching upon Russia’s IT business ties causes investors in Russia’s economy to freak out and invest elsewhere – that results in economic decline.

#### 2. Largest impact – Russian economic decline triggers a mass refugee crisis, escalating up to all members of the Eastern-European trading regime – global involvement becomes inevitable, oppressive regime collapse would enable loose nukes, which is comparatively the greatest existential threat to the US –

#### 3. Solves the aff.

Avram 12 – Cristina, staff writer for the World Reporter and Geopolitics.ro (“Russia and Latin America: Geopolitical Considerations”, The World Reporter, 26 January 2012, http://www.theworldreporter.com/2012/01/russia-and-latin-america-geopolitical.html#.UeFsuNI3tsl)

Venezuela is the key element in the Russian-Latin-American game. The parallel anti-american positions of Russia and Venezuela are already known: Russia out of interest and willingness to become a respected power like USSR used to be, Venezuela by Chavez's ideology and willingness to impose himself as a lider in his country as well throughout the South-American continent. For the anti-imperialist sentiment is growing rapidly in an over-exploited Latin-America by the 'yankee' 's interests for so long. Caracas is a reliable ally for Moscow in the new energy cold war that is foreshadowing. First producer of gas from South America and fifth worldwide producer of oil, Venezuela incites the Russian gas and oil appetite. In November of 2008, Russian companies Lukoil and Gazprom signed an agreement with the PDVSA oil group which was targeting the exploitation of oil in Orinoco, a river located in the East of the country, hoping to produce more than 1 million barrels per day. If this project materializes, we'll be talking about the most powerfull alliance in the world of oil. Far from being limited to hydrocarbons, Russian strategy in Venezuela is making profit from Venezuela's chavist government military ambitions. Between 2005 and 2007 Caracas signed with Moscow 12 contracts for arms worth 4.4 billion dollars, buying 24 Sukhoi fighter jets, 50 fighter helicopters and 100,000 Kalachnicov rifles. In 2010 Caracas obtained from Moscow a loan of $ 2.2 million to buy T-72 tanks and an undisclosed number of S-300 air-defense bombs, in 2011 negociating a new agreement with Russia to get a $ 4 billion loan, half of which is destined to equip and modernize the armed forces. Also, with Chavez's visit to Moscow in 2010, relations with Russia have been strengthened, Russian President saying that Russia may sell equipment and machinery to Venezuela, and Venezuela might sell agricultural products to Russia. Medvedev claimed that Russia is ready to take part in various regional organizations and Latin American forums which requires a joint task approach such as terrorism, transnational crime, drug trafficking, environmental issues, sustainable development and economic aid. Furthermore, Medvedev considers that Venezuela 'has acted like a true friend' when it followed Russia and recognized former Georgian republics South Ossetia and Abkhazia at the last visit Chavez had made to Moscow in 2009. In the civil nuclear area, Russians and Venezuelans have signed a bilateral agreement on controlled thermonuclear synthesis and safety of nuclear installations and radiation sources. The nuclear cooperation is also accompanied by a military cooperation. On September 10, 2008, two Russian bombers capable of carrying nuclear bombs landed at Palo Negro in Venezuela to participate in joint manuevers with Hugo Chavez's Bolivarian armed forces. In December 2008, a similar training of naval forces of the two countries, called "VenRus", took place in the Caribbean. These military exercises employed 2,300 people of the Russian and Venezuelan fleet, 3 frigates, an amphibious vehicle and 8 patrol vessels. This strategic cooperation serves Moscow's interests who wants to propose an alternative to the American presence in the region. In fact, the geopolitical situation between these two countries illustrates how the relationship between Russia and Latin America becomes more important day by day, not only because of the weapons sold in the region, but also because of the diplomatic resources that Moscow had used in South America. The continously cold relationship between Venezuela and the U.S. in addition to Washington's controversial relationship with Moscow will contribute further to the substantial strengthening of military and diplomatic ties between Russia and Venezuela. This possibility can't make U.S. happy. The new situation facing Washington is that Russia will be a growing factor when it comes to leftist governments in the region, who want autonomy from U.S. policy makers, and which Washington considers dangerous, but that Moscow considers to be very good.

## turns heg

#### Russian instability will shift the balance of power away from the US towards China—this terminally jacks hegemony.

Zeyno **Baran et al**, Summer **2007**. Senior Fellow and Director Center for Eurasian Studies, Hudson Institute. “U.S. – RUSSIAN RELATIONS : IS CONFLICT INEVITABLE?” Hudson Institute Symposium on US-Russian Relations, www.hudson.org/files/pdf\_upload/Russia-Web%20(2).pdf.

The West needs a stable Russia in order to maintain the global balance of power against China. In the event of Russia’s disintegration, her resources will go to China, not the West. The West cannot stop Russia’s slide into a systemic cri- sis, and can only help get out of it once it has begun. This is a challenge for the future. Currently, the West needs a “Cold War” only with Russia’s new masters, not with the Russian people. Russians are protesting against the politics of the Russian bureaucracy, and their protest should not be re-directed at the bureaucracy’s strategic partners in the West. If the West understands and accepts this, it needs to learn to acknowledge Russians’ rights to patriotism and to a normal level of freedom—not as a religious symbol, but as the only path to prosperity and justice. Russian “democrats” and “liberals” have forgotten these demands and rights, and therefore the terms “dem - o crat” and “liberal” are cursed in Russia. Official propa- ganda uses this to divert Russian citizens from asserting their interests and rights to fighting the West. The West needs to explain to Russia that these rights have been destroyed not by rivalry with the West, but solely by the avarice of the new Russian leaders. It is true that in the future, the issue of global competition will arise. Currently, however, there is only one key prob- lem—corruption (including, of course, corruption in the interests of the West) and a lack of bureaucratic integrity. After Russia experiences a systemic crisis the West must be able to say to Russians; “You see? We are for democracy, but not for “democrats,” for law, but not for lawyers, for prosperity, but not for prospering oligarchs.” All of these are things that the West could not say after the 1990s. Russia will be useful to the West if the West can side with Russia against China and global Islam in foreign policy and with the Russian people against the Russian bureaucracy in domestic policy. If the West attempts to transform Russia according to its own conceptualization of the correct societal order, or simply to seize Russian raw materials, intellect, and money, it will destroy Russia and pay dearly for the rela- tively small gain. **As a consequence** of doing so, **the West will experience large-scale, global systemic problems**.

## turns prolif

**Economic collapse kills nuclear security spurring proliferation**

**The Antiatom**, антиатом, Russian newspaper, December 23, **2008** “ RUSSIAN ECONOMIC CRISIS MAY LEAD TO NUCLEAR ACCIDENTS AND ADVANCE ILLEGAL NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION,” <http://antiatom.ru/en/node/644>

The nuclear industry in Russia is being negatively affected by the country's economic crisis; and the situation is expected to to worsen in 2009. This is according to a recently released annual report by the states nuclear regulatory body. Ongoing job cuts at nuclear facilities include the personnel directly responsible for safety control. Activists call on the Russian government to quickly adopt a plan to insure public safety and nuclear security. Antiatom.ru (Moscow, December 23, 2008 - The deteriorating social and economic situation in Russia is likely to result in significant drop of nuclear safety' level at many nuclear facilities. Some nuclear facilities have already seen jobs cut because of reduced national income due to declining oil prices and the global recession. It is possible that further cut jobs in Russians and may bring back the nuclear proliferation problems related to illegal trade of radioactive materials. These radioactive materials can be used for building a "dirty bomb". According to governmental report, obtained by Ecodefense, staff cuts have been underway since 2007. According to the recently released annual report written by the Russian nuclear regulator, Rostekhnadzor, there have been "job cuts at facilities responsible for nuclear-fuel cycle of personnel responsible for safety control and maintenance". The report also criticises nuclear facilities management for "not paying enough attention to ensuring nuclear safety". In a disturbing criticism of iteself, Rostekhnadzor reports that it doesn't have enough safety inspectors to do it's own job properly.

## turns trade

#### US growth is irrelevant to Russian but Russian growth is key to US.

**Gilman 08** Martin, 1/16/2008. Former senior representative of the IMF in Russia and professor at the Higher School of Economics in Moscow. “Well-Placed to Weather an Economic Storm,” Moscow Times, <http://www.moscowtimes.ru/stories/2008/01/16/008.html>.

Faced with this gloomy global outlook, Russia is well placed to weather the storm. In fact, not only is the Russian economy **likely to decouple largely from a sagging U**nited **S**tates and even Europe, but its continuing boom -- mostly but not solely fueled by high energy revenues -- is sucking in both consumer and investment goods, and so **acting as a motor of world growth**. And the planned $1 trillion public investment program over the next decade should ensure that the country remains decoupled for years to come.

## turns environ

**Econ decline turns clean tech and global warming**

**Richard 8** (Michael Graham, Environmental Activist and Contributor @ HuffPost, "4 Reasons Why Recession is BAD for the Environment," http://www.huffingtonpost.com/michael-graham-richard/4-reasons-why-recession-i\_b\_133564.html)

As a counter-point to Lloyd's tongue-in-cheek post about 10 Ways the Recession Can Help the Environment, here are some eco-reasons why we should wish a speedy recovery (we won't get into non-green reasons here): Firstly, when squeezed, companies will reduce their investments into research & development and green programs. These are usually not short-term profit centers, so that is what's axed first. Some progress has been made in the past few years, it would be sad to lose ground now. Secondly, average people, when money is tight, will look for less expensive products (duh). Right now, that usually means that greener products won't make it. Maybe someday if we start taxing "bads" instead of "goods" (pollution, carbon, toxins instead of labor, income, capital gains) the least expensive products will also be the greenest, but right now that's not the case. Thirdly, there's less money going into the stock markets and bank loans are harder to get, which means that many small firms and startups working on the breakthrough green technologies of tomorrow can have trouble getting funds or can even go bankrupt, especially if their clients or backers decide to make cuts. Fourthly, during economic crises, voters want the government to appear to be doing something about the economy (even if it's government that screwed things up in the first place). They'll accept all kinds of measures and laws, including those that aren't good for the environment. Massive corn subsidies anyone? **Don't even think about progress on global warming**...

# relations

**Enviro satellites have a history of failure and politicians don’t want to fund**

**Parthemore and Rogers 8-1-11**, Christine Parthemore and Will Rogers, Christine Parthemore is a Adjunct Professor in Johns Hopkins University's Global Security Studies Program and Fellow at the Center for a New American Security (CNAS), serves on the Council of Advisors for U-Mass Boston's Collaborative Institute for Oceans, Climate and Security. Will Rogers is a Research Associate and the Joseph S. Nye, Jr. Internship Coordinator at the Center for a New American Security (CNAS). “ BLINDED: THE DECLINE OF U.S. EARTH MONITORING CAPABILITIES AND ITS CONSEQUENCES FOR NATIONAL SECURITY” Center for a New American Security http://www.cnas.org/files/documents/publications/CNAS\_Blinded\_ParthemoreRogers\_0.pdf NEH)

Recent technical failures have made the challenges stemming from the gaps in U.S. satellite capabilities even more acute. In 2009, NASA’s Orbiting Carbon Observatory, a satellite designed to map global carbon dioxide levels, crashed into the Pacific Ocean after a protective shroud failed to separate from the rocket, adding extra weight that prevented the satellite from reaching orbit. 12 In March 2011, a similar failure of a protective nose cone caused NASA’s Glory satellite – intended to study the effects of black carbon soot and other atmospheric aerosols – to crash into the Pacific Ocean as well. 13 Additional challenges Four issues compound the challenges posed by the looming gaps in U.S. satellite capabilities. Budget constraints, ineffective communications, inadequate interpretation of data and over-reliance on the Global Earth Observation System of Systems (GEOSS) program all make it harder to generate and analyze the information on which U.S. national security and foreign policy practitioners increasingly rely. budgeT coNSTrAiNTS Budget constraints are likely to continue to severely limit U.S. investments in new satellites and other capabilities, according to government officials in a range of agencies. Funding may become the critical constraint on future earth monitoring capabilities.

**ITAR blocks image sharing and cooperation**

**Wigbels et. al, 8** – (July 2008, Lyn Wigbels, senior associate of Technology and Public Policy program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, G. Ryan Faith, CSIS Human Space Exploration Initiative, Vincent Sabathier, senior associate with the CSIS Technology and Public Policy Program, Center for Strategic Studies, “Earth Observations and Global Change,” Sawyer)

Export control regulations are a fundamental disincentive and significant structural impediment to U.S. participation in international systems, to foreign cooperation with the United States, and to the development of GEOSS. Since Earth observations can involve airborne, oceanic, and ground observation and are not limited only to space systems, the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR) legislation does not automatically come into play in every discussion of U.S. cooperation in GEOSS. However, ITAR can make it difficult to even initiate discussions on potential collaboration in many fruitful and obvious areas. ITAR has created real and perceived obstacles to engagement and cooperation. Although ITAR was intended to cover critical, highly sensitive military technologies, in practice the regulations are applied to a much, much wider array of other technologies. In addition, as individuals in the approval process are criminally liable equally for real and perceived mistakes, decisionmakers have a strong incentive to be excessively cautious. Furthermore, ITAR is now being applied to data from space systems, not just the space systems themselves. This has led to a situation where ITAR has forced the international community to develop their own independent capabilities (for example, radar ocean altimetry and Lidar/IMU). As a result, the international community now leads in several technologies, and U.S. firms are losing access to global markets and in some cases have lost the ability to produce such technologies altogether.

**Agency disputes derails solvency**

**Wigbels et. al, 8** – (July 2008, Lyn Wigbels, senior associate of Technology and Public Policy program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, G. Ryan Faith, CSIS Human Space Exploration Initiative, Vincent Sabathier, senior associate with the CSIS Technology and Public Policy Program, Center for Strategic Studies, “Earth Observations and Global Change,” Sawyer)

Though these efforts are a laudable attempt to address the dispersion of responsibility for Earth observations in the U.S. government, there are questions about whether they are enough to address the looming gaps in Earth observation coverage, current and future investments needed for Earth observation systems, and the lack of planning for future Earth observation systems. USGEO is a coordinating body that has three cochairs, has no budgetary authority for Earth observations and cannot compel federal agencies to take any actions with respect to budgeting for Earth observation capabilities or implementing a national Earth observation plan. USGEO also cannot compel governmental agencies to work together to more effectively transition research capabilities to a system that acquires data consistently over the long term. This arrangement limits the support for a robust, holistic national Earth observation program to meet the nation’s needs and a national budget sufficient to implement it.

**Tech restrictions blocks development**

**Glackin, 2k** – senior staff member at The Aerospace Corporation, private consultant in remote sensing techniques and commercialization (December 2000, David L., American Institute of Physics, “Space-Based Earth Sensing,” The Industrial Physicist, pgs. 22-25, http://www.aip.org/tip/INPHFA/vol-6/iss-6/p22.pdf, Sawyer)

The final difficulty is the tightening of restrictions on the transfer of technology from the United States to other countries. Some nations have asked U.S. firms for turnkey remote-sensing satellite systems, but the companies were unable to obtain the necessary federal licenses. As a result, foreign countries are starting to look dubiously on bids from U.S. firm.

**Satellites read the data wrong**

**Markowitz, 2** – President of EarthPace LLC. Director of Law and Technology Program, Center for International Environmental Law (Spring 2002, Kenneth J., Duke Environmental Law and Policy Forum, “Legal Challenges and Market Rewards to the use and Acceptance of Remote Sensing and Digital Information as Evidence,” Vol. 12, Issue 219, http://www.epa.gov/esd/gqc/pdf/evidence.pdf, Sawyer)

Section I revealed the potential satellite remote sensing and GIS technologies hold in legally mandated decisions regarding the environment. This section details the technical processes that move information from raw data to a usable product, and highlights the potential for error in each of these processes. As the information is passed through the information chain, it may be lost, distorted, or mishandled, thereby increasing the likelihood that a court will exclude it from evidence in a legal proceeding. A. Satellite Data Error Remote sensing information flow is a complex process involving five phases: (1) pre-launch calibration, (2) data ingest (collection), (3) digital image processing, (4) storage and archiving, and (5) retrieval and application.85 Satellite data must be transformed from newly-collected petabytes of binary code, to calibrated data occupying terabytes of storage area, to gigabytes that are usable for modeling and observational systems, to megabytes that can be used in daily applica-tions.86 Potential for error exists in all of these transformations, but NASA and other satellite developers are continually creating and improving calibration tools to reduce amount of potential error. For most satellites, data handbooks exist that detail collection and calibration procedures.

**The international system is solving the aff now: either the aff is not inherent or the counterplan solves it**

**IAF 10,** International Astronautical Federation: The IAF gathered experts from the science,

engineering, geo-information, decision support, and policy-making communities “ Space Sensors for Climate Monitoring” 3-25-10, http://www.iafastro.org/docs/2010/2010\_GEOSS.pdf NEH)

Our ability to view the Earth from space has transformed our view and understanding of our planet. Space technologies, from communications to navigation to remote sensing, have greatly improved life here on Earth. Earth observations from space have given governments and the private sector the ability to understand and make predictions of climate change which in turn is essential to be able to adapt to, mitigate, and minimize the impact of these changes. The importance of Earth observations to understanding climate change is acknowledged by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). IPCC was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in October 2007 for its “efforts to build up and disseminate greater knowledge about man-made climate change, and to lay the foundations for the measures needed to counteract such change.” Earlier in 2007, the IPCC concluded that major advances in climate modeling and collection and analysis of data, including space-based monitoring, had given scientists “very high confidence” 3 (representing a 9 out of 10 chance of being correct) in their understanding of how the climate is changing and “considerably narrowed the uncertainties” of the previous report released in 2001. The ability to characterize climate change is enabled by following the trends of global observations of a comprehensive set of multiple variables sustained over an appropriate period. Space-based sensors have the capacity to provide measurements of essential variables, and comprehensive monitoring is enabled by collaboration among nations around the globe. Currently, Earth observation spacecraft from space-faring nations carry science instruments capable of measuring a range of climate variables, including temperatures of the land and oceans, atmospheric trace gases, gravity, ice extent, and solar irradiance. These space-based monitoring systems developed and operated by NASA, NOAA, ESA, EUMETSAT, JAXA and other space and meteorological agencies augment ground systems in terms of coverage, frequency, and density of measurements, especially over unpopulated areas, like oceans. These climate observations are establishing a global database of empirical data to monitor long-term trends of key environmental conditions. Climate models using data from Earth observation systems are being developed and used to run projections for future scenarios. **Standardized data sets are enabling interoperability with climate models and support tools that are currently being used by governments and the private sector for informed policy and management decision-making**. Climate monitoring is a global enterprise. The global science community has identified a set of “essential climate variables” that can be monitored from space-based sensors. The global Earth observation satellite community **is conducting an assessment of the sensors, both current and planned,** that can make these measurements. The global intergovernmental community is coordinating an end-to-end approach to collecting and applying the data from the sensors to achieve societal benefits. Global humanitarian organizations are linking their decision tools to the information from climate models and sensor data to enhance lives, ecosystems, and sustainability.

# trade

**prolif**

**Proliferation spreads at glacial pace**

**A. Numbers -** in the last 64 years we've gone from a max 12 nuclear states to the current 9

**B. Costs and controversy -** it deters most countries and only a few even attempt to proliferate – Even if they win one or two states proliferate it won't be disastrous because the associated tendencies are mellow – that’s Tepperman

**And, this means they have no impact**

**A. Exaggerations - their authors look for the worst to validate their claims, this means their impact cards are apocalyptic nonsense**

**Potter 08 –** [William C. andMukhatzhanova Gaukhar**, \*** Sam Nunn and Richard Lugar Professor of Nonproliferation Studies and Director of the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies at the Monterey Institute of International Studies and \*\* Research Associate at the James Martin Center, **“**Divining Nuclear Intentions: a review essay.” International Security, Vol. 33, No. 1 (Summer 2008), pp. 139–169, Google scholar]

For much of the nuclear age, academic experts, intelligence analysts, and public commentators periodically have forecast rapid bursts of proliferation, which have **failed to materialize**. Central to their prognoses, often imbued with the imagery and metaphors of nuclear dominoes and proliferation chains, has been the assumption that one state’s nuclearization is likely to trigger decisions by other states to “go nuclear” in quick succession. Today the proliferation metaphors of choice are “nuclear cascade” and “tipping point,” but the implication is the same—we are on the cusp of rapid, large-scale nuclear weapons spread. It is with some justification, therefore, that the study of proliferation has been labeled “the sky-is-still-falling profession.”1 Although proliferation projections abound, few of them are founded on, or even informed by, empirical research and theory.2 This deficiency, though regrettable, is understandable given the small body of theoretically or empirically grounded research on forecasting proliferation developments, and the underdeveloped state of theory on nonproliferation and nuclear decisionmaking more generally. Also contributing to this knowledge deficit is the stunted development of social science research on foreign policy–oriented forecasting and the emphasis on post hoc explanations, rather than predictions on the part of the more sophisticated frameworks and models of nuclear decisionmaking.

**B. Empirics – numerous examples proves them wrong**

**1. Sweden -** they were thought to produce its first nuclear weapon in 1961 - they didn't

**2. Japan -** we thought they were going to acquire them some time during the 60's - they didn't

**3. India -** in 1974, their acquisition or nuclear arms was thought to destroy the NPT and cause a domino proliferation effect - neither of those happened

**4. The 1976 monograph -** It predicted 15 scenarios for massive nuclear spread based on 1 state's acquisition – they were 0 for 15 – that’s Potter

**C. Physicals constraints**

**Karl, 1998**

[David, president of the Asia Strategy Initiative, a consultancy based in Los Angeles, and a lecturer in international relations at the University of Southern California, “Prolif Pessimism and Emerging Nuclear Powers” JSTOR]

The shortage of critical resources and capabilities faced by emerging nuclear powers are, in the abstract, a bane for crisis stability, but in practice they may tend to operate as blessings in disguise. While constraints limit arsenal size and thus in theory create inviting targets for offensive action, they also restrict the number of weapons available for use in counterforce attacks. Unless counter-force attacks are executed with improbable accuracy and effectiveness-all the more improbable in view of the rudimentary intelligence capabilities possessed by new proliferators-they are impossible using the sparse arsenals that emerging nuclear states are likely to deploy against each other.64 The paucity of resources may also force reliance on aircraft as delivery vehicles, against which reasonably good defenses could be affected, and may limit the number and sophistication of ballistic missiles that are fielded.6

**Even with “irrational” regimes – prolif is slow and stable**

**Barnett, 2009**

[5/14/09, Thomas Barnett, B.A. in International Relations and Russian Literature, University of Wisconsin, 1984, A.M. in Soviet Union Program, Harvard University, 1986, Ph.D. in Political Science, Harvard University, Esquire Magazine, “Seven Reasons Why Obama's Nuke-Free Utopia Won't Work” http://www.esquire.com/the-side/war-room/obama-nuclear-proliferation-051409]

1. The "increasing speed" of proliferation is a myth. As far as a world filled with nuclear powers is concerned, we're just reaching double digits (as in, ten!) with North Korea and Iran. Meanwhile, roughly three-dozen additional states have achieved nuclear power while eschewing weaponization. Ah, but we are told that when "irrational" regimes reach for the Bomb, like Tehran's mullahs or Pyongyang's whacked-out Kims, we enter into a new, far more threatening era. And yet history remains clear on this subject: When nuclear monopolies are ended and existing rivalries are nuclearized, stability tends to break out —  **time and again**.

**Even if it’s fast - every state acts more cautiously with nuclear weapons, regardless of general concerns about their stability**

**Waltz, 2007**

[Kenneth, member of the faculty at Columbia University, one of the most prominent scholars of IR alive today, one of the founders of neorealism, or structural realism, in international relations theory, “A Nuclear Iran: Promoting Stability or Courting Disaster” Spring/Summer, http://iis-db.stanford.edu/pubs/21918/Sagan\_Nuclear\_Iran.pdf]

Second, it doesn’t matter who has nuclear weapons. Conversely the spread of conventional weapons makes a great deal of difference. For instance, if a Hitler-type begins to establish conventional superiority, it becomes very difficult to contain and deter him. But, with nuclear weapons, it’s been proven without exception that whoever gets nuclear weapons behaves with caution and moderation. Every country–whether they are countries we trust and think of as being highly responsible, like Britain, or countries that we distrust greatly, and for very good reasons, like China during the Cultural Revolution–behaves with such caution.

### iran strikes

**Iran is not a threat to American interests in Latin America – any claims of threats are racist and illegitimate**

**Fernandez 2013** – journalist and the secretary of the Muslim Federation of Spain [Yusuf, “Why Latin America will not bow to US pressure over Iran”, Jan 10, http://www.presstv.com/detail/2013/01/10/282761/waning-us-influence-in-latin-america//cc]

On 28 December, US President Barack Obama enacted the so-called Countering Iran in Western Hemisphere Act, which seeks to undermine Iran’s growing relations with Latin America, a region that has traditionally been seen by the United States as its backyard and sphere of influence.¶ The Act requires the US Department of State to develop a strategy within 180 days to “address Iran’s growing hostile presence and activity” in Latin America. The Act points out that “Iran’s business and diplomatic ties are a threat to US national security.” It is seen, however, as another anti-Iranian move fabricated by the Zionist lobby in the US. ¶ Shortly before, in July 2011, Robert F. Noriega - former Assistant Secretary of State for Western Hemisphere Affairs, former US ambassador to the Organization of American States (OAS) and the current Visiting Fellow at the American Enterprise Institute, one of the main neocon-controlled entities in the US - said in a hearing before the House Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence that Iran was carrying out “an offensive strategy” in Latin America. ¶ The Iranian presence in Latin America has been also harshly attacked by the pro-Israeli hawk Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Foreign Affairs Committee chairman and self-appointed bulwark against the alleged “Islamo-Boliviarian threat” to US security. She was co-star of a so-called “documentary” entitled “La amenaza irani” (‘The Iranian Threat’), in which she said, without blushing, that the US should attack Iran in order to “avert bomb explosions in various Latin American capitals.” The film was aired by Univision, a US broadcast network, which is owned by someone who has hosted galas in honour of the occupying Israeli army. ¶ In 2009, another ridiculous “documentary” released by Univision involved Venezuelan consul in Miami, Livia Acosta, in an absurd cyber-plot against the US, allegedly promoted by “Iranian diplomats and Mexican computer hackers.” This was the pretext used for expelling her from the United States in a move that was widely seen as an American political revenge for Venezuela’s independent foreign policy. ¶ Actually, the US Act rudely violates Latin American countries’ sovereignty and contains some stupid claims such as that the opening of Iranian embassies or cultural centers is akin to “spread terrorism.” Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta also echoed those views by claiming, in a recent visit to Colombia, that Iranian attempts to expand its influence in South America amounted to expanding terrorism. Of course, no real evidence has ever been shown to support that laughable allegation.¶ “The paranoid nature of these estimations, and the scant evidence presented for them, are eerily reminiscent of the kind of broad-strokes, hawkish fear-mongering on display in the lead-up to the war in Iraq. The testimony comes from a group bent on hyping security threats and, as Noriega admitted in the testimony, is not even in agreement with the State Department or intelligence agencies,” wrote expert John Glaser in a recent report. ¶ The US accusations against Iran are also a way of targeting and casting suspicion on Latin American Muslims. In the Act, Washington speaks of “isolating Iran and its allies” and US officials accuse Iran or other pro-Iranian forces of “establishing mosques or Islamic centers throughout the region” in order to advance violent jihad “on our doorstep.”

**No threat – Iran influence is declining in Latin America – elections prove**

**Inside of Iran, June 28, 2013** [“Iranian Influence In Latin America On the Wane, State Department Report Says”, [http://www.insideofiran.org/en/component/content/article/25-important-news/7525-iranian-influence-in-latin-america-on-the-wane-state-department-report-says.html//cc](http://www.insideofiran.org/en/component/content/article/25-important-news/7525-iranian-influence-in-latin-america-on-the-wane-state-department-report-says.html/cc)]

Fox News - Iran is not actively supporting terrorist groups in Latin America, the U.S. State Department acknowledged in a recent report – even though for years it has insisted the influence was growing.¶ The report, which said that the Islamic Republic’s influence in the region is still a “concern,” said that due to strong sanctions imposed on the country by both the United States and the European Union, Iran has been unable to expand its economic and political ties in Latin America.¶ “As a result of diplomatic outreach, strengthening of allies’ capacity, international nonproliferation efforts, a strong sanctions policy, and Iran’s poor management of its foreign relations, Iranian influence in Latin America and the Caribbean is waning,” the report stated, according to Bloomberg News.¶ While the State Department declined to comment on the report because it had not yet been sent to Congress, some Republican lawmakers said that it was too lax on Iran and downplayed the Middle Eastern nation’s threat in the U.S.’s perceived backyard.¶ “I believe the Administration has failed to consider the seriousness of Iran’s presence here at home,” said Congressman Jeff Duncan, a Republican from South Carolina who wrote the legislation requiring the State Department report, told Bloomberg. “I question the methodology that was used in developing this report.”¶ Under the presidency of Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, Iran had forged strong relationships with the left-leaning governments of Bolivian President Evo Morales and the late Venezuelan leader Hugo Chávez.¶ Current Venezuelan President Nicolas Maduro announced in late May that three surveillance drones built with Iran’s help were launched by the Venezuelan government as part of an initiative to curb drug trafficking.¶ The U.S. government and analysts throughout the region will be keeping a close eye on Iranian-Latin American relations in the coming in the wake of Iran’s presidential election two weeks ago.

### terror

#### No risk of nuclear terror.

**Chapman 12** (Stephen, editorial writer for Chicago Tribune, “CHAPMAN: Nuclear terrorism unlikely,” May 22, http://www.oaoa.com/articles/chapman-87719-nuclear-terrorism.html)

A layperson may figure it’s only a matter of time before the unimaginable comes to pass. Harvard’s Graham Allison, in his book “Nuclear Terrorism,” concludes, “On the current course, nuclear terrorism is inevitable.” But remember: After Sept. 11, 2001, we all thought more attacks were a certainty. Yet al-Qaida and its ideological kin have proved unable to mount a second strike. Given their inability to do something simple — say, shoot up a shopping mall or set off a truck bomb — it’s reasonable to ask whether they have a chance at something much more ambitious. Far from being plausible, argued Ohio State University professor John Mueller in a presentation at the University of Chicago, “**the likelihood that a terrorist group will come up with an atomic bomb seems** tobe vanishingly **small.” The events required** to make that happen **comprise a multitude of Herculean tasks**.First, **a terrorist** group **has to get** a bomb or **fissile material**, perhaps from Russia’s inventory of decommissioned warheads. **If that were easy, one would have already gone missing**. Besides, those devices are probably no longer a danger, since weapons that are not maintained quickly become what one expert calls “radioactive scrap metal.” If terrorists were able to steal a Pakistani bomb, they would still have to defeat the arming codes and other safeguards designed to prevent unauthorized use. As for Iran, no nuclear state has ever given a bomb to an ally — for reasons even the Iranians can grasp. Stealing some 100 pounds of bomb fuel would require help from rogue individuals inside some government who are prepared to jeopardize their own lives. **Then comes the task of building a bomb.** It’s not something you can gin up with spare parts and power tools in your garage. **It requires** millions of dollars, a safe haven and advanced equipment — plus people with **specialized skills**, lots of time and a willingness to die for the cause. Assuming the jihadists vault over those Himalayas, **they would have to deliver the weapon onto American soil.** Sure, drug smugglers bring in contraband all the time — but seeking their help would confront the plotters with possible exposure or extortion. **This**, like every other step in the entire process, **means expanding the circle of people who know what’s going on**, **multiplying the chance someone will blab, back out or screw up**. That has heartening implications. If al-Qaida embarks on the project, it has only a minuscule chance of seeing it bear fruit. **Given the** formidable **odds, it** probably **won’t bother**. None of this means we should stop trying to minimize the risk by securing nuclear stockpiles, monitoring terrorist communications and improving port screening. But it offers good reason to think that in this war, it appears, the worst eventuality is one that will never happen.

### heg

**We control uniqueness – the US has no influence now**

**Stowcroft 4/25 –** [Brent, the president and founder of the Scowcroft Group, served as national-security adviser to presidents Gerald Ford and George H. W. Bush, member of The National Interest’s Advisory Council, “A World in Transformation,” http://nationalinterest.org/article/world-transformation-6794?page=1]

Since the end of World War II, the United States has been the country that could take the lead in moving the world from drift to transition and perhaps even to a new global order. The shining example is the immediate post–World War II period. But **America is not** as **well positioned to do that now**. The 9/11 attacks were a watershed experience for us. They were a wake-up call that jolted us from the relative calm of the 1990s, when the country basked in the notion that it did not have to think much about foreign policy. Afterward, it became clear that we had to think a great deal about foreign policy. That led to an anomalous decade that has changed how we think about the world and altered our image in the world. Once, we were viewed as trying to do what was best for everybody; now, we are seen as being preoccupied with our own narrow interests. **We** have **appear**ed sometimes **to be seeking to dominate rather than** to **lead**. As a result, it is not as easy as it used to be to get nations to mobilize in the same direction. And **that retards our ability to navigate through this time of chaos and transition**.

**Defense cuts make heg unsustainable.**

**Kagan, 1-23-12**

[Robert, senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, “Grading Obama's Foreign Policy,” http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/01/23/grading\_obama\_s\_foreign\_policy?page=full]

The decision to allow deep cuts in defense spending -- rather than addressing entitlements -- is equally irresponsible. Here the Obama administration and Congress are both to blame. But the Obama team has compounded the problem by elaborating a budget-driven defense strategy that is not commensurate with American strategic goals and interests. It is ironic that Obama is adopting Donald Rumsfeld's defense strategy -- high tech, light footprint. We will find, as we did in the Bush years, the Clinton years, and in many previous decades, that drones and missiles can only go so far in preserving American interests. If not reversed, the deep cuts looming in defense will go a long way to undermining the U.S. position in the world. They will even undercut the Obama administration's efforts to make the United States a more reliable player in Asia, despite its unconvincing protestations to the contrary.

**Devastates our capacity to respond to threats and the defense industrial base.**

**Eaglen, 1-30-12**

[Michael, resident fellow at AEI, “A defense budget that erodes America’s military power,” http://www.aei.org/article/foreign-and-defense-policy/defense/a-defense-budget-that-erodes-americas-military-power/]

 This week, Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta provided a preview of the U.S. military’s budget for fiscal year 2013. A deluge of Pentagon jargon such as “reversibility,” “rebalance,” and “sustainment” masks the fundamental reality: this is a budget that will weaken the military. Despite Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Martin Dempsey’sprotestations to the contrary, this budget request is a clear pathway towards dismantling America’s military supremacy. The severe modernization cuts under this administration increase the likelihood that U.S. military capabilities will fall short of the nation’s wide-ranging security commitments. Current budget plans indicate the United States may relinquish its military superpower status—not to another nation per se, but by reverting to a position where it lacks the capacity to engage and maintain a forward presence globally. Economically, the president’s request lays off 100,000 active-duty soldiers and Marines. The budget also seeks a new round of U.S. base closings, retires crucial ships from the fleet, and delays the Joint Strike Fighter, by far the most important program to the health of the American defense industrial base and many small businesses around the country. At a time when President Obama is calling for a rebirth of American manufacturing, it is wrong to jeopardize the health of America’s shipbuilding and aerospace manufacturing workforce—especially when the military needs these platforms now. This budget accelerates the trend of a defense manufacturing workforce in rapid decline. A recent working group hosted by The Brookings Institution concluded: "Not only then are the U.S. military services, but also American defense industry at a crossroads. … Careless defense reductions or poor planning won’t just cost jobs or competitiveness, but could actually result in lost American military industrial capability in core areas." The report continues, stating: "As presidential candidates and other national leaders develop their platforms for the 2012 elections and beyond, any serious discussion of national security and the current state and future of the military must also give direct attention to matters of the American national security scientific and industrial base." The administration’s words and actions simply don’t add up. While President Obama has spoken at length about the strategic importance of the Pacific and the growing threat of China, the defense budget greatly lacks the capabilities to back up the military’s ever-growing commitments. The Obama administration is proposing a “pivot” to Asia in name only. Take, for example, the reckless proposals to eliminate six tactical aircraft squadrons and shrink the Navy’s fleet by 16 ships. A 2009 RAND study identified the current force as too small and the United States losing an air war over the Taiwan Straits due to an overwhelming Chinese advantage in numbers of aircraft. Make no mistake: as defense budgets go down, so does America’s capacity to give its men and women in uniform the tools they need to defend our interests abroad—as well as our ability to sustain the world-class scientists, engineers, designers, and machinists that comprise our defense manufacturing industrial base. The military deserves better than this budget, and so does America.