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### 1NC – Kritik

#### Neoliberal engagement of Latin America exacerbates inequality and justifies endless intervention — causing structural violence which cumulates in extinction

Makwana 6 (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.

#### Reject the aff as a means to create space for alternatives to neoliberal engagement.

Munck**,** professor of Globalization and Social Exclusion,3 (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>, 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

#### Immigration will pass – Obama has momentum and leverage now

Laura Matthews, U.S. politics reporter for the International Business Times, 10/16 [“2013 Immigration Reform Bill: 'I'm Going To Push To Call A Vote,' Says Obama,” http://www.ibtimes.com/2013-immigration-reform-bill-im-going-push-call-vote-says-obama-1429220]

When Congress finally passes a bipartisan bill that kicks the fiscal battles over to early next year, the spotlight could return to comprehensive immigration reform before 2013 ends.¶ At least that’s the hope of President Barack Obama and his fellow Chicagoan Rep. Luis Gutierrez, D-Ill., chairman of the Immigration Task Force of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus and one of the most vocal advocates for immigration reform in the House of Representatives.¶ “When we emerge from this crazy partisan eruption from the Republicans, there will be a huge incentive for sensible Republicans who want to repair some of the damage they have done to themselves,” Gutierrez said in a statement. “Immigration reform remains the one issue popular with both Democratic and Republican voters on which the two parties can work together to deliver real, substantive solutions in the Congress this year.”¶ Reforming the status quo has consistently been favored by a majority of Americans. Earlier this year, at least two-thirds of Americans supported several major steps to make the system work better, according to a Gallup poll. Those steps include implementing an E-verify system for employers to check electronically the immigration status of would-be employees (85 percent), a path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants, (72 percent), an entry-exit check system to make sure people who enter the country then leave it (71 percent), more high-skilled visas (71 percent) and increased border security (68 percent).¶ Related¶ The Senate passed its version of a 2013 immigration reform bill in June that includes, but is not limited to, a pathway to citizenship for immigrants without documentation and doubling security on the southern border. But that measure has stalled in the House, where Republicans are adamant they will take a piecemeal approach.¶ The momentum that lawmakers showed for reform has been sapped by the stalemate that that has shut down the government for 16 days and brought the U.S. to the brink of default. The Senate has agreed on Wednesday to a bipartisan solution to break the gridlock.¶ When the shutdown and default threat is resolved (for a time), that’s when Obama will renew his push to get Congress to move on immigration reform. On Tuesday the president said reform will become his top priority.¶ “Once that’s done, you know, the day after, I’m going to be pushing to say, call a vote on immigration reform,” Obama told Univision affiliate KMEX-TV in Los Angeles. “And if I have to join with other advocates and continue to speak out on that, and keep pushing, I’m going to do so because I think it’s really important for the country. And now is the time to do it.”¶ The president pointed the finger at House Speaker John Boehner, R-Ohio, for not allowing the bill to be brought to the floor for a vote. Boehner had promised that the Senate’s bill would not be voted on unless a majority of the majority in the House supports it -- the same principle he was holding out for on the government shutdown before he gave in.¶ “We had a very strong Democratic and Republican vote in the Senate,” Obama said. “The only thing right now that’s holding it back is, again, Speaker Boehner not willing to call the bill on the floor of the House of Representatives. So we’re going to have to get through this crisis that was unnecessary, that was created because of the obsession of a small faction of the Republican Party on the Affordable Care Act.”¶ Republicans are opposing the Democratic view of immigration reform because of its inclusion of a 13-year path to citizenship for undocumented immigrants. They said this amounted to “amnesty.” Some Republicans prefer to give them legal resident status instead.¶ Immigration advocates have also been urging Obama to use his executive authority to halt the more than 1,000 deportations taking place daily. Like the activists, Gutierrez said the government shutdown didn’t do anything to slow the number of daily deportations.¶ Some Republicans who welcomed Sen. Ted Cruz’s filibuster over Obamacare because it shifted the focus from immigration.¶ “If Ted [didn’t] spin the filibuster, if we don’t make this the focus, we had already heard what was coming,” Rep. Louie Gohmert, R-Texas, told Fox News on Tuesday. “As soon as we got beyond this summer, we were going to have an amnesty bill come to the floor. That’s what we would have been talking about. And that’s where the pivot would have been if we had not focused America on Obamacare.”¶ Still, pro-immigration advocates are hopeful they can attain their goal soon. “With more prodding from the president and the American people,” Gutierrez said, “we can get immigration reform legislation passed in the House and signed into law.”

#### Engagement opponents control the debate on venezuela

Harper, 10 (liz, Senior Editor @ US Institute for Peace, adjunct fellow at the Council on Hemispheric Affairs, americasquarterly.org contributing blogger based in Washington DC, 12/21, <http://americasquarterly.org/node/2058>)

It's not clear whether some sought to use the QFR to strong arm the State Department to articulate or take tougher positions, and thereby bolster Palmer's confirmation prospects and support on the heels of his "weak" hearing performance. Alternatively, perhaps the QFR was publicized to thwart his prospects entirely. Who knows; at this stage, it's irrelevant. What's very relevant are the unfolding consequences of the QFR mishandling. First and foremost, Palmer got rolled. A dedicated Foreign Service officer was not treated with due professionalism and respect. We will not know how great he would have been in Venezuela. Second, the State Department on this matter appears naive, indecisive and disorganized. Third, critics who never wanted ANY ambassador—and certainly NOT Palmer—in Caracas, succeeded. As did Chávez, for the short term. To take up the second point, the State Department appears to have different and confused messages on Venezuela. The ostensible example of this is the two messages of Larry Palmer's Senate testimony versus his answers to the QFR. What can be said publicly and on the record regarding Venezuela? Beyond talking with a low voice on the safest matters, it is not clear. Is such timidity to Chávez' bluster necessary? The next step will be to see whether the State Department will go bold and call Venezuelan Ambassador to the U.S. Bernardo Alvarez a persona non grata, or take a softer approach and cancel his visa. Alvarez had been back home, and over the weekend, it was said he was not planning to return to Washington DC—already one move ahead of the anticipated reciprocation to Palmer's rejection. It was in Chávez’s best interests to welcome Palmer, as he wanted to work with Venezuelans, and help ease the growing tensions between the two countries. But now, the State Department will have to rethink this, and find another person...most likely with a stronger track record on human rights and democracy. Perhaps we should accept that playing nice and fair with an irrational actor like Chávez is not likely to yield positive results. At the end of the day, we've been backed into a corner to put forward a tougher ambassador, and not Palmer, who was our first pick. Does this mean likewise that our policy of engagement must be altered? Are we acting in response to Venezuela's moves? In this context, Chávez, and some conservative critics here, are setting the terms of U.S. policy. This debacle also illustrates the express need for the State Department to complete its review of Venezuela policy and clarify its positions. The QFR mishandling is a symptom of the bigger issue: uniting our various agencies to craft a coherent message and policy on Venezuela. What are the "red lines" of what we'll tolerate from Venezuela? When one of our career diplomats goes on record saying that Venezuela's National Guard is involved in narcotrafficking, provides safe haven to terrorists like the FARC, imprisons judges for ruling against Chávez, why is the State Department not publicizing those concerns? Until now, the State Department had been keeping its profile too low for anyone's good. Ostensibly that of Ambassador Palmer. At this point, why is it a mistake to outline on record ways in which the Venezuelan government is breaking very basic standards of human rights and hemispheric security? Just some open and disquieting questions. At the least, the State Department needs to figure out what its basic message is, and then put it out there with a unified voice, loud and clear. This could go far to improve its public outreach and image. But while silence continues, it seems that the Venezuelans have settled the U.S. debate: this kind of "engagement" will not get us where we want to be. Chávez is antithetical to our democratic values and security concerns. He is moving full steam down the field, while we sit on the sidelines. Time to play.

#### Zero support in Congress for the plan.

Guggenheim 11

David E. Guggenheim, marine scientist, conservation policy specialist, submarine pilot, ocean explorer and educator, president and founder of Ocean Doctor, led the formation of the Trinational Initiative for Marine Science & Conservation in the Gulf of Mexico & Western Caribbean—a major project to elevate collaboration in marine science and conservation among Cuba, Mexico and the U.S. to a new level, holds a Ph.D. in Environmental Science and Public Policy from George Mason University, a Master’s in Aquatic and Population Biology from University of California-Santa Barbara, and a Master’s in Regional Science and Bachelor’s in Environmental Studies from the University of Pennsylvania, 2011 – “Cuba Offshore Oil Drilling: Why We’re Not Ready,” *Ocean Doctor* blog, October 23rd, Available Online at <http://oceandoctor.org/cuba-offshore-oil-drilling-why-were-not-ready/>

It’s been no secret that Cuba has been planning to conduct offshore oil drilling. On Christmas day 2004, Fidel Castro announced that two Canadian companies had discovered reserves of 100 million barrels in Cuban waters of the Gulf of Mexico. Shortly after I learned the details in Havana a few months later, I briefed then-Governor Jeb Bush’s senior staff in Tallahassee and urged a face-to-face dialogue with Cuba, to at least coordinate on an emergency plan and response should the worst happen. My colleagues and I have been briefing Members of Congress and the Administration ever since, but it has taken all these years—until the drilling rig is actually on its way and Cuba is weeks away from drilling—for the Senate to hold a hearing about the issue. The hearing—which was also focused on offshore drilling in Canada, Russia and the Bahamas—took place last week.¶ Yet at the Senate hearing last week, testimony by Michael R. Bromwich, (Director of the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement) and Vice Admiral Brian M. Salerno (United States Coast Guard, Deputy Commandant for Operations), made it crystal clear that their respective legal authority to work with Cuba in the event of a spill was anything but clear. Given the proximity of the drilling site to the Keys, and given the swiftness of the currents of the Straits of Florida, we would need to mobilize a response to an oil spill within hours, not days. Both Mr. Bromwich and Vice Admiral Salerno indicated that authorities would need to be granted by an alphabet of agencies, including the State Department, Department of Commerce, Department of Justice, Department of the Treasury, and more. Surely if the legal issues are not dealt with in advance, our best-planned emergency response efforts would be hamstrung by ongoing delays by legal debate and political wrangling.¶ Unfortunately, not a single Senator was willing to explore the possibility of actually establishing a dialogue with Cuba, despite testimony from oil industry representatives recommending it. Earlier this year, President Obama’s National Commission on the BP Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill and Offshore Drilling, co-chaired by former Senator Bob Graham and former EPA Administer Bill Riley, recognized that we must work with our neighbors in the Gulf, Cuba and Mexico, stating, “It is in our country’s national interest to negotiate now with these near neighbors to agree on a common, rigorous set of standards, a system for regulatory oversight, and the same operator adherence to the effective safety culture called for in this report, along with protocols to cooperate on containment and response strategies and preparedness in case of a spill.” The Commission got it right. There can be no substitute for face-to-face dialogue to set high standards, create an emergency plan and open lines of communication should the unimaginable occur.¶ To make matters worse, Republican Senators Lisa Murkowski (R-Alaska) and Bob Corker (R-Tennessee) exploited the opportunity to call for opening up more areas in domestic waters to offshore drilling. Senator Murkowski (R-AK) stated, “…it makes no sense for this country to sit stubbornly in between active drilling operations in neighboring waters with our arms folded. It does us no good to complain that offshore drilling is too risky for us to pursue as other nations are clearly very busy reaping its benefits right outside our front door. And yet that position is precisely is what some senators and some groups would advocate, that the us stay out of this business entirely.”¶ Further, Senator Murkowski claimed that one of the best ways to help the U.S. respond to an international oil spill disaster is to expand offshore drilling in our own waters. Senator Corker picked up on this and put the question to Mr. Bromowich, “The ranking member [Senator Murkowski] mentioned something about the fact that the more we have in the way of resources ourselves involved in exploration, the better we could respond to something that might happen in waters that are nearby. Is that a sensible notion that she laid out, that in fact the more we’re producing and exploring off our own continental shelf, the better we can actually respond to something that’s happening in other countries’ waters?” Mr. Bromwich’s responded, “I think Senator Murkowski is absolutely right in stating that.”

#### Capital is key – Obama has to push now to force Boehner to call a vote

Bob Ray Sanders, columnist, 10/19 [“There’s no better time for Obama to push for immigration reform,” http://www.star-telegram.com/2013/10/19/5258963/theres-no-better-time-for-obama.html]

Now that the Republican hijacking of the federal government has been brought to an end, perhaps President Barack Obama and Congress can move on to other major issues that have been neglected too long.¶ The president, in addition to wanting to work out a long-term budget deal, has said that he is now ready to push for passage of a comprehensive immigration bill, as well as rescuing the farm bill, which was gutted when GOP lawmakers stripped out the food stamp section.¶ Just a few months ago, immigration reform looked promising, garnering bipartisan support in the Senate. A measure that was long overdue passed the upper chamber in Congress last June, but has been stalled in the House as recalcitrant Republicans simply couldn’t stomach the idea of providing a path to citizenship for the millions of illegal immigrants already in the country.¶ While the Senate bill has its faults — including adding 700 miles of new fencing along the U.S.-Mexico border — it is a compromise that, if passed, would be a giant step toward improving the entire immigration system and, at the same time, bringing illegal immigrants out of the shadows.¶ Obama got re-elected partly on his promise to pursue the issue aggressively, receiving 71 percent of the Latino vote. He has not been as aggressive as many would like, even though they’re willing to cut him a little slack because of all the uncontrollable international crises and manufactured domestic distractions (like the shutdown of the government) he has had to deal with.¶ But he shouldn’t let anything get in his way this time, even though Republicans in the House are vowing not to negotiate with him because the president stood his ground and refused to negotiate on his healthcare law in connection with raising the debt ceiling and ending the government shutdown.¶ House Speaker John Boehner, who has refused to bring the Senate bill to a vote, has said he won’t bring any immigration legislation to the floor until a majority of his Republican caucus agrees.¶ That, in effect, means never. Or, if there is a bill that the majority of his party would support, you can almost bet it will be terribly inadequate, one that would not pass the Senate and one that the president wouldn’t sign if it did.¶ Boehner, who has been on the losing end a lot lately, ought to be pressured into bringing the Senate bill to a vote**.** It’s clear that on many of the important matters facing this country, the majority of his party in the House will reject just about anything the president supports.¶ Therefore, it will be left up to the House Democrats and the moderate Republicans who are not afraid of the Tea Party to get an immigration bill passed.¶ Since the government shutdown fiasco, in which the GOP unmistakably was the loser, the president has the upper hand, and he should take the opportunity to press forward with his agenda.¶ By no means am I suggesting that Obama become a bully or deliberately attempt to undermine Boehner’s leadership, but he shouldn’t back away from this fight again.¶ Every time an election approaches — and there’s always an approaching election — it is suggested that it’s the wrong time to bring up immigration reform.¶ Frankly, there’s no better time than right now as candidates prepare to file for office and gear up their campaigns for the 2014 contests.¶ Let them state their positions on this issue, vote their consciences and then stand on their records.

#### Immigration reform expands skilled labor—spurs relations and economic growth in China and India.

LA Times 12 [Other countries eagerly await U.S. immigration reform, http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/world\_now/2012/11/us-immigration-reform-eagerly-awaited-by-source-countries.html]

"Comprehensive immigration reform will see expansion of skilled labor visas," predicted B. Lindsay Lowell, director of policy studies for the Institute for the Study of International Migration at Georgetown University. A former research chief for the congressionally appointed Commission on Immigration Reform, Lowell said he expects to see at least a fivefold increase in the number of highly skilled labor visas that would provide "a significant shot in the arm for India and China." There is widespread consensus among economists and academics that skilled migration fosters new trade and business relationships between countries and enhances links to the global economy, Lowell said. "Countries like India and China weigh the opportunities of business abroad from their expats with the possibility of brain drain, and I think they still see the immigration opportunity as a bigger plus than not," he said.

#### US-Indian relations avert South Asian nuclear war.

Schaffer 2 [Spring 2002, Teresita—Director of the South Asia Program at the Center for Strategic and International Security, Washington Quarterly, Lexis]

Washington's increased interest in India since the late 1990s reflects India's economic expansion and position as Asia's newest rising power. New Delhi, for its part, is adjusting to the end of the Cold War. As a result, both giant democracies see that they can benefit by closer cooperation. For Washington, the advantages include a wider network of friends in Asia at a time when the region is changing rapidly, as well as a stronger position from which to help calm possible future nuclear tensions in the region. Enhanced trade and investment benefit both countries and are a prerequisite for improved U.S. relations with India. For India, the country's ambition to assume a stronger leadership role in the world and to maintain an economy that lifts its people out of poverty depends critically on good relations with the United States.

### 1NC – Counterplan

#### Using its licensing authority and enforcement discretion, the United States Department of Treasury’s Office of Foreign Assets Control should exempt transactions involving oil from enforcement under the Cuban Assets Control Regulations.

#### First, the counterplan solves via specific exemptions — OFAC has broad discretion over sanctions enforcement.

Golumbic and Ruff 13 — Court E. Golumbic, Managing Director and Global Anti-Money Laundering, Anti-Bribery and Government Sanctions Compliance Officer at Goldman Sachs & Co., Lecturer-in-Law at the University of Pennsylvania Law School, former Assistant United States Attorney with the United States Attorney's Office for the Southern District of New York, and Robert S. Ruff III, Associate in the Securities Litigation practice group at Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP, 2013 (“Leveraging the Three Core Competencies: How OFAC Licensing Optimizes Holistic Sanctions,” *North Carolina Journal of International Law & Commercial Regulation* (38 N.C.J. Int'l L. & Com. Reg. 729), Spring, Available Online to Subscribing Institutions via Lexis-Nexis)

2. Ability to Mitigate Collateral Damage

Because OFAC prefers to formulate its sanctions program broadly, its economic sanctions can affect the lives of unintended targets, such as ordinary citizens of foreign countries that have no influence in their sanctioned government. n347 The broad reach of U.S. sanctions can also unnecessarily put U.S. citizens and companies at a competitive disadvantage, undermine international support for the sanctions programs, and even undermine the policy objectives of the programs. n348 One way in which OFAC mitigates [\*792] the collateral damage of its holistic sanctions is by issuing licenses that permit U.S. citizens to export food and medical supplies n349 and provide humanitarian aid n350 to people in sanctioned countries. In an effort to avoid placing private enterprises at an unnecessary competitive disadvantage, which can damage U.S. influence internationally and U.S. interests as a whole, OFAC may also allow certain activities from an otherwise sanctioned country. n351 Additionally, OFAC issues licenses to avoid interfering with the legitimate activities of international and charitable organizations and to permit U.S. persons to participate in such organizations. n352 By licensing these types of activities and transactions, OFAC focuses its sanctions and the punitive consequences thereof, to the extent possible, on those in a position to produce the desired change, rather than on innocent civilians and businesses. n353

### 1NC – Topicality

#### Engagement” requires direct talks with the target government

Crocker 9 – Chester Crocker, Professor of Strategic Studies at the Walsh School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University, Former Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, “Terms of Engagement”, New York Times, 9-13, http://www.nytimes.com/2009/09/14/opinion/14crocker.html?\_r=0

PRESIDENT OBAMA will have a hard time achieving his foreign policy goals until he masters some key terms and better manages the expectations they convey. Given the furor that will surround the news of America’s readiness to hold talks with Iran, he could start with “engagement” — one of the trickiest terms in the policy lexicon.

The Obama administration has used this term to contrast its approach with its predecessor’s resistance to talking with adversaries and troublemakers. His critics show that they misunderstand the concept of engagement when they ridicule it as making nice with nasty or hostile regimes.

Let’s get a few things straight. Engagement in statecraft is not about sweet talk. Nor is it based on the illusion that our problems with rogue regimes can be solved if only we would talk to them. Engagement is not normalization, and its goal is not improved relations. It is not akin to détente, working for rapprochement, or appeasement.

So how do you define an engagement strategy? It does require direct talks. There is simply no better way to convey authoritative statements of position or to hear responses. But establishing talks is just a first step. The goal of engagement is to change the other country’s perception of its own interests and realistic options and, hence, to modify its policies and its behavior.

### 1NC – Disad

#### China’s intent to drill confirmed by exploratory drilling

Investors.com (Business magazine and advisory), 4-11-12, Investor’s Business Daily, “While We Dither On Oil, It's Drill, Beijing, Drill,” http://news.investors.com/ibd-editorials/041112-607461-china-seeks-canadian-cuban-oil.htm?p=full

Energy Policy: A Chinese oil company is now the world's top producer. While we sleep and watch pump prices rise, China, India and even Cuba seek supplies the world over, including drilling off the Florida coast. Global demand for oil is rising, as is its global price, as energy-hungry economies such as China, India and Brazil scour the earth for oil they know will be the energy of the present for some time to come. Even those lacking their own technology are asking others to help them get more. For them, there is no such thing as "peak oil." The U.S., however, stands alone as the only major country not actively seeking new supplies. Less than two years after the Deepwater Horizon explosion of a single rig virtually shut down our efforts in the Gulf of Mexico, a Chinese rig built for a Spanish company, Repsol, has begun exploratory drilling for oil off Cuba as close as 50 miles to Key West, Fla. The Scarabeo 9 rig will drill at a depth of 6,000 feet underwater. The 2010 Deepwater Horizon spill happened at a shallower depth of 5,500 feet. The U.S. Geological Survey recently estimated the North Cuban Basin contains as much as 9 billion barrels of oil and 22 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. Other estimates range from 5 billion to 20 billion barrels. Pools of oil and natural gas tend not to obey lines drawn on a map. It is certain that at least some of Cuba's wells will be tapping oil pools that straddle the boundary separating our zone from theirs, meaning Havana will be getting oil that should be ours. Countries like China clearly don't see oil as an energy source of the past. China and India provided a combined $24 billion in oil industry subsidies in 2010, according to the International Energy Agency. The figure dwarfs the $4 billion in industry incentives that President Obama is seeking to end.

#### Cuba trade reverses Chinese bilateral dominance

Luko 11 – (James – Served in Washington DC with the National Council For Soviet East European Research, the Smithsonian Institute and two years as an analyst with the Canadian Department of National Defence, “China's Moves on Cuba Need to Be Stopped”, 6/29, <http://www.nolanchart.com/article8774-chinas-moves-on-cuba-need-to-be-stopped.html>)

The Red Dragon takes another wide step of not only flexing its muscles in Asia, but now wishes to supplant Russias and (former USSRs) forward base presence 90 miles from the United States- CUBA. Cuba is China's biggest trade partner in the Caribbean region, while China is Cuba's second-largest trade partner after Venezuela. Over the past decade, bilateral trade increased from $440 million in 2001 to $1.83 billion in 2010. [1] In 2006 China and Cuba discussed offshore oil deals and now China's National Petroleum Corporation is a major player in Cuban infrastructure improvements. [ibid] In 2008, none other than China's President himself, Hu JinTao visited Cuba with a sweet package of loans, grants and trade deals. If Cuba becomes a 'client' state of China, it will be a source of leverage against America whenever the U.S. Pressures China on Tibet and Taiwan. Soon we will witness the newly constructed blue-water navy of China cruising Cuba's coast in protection of their trade routes and supply of natural resources. In 2003 it was reported that Chinese personnel were operating at least TWO (2) intelligence signal sations in Cuba since at least 1999 ! [2] This month, June 2011, the Vice President of China made an important visit, extending more financial aid, interest-free, as well as related health projects to be paid for by China. A client state in the making ! [3] The best way to counter the Chinese in Cuba is to reverse Americas 50 year old, ineffective and obsolete policy of isolationism and boycott of Cuba. The Chinese threat in Cuba should be the catalyst for the US to establish open and normalized relations, with economic incentives to re-Americanize Cuba, return of American investments and security agreements. Checking the Chinese move in Cuba early on is vital to preventing a strategic Chinese foothold 90 miles from Florida. Allowing China to replace Russia in Cuba would be a strategic disaster. China is dangling financial assistance and investments in order to establish a beachhead close to the shores of America. This is a counter-response to Americas continued military presence in Asia, continued support of Taiwan and recent increased American aid to the Philippines in its spat with China over sovereignty of the Spratly Islands. The Cuban people wish to return to the American fold and re-establish the traditional relationship with the Cuban anchor in Florida- namely the almost 900,000 Cubans living in Florida alone! [4]

#### Lack of US economic engagement spurs China’s growth.

Erikson & Chen ‘7 – (Daniel is a Senior Associate of US Policy at the Inter-American Dialogue. Janice is a degree candidate at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy. “China, Taiwan, and the Battle for Latin America,” Fletcher Forum of World Affairs, Vol. 31:2, Summer 2007, pg. 71)

China’s economic engagement with Latin America responds to the requirements of a booming Chinese economy that has been growing at nearly 10 percent per year for the past quarter century. The economic figures are impressive: in the past six years, Chinese imports from Latin America have grown more than six-fold, at a pace of some 60 percent a year, to an estimated $60 billion in 2006. China has become a major consumer of food, mineral, and other primary products from Latin America, benefiting principally the commodity-producing countries of South America-par- ticularly Argentina, Brazil, Peru, and Chile. Chinese investment in Latin America remains relatively small at some $6.5 billion through 2004, but that amount represents half of China's foreign investment overseas.9 China's Xinhua News agency reported that Chinese trade with the Caribbean ex- ceeded $2 billion in 2004, a 40 percent increase from the previous year.10 China has promised to increase its investments in Latin America to $100 billion by 2014, although government officials have since backed away from that pledge and several proposed investments are already showing signs of falling short in Brazil, Argentina, and elsewhere. For their part, Latin Americans are intrigued by the idea of China as a potential partner for trade and investment. As a rising superpower with- out a colonial or "imperialist" history in the Western Hemisphere, China is in many ways more politically attractive than either the United States or the European Union, especially for politicians confronted with constituen- cies that are increasingly anti-American and skeptical of Western inten- tions. 12 Nevertheless, most analysts recognize that Latin America's embrace of China-to the extent that this has actually occurred-is intimately linked to its perception of neglect and disinterest from the United States. Nervousness about Chinas rise runs deeper among the smaller economies such as those of Central America, which do not enjoy Brazil's or Argentina's abundance in export commodities and are inclined to view the competi- tion posed by the endless supply of cheap Chinese labor as a menace to their nascent manufacturing sectors. But even as China seeks to reassure the United States that its interests in South America are purely economic, Beijing has begun enlisting regional powers like Mexico to aid its effort to woo Central American diplomats. Pressure is also being placed on Paraguay by Argentina, Brazil, and Chile, its partners in the South American Common Market (Mercosur), which places certain constraints on member states' bilateral foreign policy prerogatives. Despite its avowals to Washington, China appears to be using its economic might as a means to achieve the patently political objective of stripping Taiwan of its democratic allies in the Western Hemisphere.

#### CCP Collapse causes nuclear and biological warfare

Renxing 5 (San, Epic Times Staff Member, The CCP’s Last-ditch Gamble: Biological and Nuclear War, 8/5/5, The Epoch Times,<http://english.epochtimes.com/news/5-8-5/30975.html>)

As *The Epoch Times*’ *Nine Commentaries on the Communist Party* spreads ever wider in China, the truth it speaks is awakening Chinese people to the true nature of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) and inspiring them to cancel their Party memberships. With the number of people quitting the Party growing rapidly by the day, the Communist Party sees that the end is near. In a show of strength to save itself from demise, the CCP has brought out a sinister plan that it has been preparing for years, a last-ditch gamble to extend its life. This plan is laid out in two speeches written by Chi Haotian, Minster of Defense and vice-chairman of China’s Central Military Commission, and posted on the Internet. The background surrounding the speeches is still shrouded in mystery. The titles of the two speeches are “[War Is Approaching Us](http://english.epochtimes.com/news/5-8-4/30974.html" \t "_blank)” [[1]](http://english.epochtimes.com/news/5-8-5/30975.html#1) and “[War Is Not Far from Us and Is the Midwife of the Chinese Century](http://english.epochtimes.com/news/5-8-4/30974.html" \t "_blank).” The two, judging from their similar contexts and consistent theme, are indeed sister articles. These speeches describe in a comprehensive, systematic, and detailed way the CCP’s nearly 20 years of fear and helplessness over its doomed fate, and its desperate fight to extend its life. In particular, the speeches lay uncharacteristically bare what is really on the CCP’s mind and hide nothing from the public—a rare confession from the CCP that can help people understand its evil nature. If one truly understands what is said in this confession, one will immediately catch on to the CCP’s way of thinking. In short, the speeches are worth reading, and I would like to comment on them. I. A Gangster Gambles with the World as His Stake, and the Lives of People in this Global Village Become Worthless What, then, is the gist of this wild, last-ditch gamble? To put it in a few words: A cornered beast is fighting desperately to survive in a battle with humanity. If you don’t believe me, read some passages directly from the speeches. 1) “We must prepare ourselves for two scenarios. If our biological weapons succeed in the surprise attack [on the US], the Chinese people will be able to keep their losses at a minimum in the fight against the U.S. If, however, the attack fails and triggers a nuclear retaliation from the U.S., China would perhaps suffer a catastrophe in which more than half of its population would perish. That is why we need to be ready with air defense systems for our big and medium-sized cities. Whatever the case may be, we can only move forward fearlessly for the sake of our Party and state and our nation’s future, regardless of the hardships we have to face and the sacrifices we have to make. The population, even if more than half dies, can be reproduced. But if the Party falls, everything is gone, and forever gone!” 2) “In any event, we, the CCP, will never step down from the stage of history! We’d rather have the whole world, or even the entire globe, share life and death with us than step down from the stage of history!!! Isn’t there a ‘nuclear bondage’ theory? It means that since the nuclear weapons have bound the security of the entire world, all will die together if death is inevitable. In my view, there is another kind of bondage, and that is, the fate our Party is tied up with that of the whole world. If we, the CCP, are finished, China will be finished, and the world will be finished.” 3) “It is indeed brutal to kill one or two hundred million Americans. But that is the only path that will secure a Chinese century, a century in which the CCP leads the world. We, as revolutionary humanitarians, do not want deaths. But if history confronts us with a choice between deaths of Chinese and those of Americans, we’d have to pick the latter, as, for us, it is more important to safeguard the lives of the Chinese people and the life of our Party. That is because, after all, we are Chinese and members of the CCP. Since the day we joined the CCP, the Party’s life has always been above all else!” Since the Party’s life is “above all else,” it would not be surprising if the CCP resorts to the use of biological, chemical, and nuclear weapons in its attempt to extend its life. The CCP, which disregards human life, would not hesitate to kill two hundred million Americans, along with seven or eight hundred million Chinese, to achieve its ends. These speeches let the public see the CCP for what it really is. With evil filling its every cell the CCP intends to wage a war against humankind in its desperate attempt to cling to life. *That* is the main theme of the speeches. This theme is murderous and utterly evil. In China we have seen beggars who coerced people to give them money by threatening to stab themselves with knives or pierce their throats with long nails. But we have never, until now, seen such a gangster who would use biological, chemical, and nuclear weapons to threaten the world, that they will die together with him. This bloody confession has confirmed the CCP’s nature: That of a monstrous murderer who has killed 80 million Chinese people and who now plans to hold one billion people hostage and gamble with their lives.

#### Collapse of the Chinese government causes border conflict with Russia

Lo and Rothman 6 [Bobo Lo and Andy Rothman, May 2006, Asian Geopolitics, special report http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_7057/is\_2\_9/ai\_n28498825/pg\_17/]

The second scenario for strategic conflict is predicated on a general collapse of law and order in China. With no effective central authority to contain the anarchy, millions of Chinese could cross the border into the Russian Far East. This would lead to tensions and clashes, at first sporadic and random, but subsequently escalating into interstate conflict.

#### Nuclear winter

Sharavin 01[Alexander, What the Papers Say, 10-3-01, The Third Threat]

Russia may face the “wonderful” prospect of combating the Chinese army, which, if full mobilization is called, is comparable in size with Russia’s entire population, which also has nuclear weapons (even tactical weapons become less strategic if states have common borders) and would be absolutely insensitive to losses (even a loss of a few million of the servicemen would be acceptable for China). Such a war would be more horrible than the World War II. It would require from our state maximal tension, universal mobilization and complete accumulation of the army military hardware, up to the last tank or a plane, in a single direction (we would have to forget such “trifles” like Talebs and Basaev, but this does not guarantee success either). Massive nuclear strikes on basic military forces and cities of China would finally be the only way out, what would exhaust Russia’s armament completely. We have not got another set of intercontinental ballistic missiles and submarine-based missiles, whereas the general forces would be extremely exhausted in the border combats. In the long run, even if the aggression would be stopped after the majority of the Chinese are killed, our country would be absolutely unprotected against the “Chechen” and the “Balkan” variants both, and even against the first frost of a possible nuclear winter.

### Solvency

Even a small nuclear launch causes a laundry list of scenarios for extinction

Starr ‘9 (Catastrophic Climatic Consequences of Nuclear Conflict, October 2009, by Steven Starr Steven Starr is a Senior Scientist with Physicians for Social Responsibility, and the Director of the Clinical Laboratory Science Program at the University of Missouri. He has been published in the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists and the STAR (Strategic Arms Reduction) website of the Moscow Institute of Physics and Technology.

Despite a two-thirds reduction in global nuclear arsenals since 1986, new scientific research **makes it clear** that the **environmental consequences of nuclear war** can still **end human history**. A series of peer-reviewed studies, performed at several U.S. universities, predict the detonation of even a **tiny fraction** of the global nuclear arsenal within large urban centers will cause **catastrophic disruptions of** the **global climate** and massive destruction of the protective stratospheric ozone layer. A nuclear war fought with several thousand weapons would leave the Earth uninhabitable. The studies conclude that a “regional” nuclear conflict between India and Pakistan, in which 100 Hiroshima-size weapons were exploded in the cities of those nations, could produce as many fatalities as World War II1 and would significantly disrupt the global climate for at least a decade. Up to 5 million tons of smoke would rise above cloud level and within days form a global stratospheric smoke layer. There the smoke would remain for many years to block 7 to 10% of sunlight from reaching Earth’s surface. Following such a “regional” nuclear conflict, average surface temperatures beneath the smoke would become colder than they have been in the last 1000 years, significantly shortening growing seasons and reducing average global precipitation.2 The combined explosive power of 100 Hiroshima-size weapons represents less than 1% of the explosive power contained within the currently deployed and operational US-Russian nuclear arsenals. As of 2009, virtually all of the land-based strategic nuclear forces of both the US and Russia remained on alert and ready to launch with only a few minutes warning.3 The new research predicts that immense firestorms, produced by a nuclear war fought with these weapons, could loft 150 million tons of smoke into the stratosphere. There it rapidly would block 70% of sunlight from reaching the surface of the Northern Hemisphere and 35% of sunlight from reaching the Southern Hemisphere.4 Under such conditions, it would only require a matter of days or weeks for daily minimum temperatures to fall below freezing in the largest agricultural areas of the Northern Hemisphere. Nightly killing freezes would continue to occur for a period of between one to three years. Average surface temperatures would become colder than those experienced 18,000 years ago at the height of the last Ice Age, and the prolonged cold would cause average rainfall to decrease by up to 90%. Growing seasons would be completely eliminated for more than a decade and cause most humans and large animal populations to die of starvation.5 2 Deadly Climate Change from Nuclear War Nuclear detonations within urban and industrial areas would ignite immense mass fires which would burn everything imaginable and create millions of tons of thick, black smoke (soot). This soot would ultimately be lofted into the stratosphere. There it would absorb and block sunlight from reaching the lower atmosphere where greenhouse gases mainly reside, and thus act to reduce the natural greenhouse effect.6 The profound darkness and global cooling predicted to be result of this process (along with massive amounts of radioactive fallout and pyrotoxins7, and ozone depletion) was first described in 1983 as nuclear winter.8 Joint research by Western and Soviet scientists led to the realization that the climatic and environmental consequences of nuclear war, in combination with the indirect effects of the collapse of society, could produce a nuclear winter which would cause **famine for billions** of people far from the war zones.9 These predictions led to extensive international research and peer review during the mid-1980s. A large body of work which essentially supported the initial findings of the 1983 studies was done by such groups as the Scientific Committee on Problems of the Environment (SCOPE),10 the World Meteorological Organization,11 and the U.S. National Research Council of the U.S. National Academy of Sciences.12 The idea of nuclear winter, published and supported by prominent scientists, generated extensive public alarm and put political pressure on the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. to terminate a runaway nuclear arms race which, by 1986, had created a global nuclear arsenal of more than 65,000 nuclear weapons. Unfortunately, this was anathema to the nuclear weapons establishment and thus nuclear winter created a backlash among many powerful conservative groups, who undertook an extensive media campaign to brand it as “bad science” and the scientists who discovered it as “irresponsible.” Critics used various uncertainties in the studies and the first climate models (which are relatively primitive by current standards) as a basis to denigrate and reject the concept of nuclear winter. In 1986, the Council on Foreign Relations published an article by scientists from the National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR), who predicted drops in global cooling about half as large as those first predicted by the 1983 studies and described this as a ‘nuclear autumn.’ Subsequent widespread criticism, in such publications as the Wall Street Journal and Time Magazine, often used the term “nuclear autumn” to imply that no important climatic change would result from nuclear war. In 1987, the National Review called nuclear winter a “fraud.” In 2000, Discover Magazine published an article which described nuclear winter as one of “The Twenty Greatest Scientific Blunders in History.”13 Sadly enough, for almost two decades this smear campaign limited serious discussion and prevented further studies of nuclear winter – and such criticism will continue.14 Yet the basic findings of the nuclear winter research, that extreme climatic changes would result from nuclear war, were **never scientifically disproved** and **have been strengthened by the latest studies**. 3 Most importantly, the new studies show that the original research actually underestimated by an order of magnitude the amount of time the soot from nuclear firestorms would remain above cloud level to block sunlight. This greatly magnifies the impact such a global smoke layer would have on weather and climate. The new studies clearly demonstrate that massive changes in climate created via nuclear conflict, which are much less severe than “nuclear winter”, would certainly have catastrophic and devastating impacts on human populations. Regional Nuclear Conflict Fought with Low-Yield Nuclear Weapons To create the new studies, U.S. researchers used the latest NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies climate model (Model 1E, also used for the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change), which is able to model the entire troposphere, stratosphere, and mesosphere from the Earth’s surface up to 80 kilometers. They simulated a small nuclear war between two countries in the sub-tropics in which each nation attacked the other’s most densely populated urban centers with 50 Hiroshima-size (15 kiloton per weapon) low-yield nuclear bombs.15 This scenario is possible because the smallest nuclear weapon states today (India and Pakistan) are each believed to possess more than 50 of these low-yield weapons, and an arsenal of this size (or larger) could be acquired by other nations in the near future. Thirty-two countries that do not now have nuclear weapons own sufficient fissionable nuclear materials to construct weapons, some in a relatively short period of time.16 U.S. warplanners aim their extensive nuclear arsenal at a mix of military targets (nuclear forces, conventional forces, leadership and communication facilities, and war-supporting industries)17 and it is assumed that Russian warplanners do the same. However, it is commonly believed that small nuclear powers with limited arsenals are most likely to aim their weapons at the largest cities of their adversaries. Toon et al. calculated that a “regional” nuclear war which employed this targeting strategy would create 1-5 million metric tons of soot from the burning cities.18 Robock et al. used the NASA climate model to demonstrate that this soot would be lofted to near the top of the stratosphere. 19 There the smoke would remain, far above the area where weather occurs, for at least a decade – about ten times longer than previously thought possible. Further modeling demonstrated that smoke particles from much larger nuclear conflicts would also remain in the upper stratosphere for a decade or more,20 and these findings provided the basis for rejecting the conclusion of the studies which suggested that “nuclear autumn” instead of nuclear winter would follow a full-scale war. Robock’s team also discovered that smoke in the sub-tropical latitudes would undergo more solar heating than smoke studied in previous nuclear winter scenarios, and this heating would insure that the smoke particles would be lofted into the stratosphere year-round, regardless of the month in which the war would occur.21 4 Figure 1: Map showing the present principal area of Canadian wheat production and the reduction that would result from small decreases in average surface temperature22 Although there would not be enough sunlight blocked to create a “nuclear winter”, the massive smoke emissions from the fires of a small “regional” nuclear war would cause a global climate change unprecedented in human history. In a matter of days, average temperatures in the Northern Hemisphere would become colder than any experienced during the last 1000 years.23 Growing seasons in the middle latitudes would immediately be significantly shortened, completely eliminating some crops that had insufficient time to reach maturity. The studies predict climatic consequences significantly greater and more persistent than those which resulted from greatest volcanic eruption of the past 500 years, the 1815 Tambora eruption in Indonesia. Tambora lofted enormous amounts of volcanic smoke particles into the stratosphere, which blocked and scattered enough sunlight to cause the 1816 “Year Without Summer,” when killing frosts disrupted agriculture every month of the summer in New England and widespread harvest failure and famine occurred in Europe. The long-term global climate, as measured by the average surface temperature over the planet, has not varied by more than 10º C from current values during the entire climatic history of the Earth accessible to modern science.24 Ice Ages represent periods of cooling of about 5º C below the global average which extend for periods of thousands of years. Modern agriculture is finely tuned to the present climate and would be severely impacted by rapid average temperature declines of even a few degrees Celsius. Computer simulations of the regional nuclear conflict predict a global average surface cooling of 1.25º C which would persist for three years, with the global average temperature still 0.5º C below normal a decade after the war. One year after the smoke injection there would be temperature drops of several degrees Celsius within the grain-growing interior regions of Eurasia and North America. There would be a corresponding shortening of growing seasons by up to 30 days and a 5 10% reduction in average global precipitation – which would have major impacts on global food supplies.25 In addition, the stratospheric smoke plumes from this regional conflict would significantly disrupt the ozone layer. Studies by Mills, et al, predict ozone losses of 25–45% at mid latitudes, and 50–70% at northern high latitudes persisting for 5 years, with substantial losses continuing for 5 additional years.26 Such levels of ozone loss have previously been forecast only for large nuclear conflicts between the U.S. and the former U.S.S.R.27 Severe ozone depletion would allow intense levels of ultraviolet light to reach the Earth even with the stratospheric smoke layer in place. It is unknown what effects such massive increases in UV would have upon terrestrial and marine wildlife and ecosystems. Unfortunately, no studies using modern climate models have yet been done to assess ozone depletion following larger nuclear conflicts fought with high-yield strategic nuclear weapons. This is an area of critically important research which should receive funding. Nuclear War Fought with High-Yield Strategic Nuclear Weapons Using the vastly more modern NASA climate model and new supercomputers, in 2007 Robock et al. re-examined the climate response to a range of nuclear wars which detonated moderate and large portions of the global nuclear arsenal in a combination of urban, industrial, and military targets.28 The researchers utilized data from previous studies to calculate that the “moderate” and “large” nuclear conflicts would produce 50 and 150 million tons of smoke,29 which they found would be lofted into the stratosphere, where it would impact surface climate for more than a decade.30 The “moderate” war simulation employed one third of the global nuclear arsenal (1,667 megatons) – roughly equivalent to 60% of the explosive power contained in the strategic nuclear weapons now kept at high-alert, launch-on-warning status by the U.S. and Russia.31 The large war simulation used one of the current published estimates for the total explosive power of the entire global nuclear arsenal (approximately 5,000 megatons). However, additional research in 2008 indicated that significantly lower total numbers of weapons and megatonnage (explosive power) could cause the same levels of damage and climate change previously predicted in the large war scenario.32 A large nuclear war would produce enough smoke and soot to quickly block a very large percentage of sunlight from reaching the surface of the entire Northern and Southern Hemispheres. In the target areas, for the first few days after the attack, sunlight would be reduced so much that at mid-day it would appear as dark as a moonlit night before the war.33 Within a matter of days, winds in the upper atmosphere would distribute this smoke and soot around the Earth. The research predicts that 150 million tons of stratospheric soot would block 70% of sunlight from reaching the surface of the Northern Hemisphere and 35% of sunlight from reaching the lands of the Southern Hemisphere.34 The global smoke layer would remain in place for about a decade, blocking the warming sunlight from reaching the surface of Earth. This profound darkening of the sky would cause average global surface air temperatures to rapidly cool by 7-8º C. Both the moderate and large nuclear wars would produce cooling equal to 6 or greater than that experienced 18,000 years ago during the coldest period of the last Ice Age35 – and these temperature drops would occur abruptly in a matter of days or weeks, rather than over centuries or millennia. The dramatic cooling of the Earth would take years to reverse; ten years later, after the smoke was gone, average surface temperatures would still be 4º C below normal. The most recent research (December, 2008) predicts that a U.S.-Russian war which detonated 4400 strategic nuclear weapons would put up to 180 million tons of soot into the stratosphere.36 The resulting nuclear darkness would cause rapid cooling of more than 20º C over large areas of North America and of more than 30º C over much of Eurasia, including all agricultural regions (Figure 2). Daily minimum temperatures in the world’s agricultural heartlands would plummet below freezing for one to three years. Figure 2: Surface Air Temperature (degree C) changes following a full-scale nuclear war averaged for June, July, and August of the year following the conflict.37 Under such conditions, it would be impossible to grow food crops for more than a decade. Long-term consequences of the large nuclear conflict are implied by Figure 3, which depicts predicted decreases in the growing seasons during the third year following the conflict. 7 Figure 3: Changes in the growing season (the time period with freeze-free days) in the third year following a large nuclear war which caused 150 million tons of smoke to enter the stratosphere.38 Agriculture would be affected by not only the catastrophic drops in temperature, but also by a dramatic decrease in sunlight (insolation) and precipitation. The cooling of the Earth’s surface would weaken the global hydrological cycle and the Northern Hemisphere summer monsoon circulations would collapse because the temperature differences that drive them would not develop. Consequently, a 45% reduction in average global precipitation is also predicted to occur. Catastrophic climatic effects lasting for many years would occur in regions far removed from the target areas or the countries involved in the conflict.39 Nuclear War Fought with U.S. and Russian High-Alert Strategic Nuclear Arsenals The failure of the U.S. and Russia to relax their Cold War nuclear confrontation has led each nation to continue to operate under policies that assume the opposing side could authorize a disabling nuclear attack against them. Both nations consequently still maintain a large fraction of their strategic nuclear arsenals on high-alert status (in 2009, more than 2000 warheads were on high-alert),40 with virtually all their land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles able to be launched within 30 seconds to 3 minutes, apparently operating under the policy of launch-on-warning.41 Thus the “moderate” war simulated in the new research, which as noted contains a destructive power equivalent to that contained by these high-alert arsenals, can be ordered and executed by either of these nations in less time than it takes to read this article. 8 The 2007 studies predicted that a “moderate” nuclear war which lofted 50 million tons of soot into the stratosphere would cause average global surface air temperatures to plummet 3.5-4º C, roughly half the drop predicted for a war which created 150 million tons of stratospheric soot.42 Consider that average global temperature declines of 3-4º C would prevent all grain production in Canada, and a single night below freezing is sufficient to destroy the entire Asian rice crop.43 Because of its rapid onset, this level of climate change (although the duration would be much briefer) would cause more stress to plant and animal life than would a severe Ice Age.44 Climatic Consequences of Nuclear Conflict Compared with Global Warming Climatic changes resulting from nuclear conflict would occur many thousands of times faster – and thus would likely be far more catastrophic – than the climatic changes predicted as a result of global warming.45 The rapidity of the war-induced changes, appearing in a matter of days and weeks, would allow human populations and the whole plant and animal kingdoms **no time to adapt**. It is worth noting that the same methods and climate models used to predict global warming were used in these studies to predict global cooling resulting from nuclear war. These climate models have proved highly successful in describing the cooling effects of volcanic clouds during extensive U.S. evaluations and in international intercomparisons performed as part of the Fourth Assessment of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.46 Predicted drops in average global temperatures caused by a range of nuclear conflicts are contrasted with the effects of global warming during the last 1,000 years in Figure 4. Global Warming versus Global Cooling from Nuclear War Figure 4: Northern Hemisphere average surface air temperatures anomalies during the last 1000 years contrasted with forecast temperature drops from a range of nuclear conflicts. The anomalies are with respect to the 1902-1988 Northern Hemisphere average surface air temperatures. 47 9 There are, of course, other important considerations which must be made when estimating the overall environmental and ecological impacts of nuclear war. These must include the release of enormous amounts of radioactive fallout, pyrotoxins, and toxic industrial chemicals into the ecosystems. A decade after the conflict, when the smoke begins to clear, there will also be massive increases in the amount of deadly ultraviolet light which will reach the surface of the Earth as a result of ozone depletion. All these by-products of nuclear war must be taken into account when comparing the danger of nuclear conflict to other potential dangers now confronting humanity and life on Earth. Conclusions The scientific studies summarized in this paper make it clear that the environmental consequences of nuclear war threaten the continued **survival of the human species**.

#### Even small nuclear attacks cause extinction

Toon et al ‘6 [Atmospheric eﬀects and societal consequences of regional scale nuclear conﬂicts and acts of individual nuclear terrorism O. B. Toon 1 , R. P. Turco 2 , A. Robock 3 , C. Bardeen 1 , L. Oman 3 , and G. L. Stenchikov 3 1 Department of Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences, Laboratory for Atmospheric and Space Physics, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado, USA 2 Department of Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences, Univ. of California, Los Angeles, USA 3 Department of Environmental Sciences, Rutgers Univ., New Brunswick, New Jersey, USA Received: 15 August 2006 – Accepted: 8 November 2006 – Published: 22 November 2006, http://www.atmos-chem-phys-discuss.net/6/11745/2006/acpd-6-11745-2006-print.pdf]

To an increasing extent, people are congregating in the world’s great urban centers, creating megacities with populations exceeding 10 million individuals. At the same time, advanced technology has designed nuclear explosives of such small size they can be easily transported in a car, small plane or boat to the heart of a city. We demonstrate here that a single detonation in the 15 kiloton range can produce urban fatalities approaching one million in some cases, and casualties exceeding one million. Thousands of small weapons still exist in the arsenals of the U.S. and Russia, and there are 5 at least six other countries with substantial nuclear weapons inventories. In all, thirtythree countries control suﬃcient amounts of highly enriched uranium or plutonium to assemble nuclear explosives. A conﬂict between any of these countries involving 50100 weapons with yields of 15 kt has the potential to create fatalities rivaling those of the Second World War. Moreover, even a single surface nuclear explosion, or an 10 air burst in rainy conditions, in a city center is likely to cause the entire metropolitan area to be abandoned at least for decades owing to infrastructure damage and radioactive contamination. As the aftermath of hurricane Katrina in Louisiana suggests, the economic consequences of even a localized nuclear catastrophe would most likely have severe national and international economic consequences. **Striking eﬀects result** even from **relatively small nuclear attacks** because low yield detonations are **most eﬀective against city centers** where business and social activity as well as population are concentrated. Rogue nations and terrorists would be **most likely to strike there**. Accordingly, an organized attack on the U.S. by a small nuclear state, or terrorists supported by such a state, could generate casualties comparable to those once predicted 20 for a full-scale nuclear “counterforce” exchange in a superpower conﬂict. Remarkably, the **estimated quantities of smoke** generated by attacks totaling about one megaton of nuclear explosives **could lead to signiﬁcant global climate perturbations** (Robock et al., 2006).

#### Prefer the specificity of our impacts- their overly optimistic “no war” theories aren’t grounded in empirics and can’t predict all state action

Busch ‘4 (Nathan E. Busch, assistant professor of political science at Christopher Newport University, 10/8/04, “No End in Sight: The continuing menace of nuclear proliferation”, p. 313

While abstract theorizing can be found on both sides of the debate, it is especially common among the optimists. Rather than asking how NWSs actually *do* act, optimists have begun with theories of how states *should* act – that is, in accordance with supposedly “realist” rational-actor models-and predicted the actions of states on that basis. One need only recall Waltz’s confident statement, “We do not have to wonder whether they [NWSs] will take good care of their weapons. They have every incentive to do so.”130 On the contrary, the proper approach to theory would *begin* with wonder about whether states do, in fact, always act with such rational incentives in mind. As the present study has demonstrated, there is little empirical support for such an optimistic position where nuclear proliferation is concerned. While realist theories may be useful for explaining certain types of state actions, they are inappropriate models for predicting specific policies and actions that NWSs will take. Having oversimplified the causes and motivations of state action, the optimists make highly inappropriate policy recommendations regarding nuclear proliferation. Indeed, those recommendations go beyond what the optimists’ own theories could possible support. In a context *other* than the proliferation debate, Waltz argues that his theories cannot predict specific policies or particular actions by individual states; instead, he maintains, they can only predict general trends.131 But, as Jeffrey Knopf has pointed out, when one is advocating a further proliferation of nuclear weapons, predicting general trends is not enough: one must be certain that one’s theories are correct *all of the time*.132 It is likely that a certain awareness of the special dangers attending nuclear weapons policy leads Waltz to misapply his own realist theory and predict that NWSs will act rationally without exception. But that awareness must be replace by fully conscious practical reasoning. Empirically grounded theories, combined with the prudence of the policymaker, would lead to policy recommendations that are more sound.

#### Miscalculation ensures conflict- history proves war can still occur

Mearsheimer ’99 (Distinguished Professor of Political Science, 1999. (John Mearsheimer, “Is Major War Obsolete?” 1999, http://www.ciaonet.org/conf/cfr10/index.html)

The whole subject of rationality is a fascinating subject. I want to emphasize here that when I say states behave rationally, that doesn’t mean that they can’t then go out and make moves that produce catastrophes. The fact of the matter is that states behaving rationally oftentimes miscalculate and end up shooting themselves in the foot. One very important aspect of international politics is the fact that when states make decisions, not only are they making those decisions based on imperfect information, but in many cases they are dealing with other states that are going to considerable lengths to fool them, to confuse them, to provide them with information that is incorrect misinformation. Because you’re working with imperfect information and because you’re oftentimes being confused by the adversary, you often times goof in a big way. I would make the argument just to highlight that when Hitler decided to invade the Soviet Union in June 1941, although it fortunately ended up with him shooting himself in a bunker in Berlin in April 1945, when he went into the Soviet Union, in my opinion, it was the result of a relatively rational decision-making process. They just miscalculated; they just guessed wrong.

### 1NC – Spills

#### 1) No drilling in the Status Quo – all companies have bailed.

O’Grady ‘13

Mary O'Grady is a member of the editorial board at The Wall Street Journal – WSJ – April 24, 2013 – http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887324474004578442511561458392.html

Then came promises of an oil boom and last week the predictable bust. The Brazilian state-owned Petrobras PETR4.BR +1.01% had given up on deep-sea drilling in Cuban waters in 2011. Repsol REP.MC -2.46% gave up in May 2012. The deep water platform it was using was then passed to Malaysia's state-owned Petronas, which also came up empty. Venezuela's PDVSA had no luck either. In November Cuba announced that the rig that had been in use would be heading to Asia. Last week came the end of shallow-water drilling.

#### 2) The plan causes more drilling which makes accidents more likely—turns the advantage

Krauss ‘12

(et al; Clifford Krauss has been a correspondent for The New York Times since 1990. He currently is a national business correspondent based in Houston, covering energy. He covered the State Department, Congress and the New York City police department before serving as Buenos Aires bureau chief and Toronto bureau chief. Before working at The Times, he worked as a foreign correspondent for The Wall Street Journal and was the Edward R. Murrow fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations. He is author of “Inside Central America: Its People, Politics and History,” (1991). He has published articles in Foreign Affairs, GQ and Wilson Quarterly, along with other publications. New York Times – November 9, 2012 – http://www.nytimes.com/2012/11/10/world/americas/rigs-departure-to-hamper-cubas-oil-prospects.html?\_r=0)

The best-case scenario for production, according to some oil experts, would be for Cuba to eventually become a medium-size producer like Ecuador. But as the three dry holes showed, far more exploration effort would be needed, and that presents a challenge for a country with limited resources and the hurdle of American sanctions. There are many offshore areas that are competing with Cuba for the attention of oil companies, particularly off the coasts of South America and East and West Africa.¶ In Cuba’s case, the American embargo makes it far more difficult for companies seeking to explore Cuban waters. The Scarabeo 9, the rig set to depart, is the only one available that is capable of drilling in deep waters and complies with the embargo. To get it built, Repsol, the Spanish oil giant, was forced to contract an Italian operator to build a rig in China to drill exploration wells.

#### 3) Cuban and non-US prevention efforts are sufficient now.

Sadowski ‘11

Richard Sadowski is a Class of 2012 J.D. candidate, at Hofstra University¶ School of Law, NY. Mr. Sadowski is also the Managing Editor of Production of¶ the Journal of International Business and Law Vol. XI. “Cuban Offshore Drilling: Preparation and¶ Prevention within the Framework of the United¶ States’ Embargo” – ¶ Sustainable Development Law & Policy¶ Volume 12; Issue 1 Fall 2011: Natural Resource Conflicts Article 10 – http://digitalcommons.wcl.american.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1497&context=sdlp

Fears that Cuban offshore drilling poses serious environmental¶ threats because of the proximity to the United States and¶ the prohibition on U.S. technology transfer are overblown. Cuba¶ has at least as much incentive to ensure safe-drilling practices¶ as does the United States, and reports indicate that Cuba is taking¶ safety seriously.64 Lee Hunt, President of the Houston-based¶ International Association of Drilling Contractors, said, “[t]he¶ Cuban oil industry has put a lot of research, study and thought¶ into what will be required to safely drill,” and that “they are¶ very knowledgeable of international industry practices and have¶ incorporated many of these principles into their safety and regulatory¶ planning and requirements.”65 Thus, while the economic¶ embargo of Cuba restricts American technology from being utilized,¶ foreign sources have provided supplemental alternatives.66

#### 4) Sanctions won’t block US safety response – Helix proves.

Bolstad ‘12

Erika Bolstad is a reporter who covers Washington for the Anchorage Daily News, the Idaho Statesman and McClatchy Newspapers. This evidence internally quotes Lee Hunt, the former president of the International Association of Drilling Contractors. Hunt, in this instance, is arguably not biased in favor of drilling, as he is speaking to safety and clean-up regimes and he is speaking before a liberal think-tank in favor of human rights – McClatchy Newspapers – May 10, 2012 – http://www.mcclatchydc.com/2012/05/10/148433/cuba-embargo-could-threaten-oil.html#.UaoUWpyADq0

Several of the experts said Thursday they are confident that the Treasury Department could react quickly in an emergency to allow U.S. oil response teams to get emergency permits to do business with the Cuban government.¶ The department, which oversees the embargo, has authorized an American firm, Helix Energy Solutions, to handle spill response for Repsol. It’s a red-tape ordeal that company officials said they’ll have to repeat when working with the other companies that have contracted to use the same rig next in Cuban waters.

#### 5) Cuban oil spills stay contained – no risk of large spread

Whittle ‘12

Daniel J. Whittle et al, Cuba Program Director for the Oceans Program, Environmental Defense Fund, 2012, “Bridging the Gulf: Finding Common Ground on Environmental and Safety Preparedness for Offshore Oil and Gas in Cuba,” http://www.edf.org/sites/default/files/EDF-Bridging\_the\_Gulf-2012.pdf

While areas at risk of immediate impact appear to be those along the Straits of Florida and U.S. south Atlantic coast, scientists are careful to note that the models are far from precise, authoritative forecasts. NOAA specialists themselves emphasize that the models vary significantly based on weather data and location of the drilling site. Richard Sears, who served as chief scientific advisor on the federal commission that investigated the Deepwater Horizon disaster, stressed there was significant uncertainty in projecting the path of the BP oil slick in 2010, even with the combined technical expertise of federal agencies and private companies.42 “There were a wide array of models surrounding the BP spill, ranging from most of the oil projected to come ashore to Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and Florida—to a significant portion going out through the Straits of Florida and up the East Coast towards North Carolina,” Sears said in a personal interview. “Neither of those happened.”

#### Marine ecosystems are resilient

Kennedy ‘2

Victor Kennedy, PhD Environmental Science and Dir. Cooperative Oxford Lab., 2002, “Coastal and Marine Ecosystems and Global Climate Change,” Pew, http://www.pewclimate.org/projects/marine.cfm

There is evidence that marine organisms and ecosystems are resilient to environmental change. Steele (1991) hypothesized that the biological components of marine systems are tightly coupled to physical factors, allowing them to respond quickly to rapid environmental change and thus rendering them ecologically adaptable. Some species also have wide genetic variability throughout their range, which may allow for adaptation to climate change.

#### **No impact to the environment**

Sagoff 97  Mark, Senior Research Scholar – Institute for Philosophy and Public policy in School of Public Affairs – U. Maryland, William and Mary Law Review, “Institute Of Bill Of Rights Law Symposium Defining Takings: Private Property And The Future Of Government Regulation: Muddle Or Muddle Through? Takings Jurisprudence Meets The Endangered Species Act”, 38 Wm and Mary L. Rev. 825, March, L/N

Although one may agree with ecologists such as Ehrlich and Raven that the earth stands on the brink of an episode of massive extinction, it may not follow from this grim fact that human beings will suffer as a result. On the contrary, skeptics such as science writer Colin Tudge have challenged biologists to explain why we need more than a tenth of the 10 to 100 million species that grace the earth. Noting that "cultivated systems often out-produce wild systems by 100-fold or more," Tudge declared that "the argument that humans need the variety of other species is, when you think about it, a theological one." n343 Tudge observed that "the elimination of all but a tiny minority of our fellow creatures does not affect the material well-being of humans one iota." n344 This skeptic challenged ecologists to list more than 10,000 species (other than unthreatened microbes) that are essential to ecosystem productivity or functioning. n345 "The human species could survive just as well if 99.9% of our fellow creatures went extinct, provided only that we retained the appropriate 0.1% that we need." n346   [\*906]   The monumental Global Biodiversity Assessment ("the Assessment") identified two positions with respect to redundancy of species. "At one extreme is the idea that each species is unique and important, such that its removal or loss will have demonstrable consequences to the functioning of the community or ecosystem." n347 The authors of the Assessment, a panel of eminent ecologists, endorsed this position, saying it is "unlikely that there is much, if any, ecological redundancy in communities over time scales of decades to centuries, the time period over which environmental policy should operate." n348 These eminent ecologists rejected the opposing view, "the notion that species overlap in function to a sufficient degree that removal or loss of a species will be compensated by others, with negligible overall consequences to the community or ecosystem." n349  Other biologists believe, however, that species are so fabulously redundant in the ecological functions they perform that the life-support systems and processes of the planet and ecological processes in general will function perfectly well with fewer of them, certainly fewer than the millions and millions we can expect to remain even if every threatened organism becomes extinct. n350 Even the kind of sparse and miserable world depicted in the movie Blade Runner could provide a "sustainable" context for the human economy as long as people forgot their aesthetic and moral commitment to the glory and beauty of the natural world. n351 The Assessment makes this point. "Although any ecosystem contains hundreds to thousands of species interacting among themselves and their physical environment, the emerging consensus is that the system is driven by a small number of . . . biotic variables on whose interactions the balance of species are, in a sense, carried along." n352   [\*907]   To make up your mind on the question of the functional redundancy of species, consider an endangered species of bird, plant, or insect and ask how the ecosystem would fare in its absence. The fact that the creature is endangered suggests an answer: it is already in limbo as far as ecosystem processes are concerned. What crucial ecological services does the black-capped vireo, for example, serve? Are any of the species threatened with extinction necessary to the provision of any ecosystem service on which humans depend? If so, which ones are they?  Ecosystems and the species that compose them have changed, dramatically, continually, and totally in virtually every part of the United States. There is little ecological similarity, for example, between New England today and the land where the Pilgrims died. n353 In view of the constant reconfiguration of the biota, one may wonder why Americans have not suffered more as a result of ecological catastrophes. The cast of species in nearly every environment changes constantly-local extinction is commonplace in nature-but the crops still grow. Somehow, it seems, property values keep going up on Martha's Vineyard in spite of the tragic disappearance of the heath hen.  One might argue that the sheer number and variety of creatures available to any ecosystem buffers that system against stress. Accordingly, we should be concerned if the "library" of creatures ready, willing, and able to colonize ecosystems gets too small. (Advances in genetic engineering may well permit us to write a large number of additions to that "library.") In the United States as in many other parts of the world, however, the number of species has been increasing dramatically, not decreasing, as a result of human activity. This is because the hordes of exotic species coming into ecosystems in the United States far exceed the number of species that are becoming extinct. Indeed, introductions may outnumber extinctions by more than ten to one, so that the United States is becoming more and more species-rich all the time largely as a result of human action. n354 [\*908] Peter Vitousek and colleagues estimate that over 1000 non-native plants grow in California alone; in Hawaii there are 861; in Florida, 1210. n355 In Florida more than 1000 non-native insects, 23 species of mammals, and about 11 exotic birds have established themselves. n356 Anyone who waters a lawn or hoes a garden knows how many weeds desire to grow there, how many birds and bugs visit the yard, and how many fungi, creepy-crawlies, and other odd life forms show forth when it rains. All belong to nature, from wherever they might hail, but not many homeowners would claim that there are too few of them. Now, not all exotic species provide ecosystem services; indeed, some may be disruptive or have no instrumental value. n357 This also may be true, of course, of native species as well, especially because all exotics are native somewhere. Certain exotic species, however, such as Kentucky blue grass, establish an area's sense of identity and place; others, such as the green crabs showing up around Martha's Vineyard, are nuisances. n358 Consider an analogy [\*909] with human migration. Everyone knows that after a generation or two, immigrants to this country are hard to distinguish from everyone else. The vast majority of Americans did not evolve here, as it were, from hominids; most of us "came over" at one time or another. This is true of many of our fellow species as well, and they may fit in here just as well as we do. It is possible to distinguish exotic species from native ones for a period of time, just as we can distinguish immigrants from native-born Americans, but as the centuries roll by, species, like people, fit into the landscape or the society, changing and often enriching it. Shall we have a rule that a species had to come over on the Mayflower, as so many did, to count as "truly" American? Plainly not. When, then, is the cutoff date? Insofar as we are concerned with the absolute numbers of "rivets" holding ecosystems together, extinction seems not to pose a general problem because a far greater number of kinds of mammals, insects, fish, plants, and other creatures thrive on land and in water in America today than in prelapsarian times. n359 The Ecological Society of America has urged managers to maintain biological diversity as a critical component in strengthening ecosystems against disturbance. n360 Yet as Simon Levin observed, "much of the detail about species composition will be irrelevant in terms of influences on ecosystem properties." n361 [\*910] He added: "For net primary productivity, as is likely to be the case for any system property, biodiversity matters only up to a point; above a certain level, increasing biodiversity is likely to make little difference." n362 What about the use of plants and animals in agriculture? There is no scarcity foreseeable. "Of an estimated 80,000 types of plants [we] know to be edible," a U.S. Department of the Interior document says, "only about 150 are extensively cultivated." n363 About twenty species, not one of which is endangered, provide ninety percent of the food the world takes from plants. n364 Any new food has to take "shelf space" or "market share" from one that is now produced. Corporations also find it difficult to create demand for a new product; for example, people are not inclined to eat paw-paws, even though they are delicious. It is hard enough to get people to eat their broccoli and lima beans. It is harder still to develop consumer demand for new foods. This may be the reason the Kraft Corporation does not prospect in remote places for rare and unusual plants and animals to add to the world's diet. Of the roughly 235,000 flowering plants and 325,000 nonflowering plants (including mosses, lichens, and seaweeds) available, farmers ignore virtually all of them in favor of a very few that are profitable. n365 To be sure, any of the more than 600,000 species of plants could have an application in agriculture, but would they be preferable to the species that are now dominant? Has anyone found any consumer demand for any of these half-million or more plants to replace rice or wheat in the human diet? There are reasons that farmers cultivate rice, wheat, and corn rather than, say, Furbish's lousewort. There are many kinds of louseworts, so named because these weeds were thought to cause lice in sheep. How many does agriculture really require? [\*911] The species on which agriculture relies are domesticated, not naturally occurring; they are developed by artificial not natural selection; they might not be able to survive in the wild. n366 This argument is not intended to deny the religious, aesthetic, cultural, and moral reasons that command us to respect and protect the natural world. These spiritual and ethical values should evoke action, of course, but we should also recognize that they are spiritual and ethical values. We should recognize that ecosystems and all that dwell therein compel our moral respect, our aesthetic appreciation, and our spiritual veneration; we should clearly seek to achieve the goals of the ESA. There is no reason to assume, however, that these goals have anything to do with human well-being or welfare as economists understand that term. These are ethical goals, in other words, not economic ones. Protecting the marsh may be the right thing to do for moral, cultural, and spiritual reasons. We should do it-but someone will have to pay the costs. In the narrow sense of promoting human welfare, protecting nature often represents a net "cost," not a net "benefit." It is largely for moral, not economic, reasons-ethical, not prudential, reasons- that we care about all our fellow creatures. They are valuable as objects of love not as objects of use. What is good for   [\*912]  the marsh may be good in itself even if it is not, in the economic sense, good for mankind. The most valuable things are quite useless.

### 1NC – Cred

#### The ends justify the means

Isaac 2 – (Jeffrey, Professor of PoliSci @ Indiana-Bloomington, Director of the Center for the Study of Democracy and Public Life, PhD Yale, “Ends, Means, and Politics,” Dissent Magazine Vol 49 Issue 2)

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

#### In the face of extinction you have to weigh consequences - outweighs all else

Bok 88 (Sissela Bok, Professor of Philosophy @ Brandeis University, 1988, Applied Ethical Theory, ed. Rosenthal and Shehadi, pg. 203)

The same argument can be made for Kant’s other formulations of the Categorical Imperative: “So act as to use humanity, both in your own person and in the person of every other, always at the same time as an end, never simply as a means”; and “So act as if you were always through your actions a law-making member in a universal kingdom of Ends.” No one with a concern for humanity could consistently will to risk eliminating humanity in the person of himself and every other or to risk the death of all members in a universal Kingdom of Ends for the sake of justice. To risk their collective death for the sake of following one’s conscience would be as Rawls said, “irrational, crazy,” And to say that one did not intend such a catastrophe, but that one merely failed to stop other persons from bringing it about would be beside the point when the end of the world was at stake. For although it is true that we cannot be held responsible for most of the wrongs that others commit, the Latin maxim presents a case where we would have to take such a responsibility seriously – perhaps to the point of deceiving, bribing, even killing an innocent person, in order that the world not perish. To avoid self-contradiction, the Categorical imperative would, therefore, have to rule against the Latin maxim on account of its cavalier attitude toward the survival of mankind. But the ruling would then produce a rift in the application of the Categorical Imperative. Most often the Imperative would ask us to disregard all unintended but foreseeable consequences, such as the death of innocent persons, whenever concern for such consequences conflicts with concern for acting according to duty. But, in the extreme case, we might have to go against even the strictest moral duty precisely because of the consequences.

#### This is particularly true for policymakers

Ignatieff 4 (Michael, Carr Professor of Human Rights @ Harvard, Lesser Evils, p. 18-19)

As for moral perfectionism, this would be the doctrine that a liberal state should never have truck with dubious moral means and should spare its officials the hazard of having to decide between lesser and greater evils. A moral perfectionist position also holds that states can spare their officials this hazard simply by adhering to the universal moral standards set out in human rights conventions and the laws of war. There are two problems with a perfectionist stance, leaving aside the question of whether it is realistic. The first is that articulating nonrevocable, nonderogable moral standards is relatively easy. The problem is deciding how to apply them in specific cases. What is the line between interrogation and torture, between targeted killing and unlawful assassination, between preemption and aggression? Even when legal and moral distinctions between these are clear in the abstract, abstractions are less than helpful when political leaders have to choose between them in practice. Furthermore, the problem with perfectionist standards is that they contradict each other. The same person who shudders, rightly, at the prospect of torturing a suspect might be prepared to kill the same suspect in a preemptive attack on a terrorist base. Equally, the perfectionist commitment to the right to life might preclude such attacks altogether and restrict our response to judicial pursuit of offenders through process of law. Judicial responses to the problem of terror have their place, but they are no substitute for military operations when terrorists possess bases, training camps, and heavy weapons. To stick to a perfectionist commitment to the right to life when under terrorist attack might achieve moral consistency at the price of leaving us defenseless in the face of evildoers. Security, moreover, is a human right, and thus respect for one right might lead us to betray another.

#### Reject engagement with human rights abusers — *moral duty* to shun.

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

A fundamental task of morality is resolving conflicting interests. If we both want the same piece of land, ethics provides a basis for resolving the conflict by identifying "mine" and "thine." If in anger I want to smash your [end page 17] face, ethics indicates that your face's being unsmashed is a legitimate interest of yours which takes precedence over my own interest in expressing my rage. Thus ethics identifies the rights of individuals when their interests conflict.

But how can a case for shunning be made on this view of morality? Whose interests (rights) does shunning protect? The shunner may well have to sacrifice his interest, e.g., by foregoing a beneficial trade relationship, but whose rights are thereby protected? In shunning there seem to be no "rights" that are protected. For shunning, as we have seen, does not assume that the resulting cost will change the disapproved behavior. If economic sanctions against South Africa will not bring apartheid to an end, and thus will not help the blacks get their rights, on what grounds might it be a duty to impose such sanctions?

We find the answer when we note that there is another "level" of moral duties. When Galtung speaks of "reinforcing … morality," he has identified a duty that goes beyond specific acts of respecting people's rights. The argument goes like this: There is more involved in respecting the rights of others than not violating them by one's actions. For if there is such a thing as a moral order, which unites people in a moral community, then surely one has a duty (at least prima facie) not only to avoid violating the rights of others with one's actions but also to support that moral order.

Consider that the moral order itself contributes significantly to people's rights being respected. It does so by encouraging and reinforcing moral behavior and by discouraging and sanctioning immoral behavior. In this moral community people mutually reinforce each other's moral behavior and thus raise the overall level of morality. Were this moral order to disintegrate, were people to stop reinforcing each other's moral behavior, there would be much more violation of people's rights. Thus to the extent that behavior affects the moral order, it indirectly affects people's rights. And this is where shunning fits in.

Certain types of behavior constitute a direct attack on the moral order. When the violation of human rights is flagrant, willful, and persistent, the offender is, as it were, thumbing her nose at the moral order, publicly rejecting it as binding her behavior. Clearly such behavior, if tolerated by society, will weaken and perhaps eventually undermine altogether the moral order. Let us look briefly at those three conditions which turn immoral behavior into an attack on the moral order.

An immoral action is flagrant if it is "extremely or deliberately conspicuous; notorious, shocking." Etymologically the word means "burning" or "blazing." The definition of shunning implies therefore that those offenses require shunning which are shameless or indiscreet, which the person makes no effort to hide and no good-faith effort to excuse. Such actions "blaze forth" as an attack on the moral order. But to merit shunning the action must also be willful and persistent. We do not consider the actions of the "backslider," the [end page 18] weak-willed, the one-time offender to be challenges to the moral order. It is the repeat offender, the unrepentant sinner, the cold-blooded violator of morality whose behavior demands that others publicly reaffirm the moral order. When someone flagrantly, willfully, and repeatedly violates the moral order, those who believe in the moral order, the members of the moral community, must respond in a way that reaffirms the legitimacy of that moral order. How does shunning do this?

First, by refusing publicly to have to do with such a person one announces support for the moral order and backs up the announcement with action. This action reinforces the commitment to the moral order both of the shunner and of the other members of the community. (Secretary of State Shultz in effect made this argument in his call for international sanctions on Libya in the early days of 1986.)

Further, shunning may have a moral effect on the shunned person, even if the direct impact is not adequate to change the immoral behavior. If the shunned person thinks of herself as part of the moral community, shunning may well make clear to her that she is, in fact, removing herself from that community by the behavior in question. Thus shunning may achieve by moral suasion what cannot be achieved by "force."

Finally, shunning may be a form of punishment, of moral sanction, whose appropriateness depends not on whether it will change the person's behavior, but on whether he deserves the punishment for violating the moral order. Punishment then can be viewed as a way of maintaining the moral order, of "purifying the community" after it has been made "unclean," as ancient communities might have put it.

Yet not every immoral action requires that we shun. As noted above, we live in a fallen world. None of us is perfect. If the argument implied that we may have nothing to do with anyone who is immoral, it would consist of a reductio of the very notion of shunning. To isolate a person, to shun him, to give him the "silent treatment," is a serious thing. Nothing strikes at a person's wellbeing as person more directly than such ostracism. Furthermore, not every immoral act is an attack on the moral order. Actions which are repented and actions which are done out of weakness of will clearly violate but do not attack the moral order. Thus because of the serious nature of shunning, it is defined as a response not just to any violation of the moral order, but to attacks on the moral order itself through flagrant, willful, and persistent wrongdoing.

We can also now see why failure to shun can under certain circumstances suggest complicity. But it is not that we have a duty to shun because failure to do so suggests complicity. Rather, because we have an obligation to shun in certain circumstances, when we fail to do so others may interpret our failure as tacit complicity in the willful, persistent, and flagrant immorality.

#### Cred inevitable

Walsh 9 [Kenneth, Chief White House Correspondent, “Obama, Like Bush, Uses Crisis to Expand Presidential Power” US News and World Report, March 16, http://www.usnews.com/articles/news/obama/2009/03/16/obama-like-bush-uses-crisis-to-expand-presidential-power.html?PageNr=2]

It's clear that Obama is intent on changing America's course in a dramatic way, as Ronald Reagan did in 1981. But [Obama](http://www.usnews.com/articles/news/obama/2009/03/16/obama-like-bush-uses-crisis-to-expand-presidential-power.html?PageNr=2" \t "undefined), while he admires Reagan's "transformational" approach, seeks to reverse much of what Reagan accomplished. "This is a guy who is defining a new way forward," says Will Marshall, president of the centrist Progressive Policy Institute. "This is terra incognita. People aren't used to seeing changes in government that are this dramatic." In a way, Obama is doing what George W. Bush did in the national security sphere, using a crisis to expand presidential authority. After the 9/11 terrorist attacks, Bush moved to increase and exert his war-making powers. Now, amid the recession and financial meltdown, Obama is moving to increase and exert his peacetime powers. The result in both cases **has been a more muscular presidency**.

### 1NC – Relations

#### 1) Normalized US-Cuban ties coming. Happens by 2018 under Diaz-Canel.

Gott ‘13

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

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

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

#### 2) A Drilling agreement alone won’t spill-over to broad relations

Padgett ‘12

Tim Padgett joined TIME in 1996 as Mexico City bureau chief covering Latin America. In 1999 he moved to Florida to become TIME’s Miami & Latin America bureau chief, reporting on the hemisphere from Tallahassee to Tierra del Fuego. He has chronicled Mexico’s democratization and drug war as well as the rise of Latin leaders like Lula and Hugo Chavez, TIME, 1-27-2012, “The Oil Off Cuba: Washington and Havana Dance at Arms Length Over Spill Prevention,” http://www.time.com/time/world/article/0,8599,2105598,00.html#ixzz2NxDjxp81, accessed 5-10-2013

What experts on both sides of the Straits hope is that sea currents will carry any oil slick directly out into the Atlantic Ocean. But that's wishful thinking. So probably is the notion that U.S.-Cuba cooperation on offshore drilling can be duplicated on other fronts. Among them are the embargo, including the arguably unconstitutional ban on U.S. travel to Cuba, which has utterly failed to dislodge the Castro regime but which Washington keeps in place for fear of offending Cuban-American voters in swing-state Florida; and cases like that of Alan Gross, a U.S. aid worker imprisoned in Cuba since 2009 on what many call questionable spying charges.

#### 3) Alt causes to US-Cuban ties – Human Rights, Guantanamo, and Cuban exiles

Hanson & Lee ‘13

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

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

#### 4) Cuba doesn’t want close relations with the US

French ‘13

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

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

#### Warming not real- recent temperatures show no increase

Happer ‘12

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

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

#### Not anthropogenic – multiple warrants

Spencer ‘12

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

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

#### Warming is slow – and not real

Taylor ’11 (7/27- senior fellow for environment policy at the Heartland Institute (2011, “New NASA Data Blow Gaping Hole In Global Warming Alarmism,” Forbes, http://blogs.forbes.com/jamestaylor/2011/07/27/new-nasa-data-blow-gaping-hold-in-global-warming-alarmism/)

NASA satellite data from the years 2000 through 2011 show the Earth’s atmosphere is allowing far more heat to be released into space than alarmist computer models have predicted, reports a new study in the peer-revewed science journal Remote Sensing. The study indicates far less future global warming will occur than United Nations computer models have predicted, and supports prior studies indicating increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide trap far less heat than alarmists have claimed. Study co-author Dr. Roy Spencer, a principal research scientist at the University of Alabama in Huntsville and U.S. Science Team Leader for the Advanced Microwave Scanning Radiometer flying on NASA’s Aqua satellite, reports that real-world data from NASA’s Terra satellite contradict multiple assumptions fed into alarmist computer models. “The satellite observations suggest there is much more energy lost to space during and after warming than the climate models show,” Spencer said in a July 26 University of Alabama press release. “There is a huge discrepancy between the data and the forecasts that is especially big over the oceans.” In addition to finding that far less heat is being trapped than alarmist computer models have predicted, the NASA satellite data show the atmosphere begins shedding heat into space long before United Nations computer models predicted. The new findings are extremely important and should dramatically alter the global warming debate. Scientists on all sides of the global warming debate are in general agreement about how much heat is being directly trapped by human emissions of carbon dioxide (the answer is “not much”). However, the single most important issue in the global warming debate is whether carbon dioxide emissions will indirectly trap far more heat by causing large increases in atmospheric humidity and cirrus clouds. Alarmist computer models assume human carbon dioxide emissions indirectly cause substantial increases in atmospheric humidity and cirrus clouds (each of which are very effective at trapping heat), but real-world data have long shown that carbon dioxide emissions are not causing as much atmospheric humidity and cirrus clouds as the alarmist computer models have predicted. The new NASA Terra satellite data are consistent with long-term NOAA and NASA data indicating atmospheric humidity and cirrus clouds are not increasing in the manner predicted by alarmist computer models. The Terra satellite data also support data collected by NASA’s ERBS satellite showing far more longwave radiation (and thus, heat) escaped into space between 1985 and 1999 than alarmist computer models had predicted. Together, the NASA ERBS and Terra satellite data show that for 25 years and counting, carbon dioxide emissions have directly and indirectly trapped far less heat than alarmist computer models have predicted. In short, the central premise of alarmist global warming theory is that carbon dioxide emissions should be directly and indirectly trapping a certain amount of heat in the earth’s atmosphere and preventing it from escaping into space. Real-world measurements, however, show far less heat is being trapped in the earth’s atmosphere than the alarmist computer models predict, and far more heat is escaping into space than the alarmist computer models predict. When objective NASA satellite data, reported in a peer-reviewed scientific journal, show a “huge discrepancy” between alarmist climate models and real-world facts, climate scientists, the media and our elected officials would be wise to take notice. Whether or not they do so will tell us a great deal about how honest the purveyors of global warming alarmism truly are.

# 2NC

## China DA

#### China won’t collapse development---their restructuring will actually help LAC economies

Sarmiento-Saher 13 (Sebastian Sarmiento-Saher is an editorial assistant for The Diplomat, “China and Latin America: Big Business and Big Competition” http://thediplomat.com/china-power/china-and-latin-america-big-business-and-big-competition/)

Despite these issues, recent external and internal developments may be creating an opportunity for the region to balance its growing economic relations with China. Notably, China’s comparative advantage may be eroding due to increased production costs and Beijing’s desire to lead its economy toward higher-end manufacturing and domestic consumption. If this trend continues, it would help beleaguered Mexico, whose security and political problems may finally start to improve and give Mexican industries a chance to compete on the global stage. Using targeted policies, other countries with manufacturing sectors may benefit from China’s economic restructuring. In terms of development overall, alarmism about China keeping LAC economies dependent on natural resources is overblown. As Latin America continues to grapple with deficits in infrastructure, education, and social mobility, the question about whether growing economic ties with the PRC will be a burden or a key opportunity lies in the actions of Latin America, not China. The central issue is about governance: those countries that benefit over the long term from the current commodity boom will be the ones most judicious when it comes to future investments and industrial policy. Fighting corruption is difficult anywhere, and Latin America is no exception. As democracy deepens and middle classes emerge in the region, new stakeholders will hold governments accountable.

## Relations

#### They don’t even want relations —

French 13 – Anya Landau, Writer for The Havana Note, 2/10/13, (“Secretary Kerry: Will He or Won't He Take On Cuba?”, <http://thehavananote.com/2013/02/secretary_kerry_will_he_or_wont_he_take_cuba>, AW)

And, then there’s the Cuban government. As much as many in the Cuban government (particularly the diplomatic corps) want to reduce tensions with the United States and finally make real progress on long-standing grievances held by both sides, they aren’t desperate for the big thaw. Many U.S. analysts, including in government, speculate that this is because Cuba’s leaders don’t really want to change the relationship, that strife serves their needs better than would the alternative. That could be so, but there’s also a hefty amount of skepticism and pride on the Cuban side, as well. After so many decades and layers of what Cuba calls the U.S. blockade, Cubans are unwilling to have the terms of any ‘surrender’ dictated to them. In fact, they are bound and determined that there will be no surrender. They would argue, what is there to surrender but their government’s very existence, something the leadership obviously isn’t going to put on the table.¶ Many in the Cuban government question whether the U.S. would offer anything that truly matters to Cuba, or honor any commitments made. Arguably, the last deal the U.S. made good on was struck during the Missile Crisis of October 1963, and Cuba wasn’t even at the table for that. It’s a lesser known fact that the United States never fully implemented the 1994/1995 migration accords, which committed both nations to work to prevent migration by irregular means. The U.S. did stop accepting illegal migrants from Cuba found at sea, but it still accepts them when they reach our shores – thus dubbed our ‘wet foot, dry foot’ policy. And with our generous adjustment policy offering a green card after one year, the incentive to make the illegal trip remains largely in place.

## Cred

#### Squo solves Obama power

NPR 12-31-2011; Obama's Grade In Foreign Policy 2011: 'Incomplete' http://m.wfiu.npr.org/news/front/144442535?page=2

"You have a world in which there is political turmoil in many countries. You have the worst American economic situation in recent memory," Cordesman says. "You have almost partisan paralysis in the Congress that affects foreign policy as well as domestic policy." Collective Action These challenges are one reason Obama has always emphasized a collective approach to foreign action. This president argues that it's easier to get things done when lots of countries are pushing in the same direction. White House Deputy National Security Adviser Ben Rhodes describes it as "fostering collective action on behalf of our interests." "In 2011, we saw the clearest demonstration of the strength of multilateral action in Libya than we've seen in perhaps decades," he says, "in that you had an immediate action taken by the United States to build an international coalition to stop a potential mass atrocity on the ground." That effort was ultimately successful: Today, Gadhafi is gone. Rhodes says the emphasis on coalitions has paid off in other ways, too. During foreign trips, Obama has focused on strengthening ties with Asia and with the booming economies of Latin America. "If you look at our core alliances, there's no question whatsoever that they're stronger under this administration than under the previous one," Rhodes says. Andy Kohut agrees. His Pew Global Attitudes Project surveys international opinions about the U.S. "The image of the United States remains highly positive in much of the world," he says.

#### Or they can’t solve Obama power

Lincoln Mitchell 12-25-2011; Arnold A. Saltzman Assistant Professor in the Practice of International Politics at Cornell; Foreign Policy The Sum of Obama’s Foreign Policy Parts http://www.thefastertimes.com/foreignpolicy/2011/12/25/the-sum-of-obamas-foreign-policy-parts/

On the other hand, this unwillingness to set ambitious or creative goals has contributed to the administration’s inability to consider bolder decisions and approaches. The killing of Bin Laden, for example, does not change the situation in Afghanistan where Obama has talked himself, and the country, into a war that continues with no clear end, or even goals, in sight. Similarly, the administration’s commitment to a U.S. position as a global hegemon spending billions of dollars it no longer has in this endeavor reflects a commitment to conventional, and increasingly unsustainable approaches to foreign policy. In this context, the accomplishments of the Obama administration will never seem satisfactory, either to opponents of the administration who seek out any opportunity to criticize the president, but more significantly, to observers who cannot help but note the distressing state of international affairs despite several high profile successes by the administration.

# 1NR

### 2NC – Holocaust Trivialization

#### They trivialized the holocaust – that’s a voting issue

Gutman & Goldberg 98 (Yisrael, Yad Vashem professor and Chief Historian, Interviewer Amos, October 28, 19, Yad Vashem Jerusalem, Shoah Resource Center, The International School for Holocaust Studies, “Holocaust Remembrance In The West – Between Coping And Trivialization”, PDF, Excerpt from interview with Professor Yisrael Gutman)

Church leaders and the Pope are saying things today that were never said before. The question they are confronting transcends the Jewish tragedy. The Holocaust was the tip of an iceberg that shed a horrific light on the fate that awaits all of humankind. This is because, when all is said and done, Nazism and World War II, the concentration camps, the murder, and the destruction, afflicted not only the Jews. The racist idea of National Socialism, which in their original thinking pertained only to the Jews, began to threaten all of Europe and all of humankind. One may say that humankind and civilization reached the edge of the abyss and that all of civilization was at risk. Today, the connection between this matter and antisemitism is understood, because the evil unleashed by antisemitism and its falsehoods released political and social forces that, ultimately, not only harmed the Jews but threatened the entire world ― culture, human existence, religion, the Divine image of man, the elementary value of human life. This is the basic issue that troubles us without respite. It has made the Holocaust issue so important in a country as far away as the United States, where neither the Jews nor the population at large had anything at all to do with the Holocaust. However, this awareness has created a trend of trivialization. The fact that the Holocaust has become part of the general human awareness and is treated so extensively ― in the press, in the arts, in literature, in cinema, etc. ― has led to a degree of simplification. Today, in developed countries and especially the United States, every social injustice is placed in the category of a Holocaust. This has created a problem of sorts: a great many people talk about things of which they know little.

### 2NC – Uniqueness

#### Immigration will pass – forced GOP lawmaking

James 10/18/13 (Frank, Obama’s Immigration Pivot Hits A Bruised GOP’s Weak Spot”) <http://www.npr.org/blogs/itsallpolitics/2013/10/17/236425197/obamas-immigration-pivot-hits-a-bruised-gops-weak-spot>   
After successfully staring down congressional Republicans in the shutdown-debt ceiling fight, President Obama pivoted to immigration in a move with almost no downside. That makes it perfect as the next [vehicle](http://www.npr.org/blogs/itsallpolitics/2013/10/17/236425197/obamas-immigration-pivot-hits-a-bruised-gops-weak-spot) for him to use to cause the GOP major indigestion. Before being re-elected last year, President Obama said he hoped the Republican "fever" of opposition to him would break during his second term. But if the just-completed standoff is any indication, that temperature is still spiking. The immediate shift to immigration could be Dr. Obama's way of trying to effect a cure. What the White House and immigration advocates working with it hope is that the political loss Republicans suffered in the recent fiscal fight will make GOP leaders desperate to show that the party can govern.

#### GOP will pass immigration reform – reinvigorates the party

McMorris 10/15/13 (Evan, Buzzfeed “Obama Has Already Won The Shutdown Fight And He’s Coming For Immigration Next”) <http://www.buzzfeed.com/evanmcsan/obama-has-already-won-the-shutdown-fight-and-hes-coming-for>

Democrats and advocates seem to hope the GOP comes back to immigration on its own, albeit with a boost from Democrats eager to join them. Polls show Republicans have taken on [more of the blame](http://politicalticker.blogs.cnn.com/2013/10/14/shutdown-poll-no-winners-but-gop-bigger-loser-than-dems/) from the fiscal battle of the past couple of weeks. But Tom Jensen, a pollster with the Democratic firm Public Policy Polling, said moving to pass immigration reform could be just what the doctor ordered to get the public back on the side of the Republicans. “We’ve consistently found that a sizable chunk of Republican voters support immigration reform, and obviously a decent number of Republican politicians do too,” Jensen said. “After this huge partisan impasse, they may want to focus on something that’s not quite as polarized, and immigration would certainly fit the bill since we see voters across party lines calling for reform.”

### 2NC – Will Pass – Momentum

Obama is pushing Immigration now – will be tight  
James 1018/13 (“Obama's Immigration Pivot Hits A Bruised GOP's Weak Spot” Frank James”) <http://www.npr.org/blogs/itsallpolitics/2013/10/17/236425197/obamas-immigration-pivot-hits-a-bruised-gops-weak-spot>

In an emailed statement, Michael Steel, a Boehner spokesman, said: "The Speaker remains committed to a step-by-step process to fix our broken immigration system." But a senior House GOP aide who asked not to be identified suggested that by turning the screws on Republicans by refusing to negotiate until the shutdown ended and [the debt](http://www.npr.org/blogs/itsallpolitics/2013/10/17/236425197/obamas-immigration-pivot-hits-a-bruised-gops-weak-spot) ceiling was raised, Obama made immigration a heavier lift. "The president's attitude and actions over the past few weeks have certainly made getting anything done on immigration considerably harder," the aide said. Tea Party Republican Rep. Raul Labrador of Idaho echoed that sentiment Wednesday at a monthly Heritage Foundation forum. Dripping with sarcasm, he told the journalists: "If the president is going to show the same kind of good-faith efforts that he has shown in the last couple of weeks, I think it would be crazy for the House Republican leadership to enter into negotiations with him on immigration.

#### Immigration reform top of the agenda – momentum after shutdown

McMorris 10/15/13 (Evan, Buzzfeed “Obama Has Already Won The Shutdown Fight And He’s Coming For Immigration Next”) <http://www.buzzfeed.com/evanmcsan/obama-has-already-won-the-shutdown-fight-and-hes-coming-for>

WASHINGTON — As the fiscal fight roiling Washington nears its end, the White House is already signaling that it plans to use the political momentum it has gained during the shutdown fight to charge back into the immigration debate. And this time, Democratic pollsters and advocates say, they could actually win. The final chapter of the current crisis hasn’t been written yet, but Democrats in Washington are privately confident that they’ll emerge with the upper hand over the conservatives in Congress who forced a government shutdown. And sources say the administration plans to use its victory to resurrect an issue that was always intended to be a top priority of Obama’s second-term agenda. Advocates argue the post-fiscal crisis political reality could thaw debate on the issue in the House, which froze in earlier this year after the Senate passed a bipartisan immigration bill that was led by Republican Sen. Marco Rubio and Democratic Sen. Chuck Schumer.

Obama won’t spend capital on budget talks

Rebecca Kaplan, staff writer, 10/17 [“Obama's priorities for the year: Budget, immigration and farm bill,” http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-250\_162-57607996/obamas-priorities-for-the-year-budget-immigration-and-farm-bill/]

White House press secretary Jay Carney indicated to reporters Thursday afternoon that Mr. Obama would stand back and let Congress take the lead in budget talks. "What we are hopeful about is that Congress will seize an opportunity here to return to what has become known as regular order, which is have a budget conference where appointed members of the House and the Senate come together to try to reach a compromise budget," he said. The president's FY2014 budget, which was released earlier this year, reflects his priorities.¶ The committee has a major challenge ahead of them. Past groups have had little success reaching agreement.¶

**Immigration at the top of the agenda – pass by the end of year**

**Hill 10/18/13** (Selena, “Immigration Reform 2013 News: Obama Uses Political Showdown in Congress to Push for Immigration Reform”, <http://www.latinospost.com/articles/30029/20131018/immigration-reform-2013-news-obama-uses-political-showdown-congress-push-immigration-reform.htm>)

The last few weeks of partisan politics and the 16-day government shutdown may surprisingly give leeway for [immigrationhttp://images.intellitxt.com/ast/adTypes/icon1.png](http://www.latinospost.com/articles/30029/20131018/immigration-reform-2013-news-obama-uses-political-showdown-congress-push-immigration-reform.htm) reform to reemerge as an issue in the national discourse. The political showdown in Washington ended Wednesday when the House GOP conceded to reopening the government and passing a last-minute bill that narrowly avoided a national default.  Now President Obama is using the political capitol he gained during the standoff to call on Congress to revisit the country's broken immigration system and pass comprehensive legislation by the end of the year. In a speech on Thursday, Obama called for a renewed, bipartisan effort to pass immigration reform. "This can and should get done by the end of this year," he said at the White House, reports [NPR](http://www.npr.org/blogs/thetwo-way/2013/10/17/236223833/obama-calls-for-budget-immigration-reform-by-years-end" \t "_blank). He continued stating, "There's already a broad coalition across America that's behind this effort of comprehensive immigration reform--from[business leadershttp://images.intellitxt.com/ast/adTypes/icon1.png](http://www.latinospost.com/articles/30029/20131018/immigration-reform-2013-news-obama-uses-political-showdown-congress-push-immigration-reform.htm) to faith leaders to [law enforcementhttp://images.intellitxt.com/ast/adTypes/icon1.png](http://www.latinospost.com/articles/30029/20131018/immigration-reform-2013-news-obama-uses-political-showdown-congress-push-immigration-reform.htm)," he said. In fact, he added, the Senate has already passed a bill, and "economists estimate that if that bill becomes law, our economy would be 5 percent larger two decades from now. That's $1.4 trillion in new economic growth."

#### Obama won’t be involved/spend capital on the budget

**CBS News, 10-17,** 13, <http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-250_162-57607996/obamas-priorities-for-the-year-budget-immigration-and-farm-bill/>

White **House press secretary** Jay **Carney indicated** to reporters **Thursday** afternoon **that** Mr. **Obama would stand back and let Congress take the lead in budget talks.** "What we are hopeful about is that Congress will seize an opportunity here to return to what has become known as regular order, which is have a budget conference where appointed members of the House and the Senate come together to try to reach a compromise budget," he said. The president's[FY2014 budget](http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-250_162-57578782/), which was released earlier this year, reflects his priorities.¶ The committee has a major challenge ahead of them. Past groups have had little success reaching agreement.

### 2NC – PC True

#### PC theory true for Obama- empirics

Color Lines, 10-14-2011 <http://colorlines.com/archives/2011/10/is_president_obamas_jobs_drumbeat_working.html>

But what Obama’s new insistence on a jobs agenda proves is this: the presidency is, in fact, a powerful bully pulpit. No, he can’t just wave a magic wand and pass bills. No one credible has ever argued that. What he can do is use the substantial power of his office to bully Congress into action, or at least into focusing on the right problem. The first step in doing so is, as the president has said, taking the discussion to the voters. Every time a president speaks, it’s news. So he controls the news cycle every day, if he so chooses, and if he talks about jobs every day, that’s what we’ll all be talking about. The second step is negotiating from the place of strength that this rhetorical bullying creates. And we will all desperately need that strength when the deficit-reduction process reaches its grim climax this winter. So let’s hope Marshall is onto something when he says we might be at a turning point in Washington.

#### Your evidence oversimplifies political capital- it’s not just about personality and likeability- it’s about the structural advantages of the presidency

Light 99 – Senior Fellow at the Center for Public Service (Paul, the President’s Agenda, p. 24-25)

Call it push, pull, punch, juice, power, or clout – they all mean the same thing. The most basic and most important of all presidential resources is capital. Though the internal resources time, information, expertise, and energy all have an impact on the domestic agenda, the President is severely limited without capital. And capital is directly linked to the congressional parties. While there is little question that bargaining skills can affect both the composition and the success of the domestic agenda, without the necessary party support, no amount of expertise or charm can make a difference. Though bargaining is an important tool of presidential power, it does not take place in a neutral environment. Presidents bring certain advantages and disadvantages to the table.

#### Capital will solve immigration

**Voice of America News, 10-17**, 13, http://www.voanews.com/content/obama-renews-push-for-us-immigration-reform/1771832.html

Thursday, President Barack **Obama** urged a renewed bipartisan commitment to confront the nation’s challenges, **and signaled he will** *press* **Congress to enact comprehensive immigration reform**. Earlier this year, the Senate approved an overhaul of America’s often-criticized immigration system. **The bill would strengthen U.S. border security and provide a long and arduous path to citizenship** for millions of undocumented immigrants. But the initiative has languished in the Republican-led House of Representatives, where many members view legalization of the undocumented as amnesty for law-breakers. Thursday, **Obama said immigration reform remains a priority.**

### 