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The 1AC’s Orthodox IR’s atomistic approach to global problems makes extinction inevitable

Ahmed 12 Dr. Nafeez Mosaddeq Ahmed is Executive Director of the Institute for Policy Research and Development (IPRD), an independent think tank focused on the study of violent conflict, he has taught at the Department of International Relations, University of Sussex "The international relations of crisis and the crisis of international relations: from the securitisation of scarcity to the militarisation of society" Global Change, Peace & Security Volume 23, Issue 3, 2011 Taylor Francis 3. From securitisation to militarisation 3.1 Complicity

This analysis thus calls for a broader approach to environmental security based on retrieving the manner in which political actors construct discourses of 'scarcity' in response to ecological, energy and economic crises (critical security studies) in the context of the historically-specific socio-political and geopolitical relations of domination by which their power is constituted, and which are often implicated in the acceleration of these very crises (historical sociology and historical materialism). Instead, both realist and liberal orthodox IR approaches focus on different aspects of interstate behaviour, conflictual and cooperative respectively, but each lacks the capacity to grasp that the unsustainable trajectory of state and inter-state behaviour is only explicable in the context of a wider global system concurrently over-exploiting the biophysical environment in which it is embedded. They are, in other words, unable to address the relationship of the inter-state system itself to the biophysical environment as a key analytical category for understanding the acceleration of global crises. They simultaneously therefore cannot recognise the embeddedness of the economy in society and the concomitant politically-constituted nature of economics. Hence, they neglect the profound irrationality of collective state behaviour, which systematically erodes this relationship, globalising insecurity on a massive scale - in the very process of seeking security.85 In Cox's words, because positivist IR theory 'does not question the present order [it instead] has the effect of legitimising and reifying it'.86 Orthodox IR sanitises globally-destructive collective inter-state behaviour as a normal function of instrumental reason -thus rationalising what are clearly deeply irrational collective human actions that threaten to permanently erode state power and security by destroying the very conditions of human existence. Indeed, the prevalence of orthodox IR as a body of disciplinary beliefs, norms and prescriptions organically conjoined with actual policy-making in the international system highlights the extent to which both realism and liberalism are ideologically implicated in the acceleration of global systemic crises. By the same token, the incapacity to recognise and critically interrogate how prevailing social, political and economic structures are driving global crisis acceleration has led to the proliferation of symptom-led solutions focused on the expansion of state/regime military-political power rather than any attempt to transform root structural causes.88 It is in this context that, as the prospects for meaningful reform through inter-state cooperation appear increasingly nullified under the pressure of actors with a vested interest in sustaining prevailing geopolitical and economic structures, states have resorted progressively more to militarised responses designed to protect the concurrent structure of the international system from dangerous new threats. In effect, the failure of orthodox approaches to accurately diagnose global crises, directly accentuates a tendency to 'securitise' them - and this, ironically, fuels the proliferation of violent conflict and militarisation responsible for magnified global insecurity. 'Securitisation' refers to a 'speech act' - an act of labelling - whereby political authorities identify particular issues or incidents as an existential threat which, because of their extreme nature, justify going beyond the normal security measures that are within the rule of law. It thus legitimises resort to special extra-legal powers. By labelling issues a matter of 'security', therefore, states are able to move them outside the remit of democratic decision-making and into the realm of emergency powers, all in the name of survival itself. Far from representing a mere aberration from democratic state practice, this discloses a deeper 'dual' structure of the state in its institutionalisation of the capacity to mobilise extraordinary extra-legal military-police measures in purported response to an existential danger. The problem in the context of global ecological, economic and energy crises is that such levels of emergency mobilisation and militarisation have no positive impact on the very global crises generating 'new security challenges', and are thus entirely disproportionate.90 All that remains to examine is on the 'surface' of the international system (geopolitical competition, the balance of power, international regimes, globalisation and so on), phenomena which are dislocated from their structural causes by way of being unable to recognise the biophysically-embedded and politically-constituted social relations of which they are comprised. The consequence is that orthodox IR has no means of responding to global systemic crises other than to reduce them to their symptoms. Indeed, orthodox IR theory has largely responded to global systemic crises not with new theory, but with the expanded application of existing theory to 'new security challenges' such as 'low-intensity' intra-state conflicts; inequality and poverty; environmental degradation; international criminal activities including drugs and arms trafficking; proliferation of weapons of mass destruction; and international terrorism.91 Although the majority of such 'new security challenges' are non-military in origin - whether their referents are states or individuals - the inadequacy of systemic theoretical frameworks to diagnose them means they are primarily examined through the lenses of military-political power.92 In other words, the escalation of global ecological, energy and economic crises is recognised not as evidence that the current organisation of the global political economy is fundamentally unsustainable, requiring urgent transformation, but as vindicating the necessity for states to radicalise the exertion of their military-political capacities to maintain existing power structures, to keep the lid on.93 Global crises are thus viewed as amplifying factors that could mobilise the popular will in ways that challenge existing political and economic structures, which it is presumed (given that state power itself is constituted by these structures) deserve protection. This justifies the state's adoption of extra-legal measures outside the normal sphere of democratic politics. In the context of global crisis impacts, this counter-democratic trend-line can result in a growing propensity to problematise potentially recalcitrant populations - rationalising violence toward them as a control mechanism. Consequently, for the most part, the policy implications of orthodox IR approaches involve a redundant conceptualisation of global systemic crises purely as potential 'threat-multipliers' of traditional security issues such as 'political instability around the world, the collapse of governments and the creation of terrorist safe havens'. Climate change will serve to amplify the threat of international terrorism, particularly in regions with large populations and scarce resources. The US Army, for instance, depicts climate change as a 'stress-multiplier' that will 'exacerbate tensions' and 'complicate American foreign policy'; while the EU perceives it as a 'threat-multiplier which exacerbates existing trends, tensions and instability'.95 In practice, this generates an excessive preoccupation not with the causes of global crisis acceleration and how to ameliorate them through structural transformation, but with their purportedly inevitable impacts, and how to prepare for them by controlling problematic populations. Paradoxically, this 'securitisation' of global crises does not render us safer. Instead, by necessitating more violence, while inhibiting preventive action, it guarantees greater insecurity. Thus, a recent US Department of Defense report explores the future of international conflict up to 2050. It warns of 'resource competition induced by growing populations and expanding economies', particularly due to a projected 'youth bulge' in the South, which 'will consume ever increasing amounts of food, water and energy'. This will prompt a 'return to traditional security threats posed by emerging near-peers as we compete globally for depleting natural resources and overseas markets'. Finally, climate change will 'compound' these stressors by generating humanitarian crises, population migrations and other complex emergencies.96 A similar study by the US Joint Forces Command draws attention to the danger of global energy depletion through to 2030. Warning of ‘the dangerous vulnerabilities the growing energy crisis presents’, the report concludes that ‘The implications for future conflict are ominous.’97 Once again, the subject turns to demographics: ‘In total, the world will add approximately 60 million people each year and reach a total of 8 billion by the 2030s’, 95 per cent accruing to developing countries, while populations in developed countries slow or decline. ‘Regions such as the Middle East and Sub-Saharan Africa, where the youth bulge will reach over 50% of the population, will possess fewer inhibitions about engaging in conflict.’98 The assumption is that regions which happen to be both energy-rich and Muslim-majority will also be sites of violent conflict due to their rapidly growing populations. A British Ministry of Defence report concurs with this assessment, highlighting an inevitable ‘youth bulge’ by 2035, with some 87 per cent of all people under the age of 25 inhabiting developing countries. In particular, the Middle East population will increase by 132 per cent and sub-Saharan Africa by 81 per cent. Growing resentment due to ‘endemic unemployment’ will be channelled through ‘political militancy, including radical political Islam whose concept of Umma, the global Islamic community, and resistance to capitalism may lie uneasily in an international system based on nation-states and global market forces’. More strangely, predicting an intensifying global divide between a super-rich elite, the middle classes and an urban under-class, the report warns: ‘The world’s middle classes might unite, using access to knowledge, resources and skills to shape transnational processes in their own class interest.’99 Thus, the securitisation of global crisis leads not only to the problematisation of particular religious and ethnic groups in foreign regions of geopolitical interest, but potentially extends this problematisation to any social group which might challenge prevailing global political economic structures across racial, national and class lines. The previous examples illustrate how secur-itisation paradoxically generates insecurity by reifying a process of militarization against social groups that are constructed as external to the prevailing geopolitical and economic order. In other words, the internal reductionism, fragmentation and compartmentalisation that plagues orthodox theory and policy reproduces precisely these characteristics by externalising global crises from one another, externalising states from one another, externalising the inter-state system from its biophysical environment, and externalising new social groups as dangerous 'outsiders\*. Hence, a simple discursive analysis of state militarisation and the construction of new "outsider\* identities is insufficient to understand the causal dynamics driving the process of 'Otherisation'. As Doug Stokes points out, the Western state preoccupation with the ongoing military struggle against international terrorism reveals an underlying 'discursive complex", where representations about terrorism and non-Western populations are premised on 'the construction of stark boundaries\* that 'operate to exclude and include\*. Yet these exclusionary discourses are 'intimately bound up with political and economic processes', such as strategic interests in proliferating military bases in the Middle East, economic interests in control of oil, and the wider political goal of 'maintaining American hegemony\* by dominating a resource-rich region critical for global capitalism.100 But even this does not go far enough, for arguably the construction of certain hegemonic discourses is mutually constituted by these geopolitical, strategic and economic interests — exclusionary discourses are politically constituted. New conceptual developments in genocide studies throw further light on this in terms of the concrete socio-political dynamics of securitisation processes. It is now widely recognised, for instance, that the distinguishing criterion of genocide is not the pre-existence of primordial groups, one of which destroys the other on the basis of a preeminence in bureaucratic military-political power. Rather, genocide is the intentional attempt to destroy a particular social group that has been socially constructed as different. As Hinton observes, genocides precisely constitute a process of 'othering\* in which an imagined community becomes reshaped so that previously 'included\* groups become 'ideologically recast' and dehumanised as threatening and dangerous outsiders, be it along ethnic, religious, political or economic lines — eventually legitimising their annihilation.102 In other words, genocidal violence is inherently rooted in a prior and ongoing ideological process, whereby exclusionary group categories are innovated, constructed and 'Otherised' in accordance with a specific socio-political programme. The very process of identifying and classifying particular groups as outside the boundaries of an imagined community of 'inclusion\*, justifying exculpatory violence toward them, is itself a political act without which genocide would be impossible.1 3 This recalls Lemkin's recognition that the intention to destroy a group is integrally connected with a wider socio-political project - or colonial project — designed to perpetuate the political, economic, cultural and ideological relations of the perpetrators in the place of that of the victims, by interrupting or eradicating their means of social reproduction. Only by interrogating the dynamic and origins of this programme to uncover the social relations from which that programme derives can the emergence of genocidal intent become explicable. Building on this insight, Semelin demonstrates that the process of exclusionary social group construction invariably derives from political processes emerging from deep-seated sociopolitical crises that undermine the prevailing framework of civil order and social norms; and which can, for one social group, be seemingly resolved by projecting anxieties onto a new 'outsider' group deemed to be somehow responsible for crisis conditions. It is in this context that various forms of mass violence, which may or may not eventually culminate in actual genocide, can become legitimised as contributing to the resolution of crises.105

Reject the affirmatives securitized discourse – rejection of securitized rhetoric is necessary to foster change

LAL 08, (Prerna P. Lal, J.D. in law, freelance writer, “Deconstructing the National Security State: Towards a New Framework of Analysis,” POSC 4910: Senior Seminar, <http://prernalal.com/wp-content/uploads/2008/10/css-deconstructing-the-nat-sec-state.pdf> , KENTUCKY)

Critical theory does not offer simple one-shot solutions to the problems created by the neo-realist state and elitist conception of security. To give simple answers would be a performativity contradiction, especially after criticizing realism for being intellectually rigid for believing in objective truth. In other words, there are no alternatives; just alternative modes of understanding. However, using the poststructuralist Foucaultian analysis that discourse is power, we can move towards deconstructing the power of the state and elites to securitize using their own tool: discourse. The elites who control the meaning of security and define it in terms that are appropriate to their interests hold tremendous power in the national security state. As Foucault astutely observed, “the exercise of power is always deeply entwined with the production of knowledge and discourse” (Dalby 1998, 4). For too long, language has been used against us to create our reality, thereby obfuscating our lens of the world, depriving us from an objective search for truth and knowledge. The history of colonized people shows how the construction of language defined and justified their oppressed status. In a way, we are colonized through discursive practices and subjected to the reality that the state wants us to see. However, definitions belong to the definer, and it is high time that we questioned and defined our own reality. Thus, citizen action is critical to questioning and deconstructing the national security state and taking away its power to define our security. In On Security, Pearl Alice Marsh (1995, 126) advances the idea of a grassroots statecraft that is defined as “challenging foreign policy of government through contending discursive and speech acts.” This calls for pitting the values of civil society against the state establishment and challenging the American statecraft’s freedom to cast issues and events in a security or militarized framework. The United States has not always been a national security state and neither does it have to maintain that hegemonic and oppressive status in order to exist. It is critical to remember that fundamental changes in our institutions and structures of power do not occur from the top; they originate from the bottom. History is case in point. Citizen action was critical to ending the Red Scare and the Vietnam War, as the American people realized the ludicrousness of framing Vietnam as a security issue, which led to the fall of the Second New Deal, the deaths of thousands of American soldiers and a financial cost that we are still shouldering. In the end, what they need to be secured from and how, is a question best left up to individual Americans and subsequently, civil society. Thus, grassroots citizen action performatively makes individuals the referent subject of security as people would call for the demilitarization and desecuritization of issues that are contrary and irrelevant to human security. There is hope for the future and practical application of critical theory ininternational relations. As Robert Lipschutz (2000, 61) concludes in After Authority:War, Peace, and Global Politics in the 21st Century, “it was the existence of the Otheracross the border that gave national security its power and authority; it is thedisappearance of the border that has vanquished that power.” Britain, France andGermany set aside their historical enmities and became part of a European community,which has formed a new collective identity and security across borders. Cold War rivals that almost annihilated the world are now friends in the “war against terror.” The apartheid regime in South Africa did collapse eventually. In the past two years, India andPakistan have been moving towards a more peaceful future that also includes fighting the“war against terror” together. While nation-states that were previously hostile to eachother have united to be hostile towards other states, it is not overly idealist to suggest thatwith each new friendship and alliance, there is one less foe and one less Other. The world is not stable and stagnant, existing in an anarchic, nasty and brutish framework in which states have to endlessly bargain for their self-interest, as realists would like us to believe.On the contrary, international relations and the boundaries constructed by the state are subject to change and ever-transitioning, which presents a compelling case for critical theory as a more realistic framework through which we can view international relations.Therefore, our ultimate search for security does not lie in securing the state from the threat of the enemy across the border, but in removing the state as the referent object of security and moving towards human emancipation.
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#### 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.

#### 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.
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#### **Venezuela bilat high – Maduro didn’t change anything (**

Xiaokun 7/19 – Li Xiaokun, Reporter for China Daily USA, (“Venezuela to maintain policies toward China”, 7/19/13, <http://usa.chinadaily.com.cn/epaper/2013-07/19/content_16799317.htm>, AW)

The new government of Venezuela will continue to prioritize its relations with China and expects to learn from China's development, Venezuelan Vice-President Jorge Arreaza said in Beijing on Thursday. Arreaza, who began an official five-day visit to China on Wednesday, made the remarks while meeting Vice-President Li Yuanchao at the Great Hall of the People. Observers said there is no need to worry about changes in Venezuela's China policies in the post-Chavez period. Frequent high-level visits showed that the two nations are trying to consolidate ties. "Apparently, Venezuelan President Nicolas Maduro has adopted Chavez's policies on China," said Wu Baiyi, deputy head of the Institution of Latin American Studies under the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences. "Besides, the Venezuelan economy's steady development and its oil exports are closely linked to China," he said. Li told Arreaza that the two nations should maintain closer high-level contacts, expand cooperation in the areas of energy, finance and agriculture, step up exchanges regarding experience in governance and deepen their strategic partnership. China and Venezuela forged a strategic partnership of common development in 2001. Li said the two nations should jointly develop a blueprint for the future development of bilateral links. Arreaza said his government will continue to prioritize its relations with China, adding that the country is ready to learn from China's experience in development and strengthen cooperation in all fields. The late Venezuelan leader Hugo Chavez visited China six times after he took office in 1999 and greatly encouraged boosting ties. Bilateral trade reached $23 billion in 2012. According to the Chinese embassy in Venezuela, China has provided more than $30 billion in financing to Venezuela to push forward nearly 300 projects of mutual cooperation. There have been concerns among Chinese investors that favorable policies on China might change under the new government. Maduro told a visiting high-ranking Chinese official after Chavez's funeral in March that the best way to pay tribute to the late leader was to keep deepening the strategic partnership with China. Beijing and Caracas have maintained frequent mutual visits of high-level officials since then. Li Yuanchao visited Venezuela for five days in May and met with key leaders including Maduro, Arreaza, and President of the Venezuelan National Assembly Diosdado Cabello. The Foreign Ministry said the visit was of great importance because the two countries had just completed a transition of leadership. Cabello paid a visit to China in July, several days before Arreaza's China trip. Cabello said ahead of the visit that Venezuela's relations with China were stable and that cooperation between the two nations would continue. He said Venezuela would like to be an important partner in China's energy imports. China is a major source of Venezuela's export income, he said. Cabello, who is also the first vice-president of the ruling United Socialist Party of Venezuela, said the party will dispatch 50 party members to learn in China in September. He said such communication will help the development of the country and the party. Venezuelan Oil and Mining Minister Rafael Ramirez also came to Beijing in June. Ramirez told reporters that Venezuela exported 626,000 barrels of oil per day to China in the first four months of this year, 18 percent more than the same period last year. He said the figure is expected to reach 1 million barrels per day within two years. In 2005, the figure was only 49,000 barrels per day. "Chinese enterprises are expanding investment in Venezuela, a reflection of their confidence in the Venezuelan economy, and its relations with China," said Wu Baiyi. Wang Zhen, former Chinese ambassador to Venezuela, said many other political parties in Venezuela, including the opposition, also attach great importance to ties with Beijing.

#### Venezuela is zero sum for the U.S. and China

Dumbaugh 8 – specialist in Asian affairs for the Congressional Research Service, 8 [Kerry, 7-18-8, Congressional Research Service, “CRS Report for Congress”, http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL34588.pdf, accessed 7-9-13]

Energy concerns also play a role in China’s Latin-American diplomacy, particularly in Venezuela, which now accounts for almost 15% of U.S. oil imports, and in Brazil, with which China announced a $10 billion energy deal in November 2004.65 As a consequence of Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez’s visit to Beijing in December 2004 and PRC Vice-President Zeng Qinghong’s visit to Venezuela in January 2005, the two countries reportedly signed a series of agreements that committed the China National Petroleum Corporation to spend over $400 million to develop Venezuelan oil and gas reserves.66 Given the current poor state of U.S.- Venezuelan relations under the Chavez government, some American observers worry that Venezuelan energy agreements with China ultimately may serve to divert oil from the United States.

#### 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.

### 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

#### Russian Economy will not collapse – stable now

Adomanis 8/27 – (2013, Mark Contributor for Forbes Magazine, http://www.forbes.com/sites/markadomanis/2013/08/27/do-you-think-russias-economy-is-doomed-the-bond-market-doesnt-agree/) rss

Earlier this year I wrote [several articles](http://www.forbes.com/sites/markadomanis/2013/01/07/why-russias-economy-isnt-going-to-collapse/) pushing back against some [particularly alarmist](http://www.thedailybeast.com/newsweek/2012/12/30/the-end-of-putinomics.html) interpretations of Russia’s economy. After predicting Russia’s imminent implosion no less than 6 or 7 different times over the past decade I’m genuinely amazed that Owen Matthews wasn’t a little more gunshy in saying that 2013 was definitely the year in which everything would come crashing down around the Kremlin’s ears, but you really do not need to search very long or hard to find people who are [extremely disdainful](http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-08-20/is-russia-already-in-recession-.html) of Russia’s economic performance and of the “obliviousness” and general stupidity of its policy makers.¶ It’s true that Russia’s economy is [slowing down](http://www.forbes.com/sites/markadomanis/2013/08/19/russias-economy-really-is-slowing-down-unemployment-ticked-up-in-q2-2013/) and its also true that the authorities [don’t have any easy choices](http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/08/26/us-russia-gdp-forecast-idUSBRE97P0C620130826): monetary easing will likely spark inflation, and the state’s ability to engage in fiscal pump-priming is highly constrained. Growth over the next few years will be decidedly sub-par when compared to the 2000 boom years and even to the modest 2010-12 bounce back from the Great Recession.¶ However, if Russia really was rapidly approaching an economic dead-end, if there was increasingly recognition that its model was not going to survive, you would expect to see the Russian government’s borrowing costs go up. Yes Russia’s stock of government debt is not particularly large (at only around 10% of GDP) but if the market came to an understanding that the economic situation was going to get a lot worse in the not too distant future then investors would demand higher returns. Demand for Russian debt would go down, and the interest rates on that debt would go up. Economics 101.¶ And that’s exactly what happened during the worst days of the 2008-09 crisis: Russia’s borrowing costs skyrocketed from around 7% to almost 11% because there were serious, and perfectly understandable, doubts about Russia’s ability to weather the economic storm.¶ Since the crisis ended, however, the interest rates on long-term Russian government securities haven’t done much – they’ve bounced around within a relatively narrow range and are at about the same level now that they were back in 2006. This would seem, to me at least, to reflect market expectations of business as usual: not overly-rapid economic growth, but certainly not some sort of spectacular collapse.¶ Is it possible that the bond market is wrong? Sure. It’s possible that the market is wrong just as it is possible that Putin will be overthrown before the end of the year or that I will win the lottery. Almost anything is possible. But it certainly does not seem likely that the bond market would be so studiously immune to a mounting economic catastrophe. What that chart says to me is that things will continue in pretty much same vein, and that there aren’t going to be any big changes one way or another.¶ Russia’s economy might not be performing particularly well at the moment, but there’s very little evidence that it’s going to come screeching to a halt. So if like many Westerners you’re eagerly waiting for Putin to be ousted by a crippling economic crisis, you’re going to be waiting for a long time.

#### Plan increases oil output—1AC Card

Campbell, 13 (4/16/2013, Darren, “A new leader could signal change for Venezuela’s troubled oil and gas sector; If Nicolas Maduro can reverse the industry's decline, it could siphon off investment in Alberta's oil sands,” http://www.albertaoilmagazine.com/2013/04/a-new-leader-could-signal-change-for-venenzuelas-oil-and-gas-sector/, JMP)

That’s because Venezuelan heavy oil is a competitor to the bitumen and heavy oil Alberta produces, and as long as the Venezuelan oil and gas industry is badly underperforming, some of the investment that could be going to develop its reserves will flow to the oil sands. But now that Maduro is the new boss in Venezuela, is he likely to reverse the decline? Devon Energy Big Box To gain some insight into that question, I contacted Roger Tissot – a native of Colombia who is now a British Columbia-based industry consultant who specializes in South America. Last June, Tissot wrote an essay on Chavez and the future of the Venezuela oil and gas industry that appeared in Alberta Oil. Maduro was Chavez’s hand-picked successor, and knowing that, Tissot says no one should expect a drastic reversal of policies – or a drastic turnaround in the industry’s fortunes. However, the status quo can’t continue, either. Maduro needs oil and gas revenue to fund the country’s social programs and keep the country from falling into chaos. A better run, more free market-leaning oil and gas industry will help Maduro accomplish this and keep him in power longer. Therefore, Tissot thinks Maduro has little choice but to shake things up when it comes to oil and gas matters. “One could expect a government more accessible to foreign investments, and foreign investors concerns (rule of law, security of payments, stability of contracts.) Although it is too early to say, one should expect the Venezuelan oil sectors – after years of stagnation and mismanagement – to perhaps start showing some signs of life again,” he wrote in an email exchange. “How soon and how deep is something that will depend on how Mr. Maduro’s administration performs.

#### Oil prices key to Russia’s economy – over half of government revenue

**Schuman, 12 –** (Michael Schuman, Associated Press Staff Writer for Times. July 5, 2012. “Why Vladimir Putin Needs Higher Oil Prices,” http://business.time.com/2012/07/05/why-vladimir-putin-needs-higher-oil-prices/)//SDL

But Vladimir Putin is not one of them. The economy that the Russian President has built not only runs on oil, but runs on oil priced extremely high. Falling oil prices means rising problems for Russia – both for the strength of its economic performance, and possibly, the strength of Putin himself.¶ Despite the fact that Russia has been labeled one of the world’s most promising emerging markets, often mentioned in the same breath as China and India, the Russian economy is actually quite different from the others. While India gains growth benefits from an expanding population, Russia, like much of Europe, is aging; while economists fret over China’s excessive dependence on investment, Russia badly needs more of it. Most of all, Russia is little more than an oil state in disguise. The country is the largest producer of oil in the world (yes, bigger even than Saudi Arabia), and Russia’s dependence on crude has been increasing. About a decade ago, oil and gas accounted for less than half of Russia’s exports; in recent years, that share has risen to two-thirds. Most of all, oil provides more than half of the federal government’s revenues.¶ What’s more, the economic model Putin has designed in Russia relies heavily not just on oil, but high oil prices. Oil lubricates the Russian economy by making possible the increases in government largesse that have fueled Russian consumption. Budget spending reached 23.6% of GDP in the first quarter of 2012, up from 15.2% four years earlier. What that means is Putin requires a higher oil price to meet his spending requirements today than he did just a few years ago.¶ Research firm Capital Economics figures that the government budget balanced at an oil price of $55 a barrel in 2008, but that now it balances at close to $120. Oil prices today have fallen far below that, with Brent near $100 and U.S. crude less than $90. The farther oil prices fall, the more pressure is placed on Putin’s budget, and the harder it is for him to keep spreading oil wealth to the greater population through the government. With a large swath of the populace angered by his re-election to the nation’s presidency in March, and protests erupting on the streets of Moscow, Putin can ill-afford a significant blow to the economy, or his ability to use government resources to firm up his popularity.

#### Russian economic decline causes nuclear war

**Filger 9** (Sheldon, Author – Huffington Post, “Russian Economy Faces Disastrous Free Fall Contraction”, <http://www.globaleconomiccrisis.com/blog/archives/356>)

**In Russia**, historically, **economic** health **and** political **stability are intertwined** to a degree that is rarely encountered in other major industrialized economies. It was the economic stagnation of the former Soviet Union that led to its political downfall. Similarly, Medvedev and Putin, both intimately acquainted with their nation's history, are unquestionably alarmed at the prospect that Russia's economic crisis will endanger the nation's political stability, achieved at great cost after years of chaos following the demise of the Soviet Union. Already, strikes and protests are occurring among rank and file workers facing unemployment or non-payment of their salaries. Recent polling demonstrates that the once supreme popularity ratings of Putin and Medvedev are eroding rapidly. Beyond the political elites are the financial oligarchs, who have been forced to deleverage, even unloading their yachts and executive jets in a desperate attempt to raise cash. Should the Russian economy deteriorate to the point where economic collapse is not out of the question, the impact will go far beyond the obvious accelerant such an outcome would be for the Global Economic Crisis. There is a geopolitical dimension that is even more relevant then the economic context. Despite its economic vulnerabilities and perceived decline from superpower status, Russia remains one of only two nations on earth with a nuclear arsenal of sufficient scope and capability to destroy the world as we know it. For that reason, it is not only President Medvedev and Prime Minister Putin who will be lying awake at nights over the prospect that a national economic crisis can transform itself into a virulent and destabilizing social and political upheaval. It just may be possible that U.S. President Barack Obama's national security team has already briefed him about the consequences of a major economic meltdown in Russia for the peace of the world. After all, the most recent national intelligence estimates put out by the U.S. intelligence community have already concluded that the Global Economic Crisis represents the greatest national security threat to the United States, due to its facilitating political instability in the world. During the years Boris Yeltsin ruled Russia, security forces responsible for guarding the nation's nuclear arsenal went without pay for months at a time, leading to fears that **desperate personnel would** illicitly **sell nuclear weapons to terrorist organizations**. If the current economic crisis in Russia were to deteriorate much further, how secure would the Russian nuclear arsenal remain? It may be that the financial impact of the Global Economic Crisis is its least dangerous consequence.

### 1NC – Counterplan

#### Text – The European Union will offer to increase trade with The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela if it complies with the standards of the International Ship and Port Facility Security Program code set by the International Maritime Organization.

#### Venezuela would rather have relations with the EU than the U.S.

Delcas and Nougayréde 5-3

Marie Delcas and Natalie Nougayrède (Staff writers for WorldCrunch) 5/03/13 [“’Obama doesn’t respect us’- Nicolas Maduro Interview” World Crunch News <http://www.worldcrunch.com/world-affairs/-quot-obama-doesn-039-t-respect-us-quot-the-nicolas-maduro-interview/maduro-venezuela-oil-usa-chavez/c1s11678/>, July 1]

CARACAS - In this exclusive interview with Le Monde, his first for any international media since his recent victory in the April 14 Venezuelan presidential election, former union leader Nicolas Maduro, 50 years old, does not waver. ¶ The hand-picked heir of Hugo Chavez had served as the Comandante’s Foreign Minister, and you can hear it in his speeches as he preaches radical “Chavism:” no mercy against the opposition's disputing his election, endless references to the Bolivarian revolution's legacy, hero-worshiping of leaders, and a strident anti-American stance that echos Gaddafi and Iran’s dictatorial regime. Maduro apologies for none of it, and only seems open to foreign investors such as China, referring to the very Chinese “special economic areas” concept.¶ Nicolas Maduro - sporting a colorful tracksuit - received us in the hall of his modest presidential residence, located on a military base as the capital Caracas saw its streets filled with May 1st demonstrators, both opposition supporters as well as the “Chavists,” deprived of their iconic leader who ran this oil state for 14 years.¶ LE MONDE: Brawls in the parliament, violent incidents in the streets resulting in seven dead: Venezuela is a very tense and polarized state. How do you intend to prevent such events from recurring?¶ NICOLAS MADURO: The country is not polarized, it’s mobilized. It remains so thanks to our revolution against economic dependency, poverty, impoverishment, inequalities. It’s a revolution against the same capitalism that devastated our homeland in the past. We have a democratic socialism. When groups of people decide to fight against us –- it happened 200 years ago during the struggle for independence, it’s happening again, this time for our new independence -- it always creates tensions. We rely on our constitution and institutions to move forward, and we can trust them. I can guarantee you peace and democracy. Whatever threat is made against us, we shall overcome it. Europe needs to understand this for the Europeans still trust their stereotypes. People think Venezuela is a dictatorial regime.¶ Are you willing to open a dialogue with the opposition?¶ I have called for a sit-down with everyone, but the opposition’s leadership is composed of very extreme right-wingers, they won’t let the political parties have peaceful negotiations. This group wants to hijack the government. […] I’m calling upon Europeans to open their eyes. Chile had Pinochet. When (Salvador)Allende was attacked, everyone was shocked by the violence. The same ideology is emerging here. If I make any comparison with Mussolini, Franco or Hitler, people say I’m exaggerating. But I’m sounding the alarm here in Latin America. All the ingredients for an extremist right-wing project are there. If those people happen to take over – it won’t happen - they would destroy democracy in Venezuela and enforce a totalitarian regime.¶ The opposition convinced 49% of the Venezuelans. Do you believe all of its members are “fascists” as you call them?¶ Not all of them are but what we call social democracy or Christian democracy is on the verge of extinction in Venezuela because of these extremists on the right. We won 17 out of the 18 elections these last 14 years. We just faced the most difficult of them all for we had to run without Commandante Chavez, the soul of the Bolivarian revolution. I was a candidate who started with nothing and I won. Chavism was fluctuating between 50 and 60%, sometimes 63%. It’s a very strong and solid historic movement. My message to France and Europe is that we will make sure Venezuela won’t witness the rise of another Pinochet. And we will do it the democratic way.¶ You see yourself as Hugo Chavez’s heir. His stance on the international stage was the one of a “resistance” against an alleged American imperialism and through alliances with repressive regimes – Gaddafi, Al-Assad, Lukashenko, Ahmadinejad. Are you willing to take a step back from all this?¶ You say “an alleged imperialism.” Imperialism exists! The US has practiced worldwide imperialism. They had already invaded half of Mexico in the 19th century. During the 20th, they accomplished a total hegemony, an economic, military and political empire. The 21st century was the start of a new era. On one side, you have a unipolar imperial world and on the other, an emerging pluripolar, multicentric, and balanced world, which in fact follows the path of our libertador Simon Bolivar. We believe in a balanced world without empires. Venezuela has coped with a century of oil domination, American companies sowing misery, this is why we have an anti-imperialist program.¶ As of our friends… Gaddafi was friends with Sarkozy and Berlusconi. They attended banquets together. He was financing their campaigns. As a member of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries, we have always been friends with Libya. President Chavez has always been a loyal friend of Gaddafi, assassinated in the crudest way possible. Europe should think about the bombings and the destruction of Libya that filled the country with terrorists. Who’s truly ruling Libya’s military and sending thousands of armed men to fight in Syria? It’s Al Qaeda.¶ The Syrian president is bombing his own people with planes and tanks. Why aren’t you condemning these actions if you’re preaching democracy?¶ The foreign intervention in Syria has created a civil war. We have a good economic agreement with Bashar Al-Assad. We need to draw a line here anyway: Venezuela is a democratic country. And in Latin America in general, everyone’s looking for its own economic model after the 1990s neo-liberal disaster. As a matter of fact, what’s happening now in Europe echoes what occurred here during the 1990s: every social indicator was pointing downward, and it led to a political explosion and revolutions. This is the reason why Chavez, Kirchner, Correa and Lula came to power. Europe, be advised.¶ You speak of a multipolar world. Who should be Venezuela’s ally in the 21st century? Europe or China and Russia?¶ A group has been formed: the BRICS. This is the global core which may bring balance through great changes. It comprises 3 billion people: China, our Brazilian brothers, India, South Africa…It brings great hope to the world, just like Europe once did. The problem is Europe let itself get dominated by the American policies. Europe needs to join the BRICS to form a great global alliance for a new kind of coexistence in order to end interventionism and war.¶ What would it take for Obama’s United States and your country to normalize relations?¶ Respect. Respect for Latin America. They don’t respect us. It’s an old grudge. Two doctrines. The Monroe Doctrine used to mean “America for Americans,” that is the United States of America. And then there was Simon Bolivar saying “the union of America, former Spanish colony.” These are two different doctrines. One is imperialist and the other is preaching liberation. I know for a fact that there is a group of ultra-conservatives and terrorists within the US. Look up Roger Noriega, John Negroponte, Otto Reich…Each of these men are planning the violent destabilization of Venezuela. Sometimes, the US government tries to control them, sometimes it doesn’t. The United States are ruled by a financial, media-centered, military-industrial apparatus. Behind Obama’s grin, he orders bombings. He just displays a different image than Bush. That’s how he expands US global domination. We just appointed a new chargé d’affaires. We are willing to work on a more positive relation. We will see.¶ Oil has been Chavez’s great tool of leverage in his regional policy, with the social programs. However, your country’s production is stagnant. How are you going to open this sector for foreign investments? How are you planning to diversify an oil-dominated economy?¶ In Venezuela, the oil belt hosts 27 multinational companies from around the world, including French ones. We welcome everyone who hasn’t invested in our country yet to do so. We are creating special economic areas to favor investments and technology. We have studied the Chinese experience of the municipality of Pudong in Shanghai. On the other hand, Venezuela has 33 million hectares of arable land available and only use 3 million. We have all it takes to be a major power in agriculture.¶ You speak of liberty. When you go to Cuba to talk with Raul and Fidel Castro, which you recently did, do you tackle the subjects of political prisoners and detained journalists?¶ We are proud of Cuba and we will continue to show our support for this noble and united people. Fidel and Chavez had a special bond, like between father and son. Fidel Castro represents the dignity of the South American continent against empires. He’s a living legend, an icon of independence and freedom across the continent. ¶

### 1NC – Terrorism

#### **Say no – recent statements and empirics – plan is perceived as sabatoge**

Aljazeera 9/8 – Aljazeera News, (“Maduro accuses US of sabotage plot”, <http://www.aljazeera.com/news/americas/2013/09/20139861558854685.html>, AW)

Venezuelan President Nicolas Maduro has claimed the White House is plotting the "collapse" of his government next month by sabotaging food, electricity and fuel supplies.¶ "I have data about a meeting at the White House, the full names of those who attended. I know what plans they made for the total collapse" of the country, Maduro said on Saturday during a ceremony in northern Aragua state.¶ "They think that Venezuela will collapse in October, so long as they plan for it by sabotaging the people's food, electricity, fuel and refineries."¶ In recent months, the Venezuelan government has made several allegations about conspiracies against it and plots to kill Maduro, who even stated that Washington wanted to kill him at the same time that it carried out a possible attack on Syria.¶ Maduro's predecessor, the late Hugo Chavez, also made claims about several plots to kill him.¶ On Tuesday, Maduro claimed the Venezuelan opposition had sabotaged the electrical power grid after a massive blackout left 70 percent of the country without power for at least four hours.¶ "The empire will fall before Venezuela, which won't collapse, by sabotage or anything," Maduro told supporters, using a euphemism for the United States.

#### Zero risk of terrorism- their impact is alarmism

Mueller ’12 (John, Senior Research Scientist at the Mershon Center for International Security Studies and Adjunct Professor in the Department of Political Science, both at Ohio State University, and Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute. Mark G. Stewart is Australian Research Council Professorial Fellow and Professor and Director at the Centre for Infrastructure Performance and Reliability at the University of Newcastle in Australia, The Terrorism Delusion, International Security, Vol. 37, No. 1, pp. 81–110, Summer 2012)

Over the course of time, such essentially delusionary thinking has been internalized and institutionalized in a great many ways. For example, an extrapolation of delusionary proportions is evident in the common observation that, because terrorists were able, mostly by thuggish means, to crash airplanes into buildings, they might therefore be able to construct a nuclear bomb. In 2005 an FBI report found that, despite years of well-funded sleuthing, the Bureau had yet to uncover a single true al-Qaida sleeper cell in the United States. The report was secret but managed to be leaked. Brian Ross, “Secret FBI Report Questions Al Qaeda Capabilities: No ‘True’ Al Qaeda Sleeper Agents Have Been Found in U.S.,” ABC News, March 9, 2005. Fox News reported that the FBI, however, observed that “just because there’s no concrete evidence of sleeper cells now, doesn’t mean they don’t exist.” “FBI Can’t Find Sleeper Cells,” Fox News, March 10, 2005. Jenkins has run an internet search to discover how often variants of the term “al-Qaida” appeared within ten words of “nuclear.” There were only seven hits in 1999 and eleven in 2000, but the number soared to 1,742 in 2001 and to 2,931 in 2002. 47 By 2008, Defense Secretary Robert Gates was assuring a congressional committee that what keeps every senior government leader awake at night is “the thought of a terrorist ending up with a weapon of mass destruction, especially nuclear.” 48 Few of the sleepless, it seems, found much solace in the fact that an al-Qaida computer seized in Afghanistan in 2001 indicated that the group’s budget for research on weapons of mass destruction (almost all of it focused on primitive chemical weapons work) was $2,000 to $4,000. 49 In the wake of the killing of Osama bin Laden, officials now have many more al-Qaida computers, and nothing in their content appears to suggest that the group had the time or inclination, let alone the money, to set up and staff a uranium-seizing operation, as well as a fancy, super-high-technology facility to fabricate a bomb. This is a process that requires trusting corrupted foreign collaborators and other criminals, obtaining and transporting highly guarded material, setting up a machine shop staffed with top scientists and technicians, and rolling the heavy, cumbersome, and untested finished product into position to be detonated by a skilled crew—all while attracting no attention from outsiders. 50 If the miscreants in the American cases have been unable to create and set off even the simplest conventional bombs, it stands to reason that none of them were very close to creating, or having anything to do with, nuclear weapons—or for that matter biological, radiological, or chemical ones. In fact, with perhaps one exception, none seems to have even dreamed of the prospect; and the exception is José Padilla (case 2), who apparently mused at one point about creating a dirty bomb—a device that would disperse radiation—or even possibly an atomic one. His idea about isotope separation was to put uranium into a pail and then to make himself into a human centrifuge by swinging the pail around in great arcs. Even if a weapon were made abroad and then brought into the United States, its detonation would require individuals in-country with the capacity to receive and handle the complicated weapons and then to set them off. Thus far, the talent pool appears, to put mildly, very thin. There is delusion, as well, in the legal expansion of the concept of “weapons of mass destruction.” The concept had once been taken as a synonym for nuclear weapons or was meant to include nuclear weapons as well as weapons yet to be developed that might have similar destructive capacity. After the Cold War, it was expanded to embrace chemical, biological, and radiological weapons even though those weapons for the most part are incapable of committing destruction that could reasonably be considered “massive,” particularly in comparison with nuclear ones. 52

#### No impact

Simon and Stevenson, 10 - \* senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations AND \*\* professor of strategic studies at the U.S. Naval War College (Steven and Jonathan, “Focus on thwarting 'simpler' attacks,” 5/4, http://www.statesman.com/opinion/simon-stevenson-focus-on-thwarting-simpler-attacks-669676.html)

But the attempt to bring a less destructive terrorist technique to bear in New York may put the lie to that explanation. While we have not seen a single attack as horrific as the collapse of the twin towers, al Qaeda and its followers have killed far more people — Americans and other nationalities — using various forms of improvised explosive devices in war zones and ostensibly peaceful locales. Some 65 percent of the military casualties in Iraq and Afghanistan have been from improvised explosive devices, the Army Times reported last year. Many of them, like the Times Square device, are activated by or packed in vehicles; several of al Qaeda's most devastating attacks since 2001 — such as bombings that killed 202 people, mainly tourists, in Bali in 2002 — involved such devices. Terrorist tactics spread by virtue of success. Consider the number of airline hijackings in the 1960s and 1970s. These days, vehicle-borne IEDs are suited to urban spaces, in which cars are commonplace and inconspicuous and dense populations mean relatively high numbers of casualties. These points would not be lost on jihadist leaders and aspiring acolytes, who tend to be students of their craft. While many questions remain about the bombing attempt — though U.S. officials have deemed it terrorist activity, and a key leader of the Taliban in Pakistan has claimed credit — we do know that al Qaeda is pragmatic and adaptive. However precious al Qaeda may deem the "stun value" of the next big attack on America, the effectiveness of U.S. actions to thwart such an incident was eventually likely to compel it to downgrade expectations. Now, perhaps, al Qaeda has. The attempted Christmas bombing on a U.S. airliner was certainly a less complex and ambitious operation than Sept. 11 — or, for that matter, the 2004 Madrid attacks, the 2005 London subway bombings or the 2006 Heathrow plot. Even if the core group has not given up on the grand apocalyptic attack, anti-terrorist activity in Pakistan has compelled it to devolve operational authority to regional affiliates and homegrown terrorist aspirants who are free — if not encouraged — to use less operationally demanding methods. And that sort of urban warfare was long ago introduced and developed in places such as Belfast and Bilbao, then refined and expanded in Iraq and Afghanistan, with the advent of explosively formed penetrators (EFPs) and "sticky bombs," which are smaller and more precise than car bombs and may be harder to detect. It would be a mistake for al Qaeda's targets to regard that tactical adjustment as any kind of victory. Old techniques such as car and bus bombs, though not as massively lethal as the new ones — such as turning a hijacked airplane into a guided missile, or detonating a "dirty bomb" or even a small atomic device — would signify mainly that jihadists are starting to consider more frequent terrorist attacks that are far easier to execute and get away with. That kind of approach won favor with Northern Ireland's Provisional Irish Republican Army in its drive to unite Ireland, and with the Basque separatist group Euskadi ta Askatasuna (ETA) in Spain. These groups, which evolved into highly capable and professional organizations, challenged civil order and palsied society for decades, claiming roughly 2,200 and 1,000 lives, respectively.

### 1NC – Relations

#### 1. Maduro refuses to normalize relations with the U.S.

AP 7/20/13 (Associated Press, Venezuela halts normalization talks with US, The Sacramento Bee, http://www.sacbee.com/2013/07/20/5582836/venezuela-halts-normalization.html)

CARACAS, Venezuela -- Venezuela says it's ending talks with the United States to restore normal relations because Washington's U.N. ambassador-designate criticized its human rights record. The Foreign Ministry said in a statement late Friday that Samantha Power's remarks compelled it to halt the process begun in Guatemala last month by its foreign minister, Elias Jaua, and U.S. Secretary of State [John Kerry.](http://topics.sacbee.com/John+Kerry/) Power said in Senate confirmation hearings Wednesday that Venezuela is guilty of a "crackdown on civil society," along with Cuba, Iran and Russia. Jaua and Kerry had said they would fast-track talks to resume ambassadorial-level ties absent since 2010. Those prospects dimmed after Venezuelan President Nicolas Maduro later offered asylum to U.S. leaker Edward Snowden. Kerry subsequently called Jaua and threatened unspecified action if Snowden wound up in Venezuelan hands.

#### Even worst-case scenarios won’t cause extinction

Barrett, professor of natural resource economics – Columbia University, ‘7

(Scott, Why Cooperate? The Incentive to Supply Global Public Goods, introduction)

First, climate change does not threaten the survival of the human species.5 If unchecked, it will cause other species to become extinction (though biodiversity is being depleted now due to other reasons). It will alter critical ecosystems (though this is also happening now, and for reasons unrelated to climate change). It will reduce land area as the seas rise, and in the process displace human populations. “Catastrophic” climate change is possible, but not certain. Moreover, and unlike an asteroid collision, large changes (such as sea level rise of, say, ten meters) will likely take centuries to unfold, giving societies time to adjust. “Abrupt” climate change is also possible, and will occur more rapidly, perhaps over a decade or two. However, abrupt climate change (such as a weakening in the North Atlantic circulation), though potentially very serious, is unlikely to be ruinous. Human-induced climate change is an experiment of planetary proportions, and we cannot be sur of its consequences. Even in a worse case scenario, however, global climate change is not the equivalent of the Earth being hit by mega-asteroid. Indeed, if it were as damaging as this, and if we were sure that it would be this harmful, then our incentive to address this threat would be overwhelming. The challenge would still be more difficult than asteroid defense, but we would have done much more about it by now.

#### 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.

#### No impact to failed states – star this card!

Patrick, senior fellow, director – program on international institutions and global governance @ CFR, 4/15/’11

(Stewart M, “Why Failed States Shouldn’t Be Our Biggest National Security Fear,” <http://www.cfr.org/international-peace-and-security/why-failed-states-shouldnt-our-biggest-national-security-fear/p24689>)

In truth, while failed states may be worthy of America's attention on humanitarian and development grounds, most of them are irrelevant to U.S. national security. The risks they pose are mainly to their own inhabitants. Sweeping claims to the contrary are not only inaccurate but distracting and unhelpful, providing little guidance to policymakers seeking to prioritize scarce attention and resources.

In 2008, I collaborated with Brookings Institution senior fellow Susan E. Rice, now President Obama's permanent representative to the United Nations, on an index of state weakness in developing countries. The study ranked all 141 developing nations on 20 indicators of state strength, such as the government's ability to provide basic services. More recently, I've examined whether these rankings reveal anything about each nation's role in major global threats: transnational terrorism, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, international crime and infectious disease.

The findings are startlingly clear. Only a handful of the world's failed states pose security concerns to the United States. Far greater dangers emerge from stronger developing countries that may suffer from corruption and lack of government accountability but come nowhere near qualifying as failed states.

The link between failed states and transnational terrorism, for instance, is tenuous. Al-Qaeda franchises are concentrated in South Asia, North Africa, the Middle East and Southeast Asia but are markedly absent in most failed states, including in sub-Saharan Africa. Why? From a terrorist's perspective, the notion of finding haven in a failed state is an oxymoron. Al-Qaeda discovered this in the 1990s when seeking a foothold in anarchic Somalia. In intercepted cables, operatives bemoaned the insuperable difficulties of working under chaos, given their need for security and for access to the global financial and communications infrastructure. Al-Qaeda has generally found it easier to maneuver in corrupt but functional states, such as Kenya, where sovereignty provides some protection from outside interdiction.

Pakistan and Yemen became sanctuaries for terrorism not only because they are weak but because their governments lack the will to launch sustained counterterrorism operations against militants whom they value for other purposes. Terrorists also need support from local power brokers and populations. Along the Afghanistan-Pakistan border, al-Qaeda finds succor in the Pashtun code of pashtunwali, which requires hospitality to strangers, and in the severe brand of Sunni Islam practiced locally. Likewise in Yemen, al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula has found sympathetic tribal hosts who have long welcomed mujaheddin back from jihadist struggles.

Al-Qaeda has met less success in northern Africa's Sahel region, where a moderate, Sufi version of Islam dominates. But as the organization evolves from a centrally directed network to a diffuse movement with autonomous cells in dozens of countries, it is as likely to find haven in the banlieues of Paris or high-rises of Minneapolis as in remote Pakistani valleys.

What about failed states and weapons of mass destruction? Many U.S. analysts worry that poorly governed countries will pursue nuclear, biological, chemical or radiological weapons; be unable to control existing weapons; or decide to share WMD materials.

These fears are misplaced. With two notable exceptions — North Korea and Pakistan — the world's weakest states pose minimal proliferation risks, since they have limited stocks of fissile or other WMD material and are unlikely to pursue them. Far more threatening are capable countries (say, Iran and Syria) intent on pursuing WMD, corrupt nations (such as Russia) that possess loosely secured nuclear arsenals and poorly policed nations (try Georgia) through which proliferators can smuggle illicit materials or weapons.

When it comes to crime, the story is more complex. Failed states do dominate production of some narcotics: Afghanistan cultivates the lion's share of global opium, and war-torn Colombia rules coca production. The tiny African failed state of Guinea-Bissau has become a transshipment point for cocaine bound for Europe. (At one point, the contraband transiting through the country each month was equal to the nation's gross domestic product.) And Somalia, of course, has seen an explosion of maritime piracy. Yet failed states have little or no connection with other categories of transnational crime, from human trafficking to money laundering, intellectual property theft, cyber-crime or counterfeiting of manufactured goods.

Criminal networks typically prefer operating in functional countries that provide baseline political order as well as opportunities to corrupt authorities. They also accept higher risks to work in nations straddling major commercial routes. Thus narco-trafficking has exploded in Mexico, which has far stronger institutions than many developing nations but borders the United States. South Africa presents its own advantages. It is a country where “the first and the developing worlds exist side by side,” author Misha Glenny writes. “The first world provides good roads, 728 airports . . . the largest cargo port in Africa, and an efficient banking system. . . . The developing world accounts for the low tax revenue, overstretched social services, high levels of corruption throughout the administration, and 7,600 kilometers of land and sea borders that have more holes than a second-hand dartboard.” Weak and failing African states, such as Niger, simply cannot compete.

Nor do failed states pose the greatest threats of pandemic disease. Over the past decade, outbreaks of SARS, avian influenza and swine flu have raised the specter that fast-moving pandemics could kill tens of millions worldwide. Failed states, in this regard, might seem easy incubators of deadly viruses. In fact, recent fast-onset pandemics have bypassed most failed states, which are relatively isolated from the global trade and transportation links needed to spread disease rapidly.

Certainly, the world's weakest states — particularly in sub-Saharan Africa — suffer disproportionately from disease, with infection rates higher than in the rest of the world. But their principal health challenges are endemic diseases with local effects, such as malaria, measles and tuberculosis. While U.S. national security officials and Hollywood screenwriters obsess over the gruesome Ebola and Marburg viruses, outbreaks of these hemorrhagic fevers are rare and self-contained.

I do not counsel complacency. The world's richest nations have a moral obligation to bolster health systems in Africa, as the Obama administration is doing through its Global Health Initiative. And they have a duty to ameliorate the challenges posed by HIV/AIDS, which continues to ravage many of the world's weakest states. But poor performance by developing countries in preventing, detecting and responding to infectious disease is often shaped less by budgetary and infrastructure constraints than by conscious decisions by unaccountable or unresponsive regimes. Such deliberate inaction has occurred not only in the world's weakest states but also in stronger developing countries, even in promising democracies. The list is long. It includes Nigeria's feckless response to a 2003-05 polio epidemic, China's lack of candor about the 2003 SARS outbreak, Indonesia's obstructionist attitude to addressing bird flu in 2008 and South Africa's denial for many years about the causes of HIV/AIDS.

Unfortunately, misperceptions about the dangers of failed states have transformed budgets and bureaucracies. U.S. intelligence agencies are mapping the world's “ungoverned spaces.” The Pentagon has turned its regional Combatant Commands into platforms to head off state failure and address its spillover effects. The new Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review completed by the State Department and the U.S. Agency for International Development depicts fragile and conflict-riddled states as epicenters of terrorism, proliferation, crime and disease.

Yet such preoccupations reflect more hype than analysis. U.S. national security officials would be better served — and would serve all of us better — if they turned their strategic lens toward stronger developing countries, from which transnational threats are more likely to emanate.

#### B. Restoring ties with Venezuela will require significant time and effort by Kerry

Meacham 13 (Carl, director of the Americas Program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, 6-21-13, "The Kerry-Jaua Meeting: Resetting U.S.-Venezuela Relations?" csis.org/publication/kerry-jaua-meeting-resetting-us-venezuela-relations

On June 5, Secretary of State John Kerry raised eyebrows when he met with his Venezuelan counterpart, Foreign Minister Elías Jaua. Both were in Guatemala to attend the recent General Assembly of the Organization of American States (OAS). The pair’s meeting was the first high-level public meeting between the two countries since U.S. president Barack Obama and former Venezuelan president Hugo Chávez shook hands and had a brief exchange at the fifth Summit of the Americas in 2009. The Venezuelan government requested the meeting, which lasted 40 minutes and was followed by the announcement that the governments would embark on high-level talks aimed at improving bilateral relations. Of particular note, both sides expressed hope that the reciprocal appointment of ambassadors would take place in short order; Chávez expelled the U.S. ambassador in 2008 and the United States retaliated in kind. All of this is complicated by the outcome of the Venezuelan presidential election on April 14. The official results have named Nicolás Maduro the winner, having beaten opposition leader Henrique Capriles by a slim 1.5 percentage points—though the opposition continues to contest both the results and the audit. While much of the region moved quickly to recognize Maduro as the victor, the United States has yet to formally recognize the outcome and is waiting for the results of an audit that is satisfactory to all parties. So, given these developments, should the United States be resetting its relationship with Venezuela? Q1: Where do U.S.-Venezuelan relations stand? A1: Despite many fits and starts to advance relations in recent years, genuine improvements in the relationship have been hard to come by. Various U.S. government agencies hold sanctions against elements of the Venezuelan government, including on state oil company Petróleos de Venezuela (PDVSA) for trading with Iran; on a former Iran-Venezuela Bank (IVB) for handling money transfers with a Chinese bank on behalf of the Export Development Bank of Iran (EDBI); and on the state-owned Venezuelan Military Industry Company after it traded with Iran, North Korea, and Syria. The U.S. Department of the Treasury’s Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC), over the past five years, has also designated more than half a dozen Venezuelan government officials for acting for, or on behalf of, the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), designated a narco-terrorist organization by the U.S. agency. And, let’s not forget that the reason there are no ambassadors in Caracas or D.C. was Chávez’s refusal in 2010 to accept Obama’s nominee for the post in Venezuela. Similarly, Venezuela severed ties with the Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA) in 2005. On the day Chávez’s death was announced, Maduro, as caretaker, expelled two U.S. air force attachés based in the Caracas embassy, accusing them of espionage. The United States retaliated in kind. The Maduro government also arrested U.S. filmmaker Tim Tracy for allegedly instigating postelection violence, though many pointed out he was simply in Venezuela to film a documentary on politics in the country. (Tracy was released without further explanation the same morning Kerry and Jaua met.) Suggestions by members of the Venezuelan government that the United States may have given Chávez the cancer that caused his death have certainly not helped relations either, neither have repeated accusations targeted at former officials and U.S. military and intelligence involvement in countless evidence-free plots. Given the complex reality of the bilateral relationship, it looks like both sides have a long road ahead of them if they seek to enact positive changes.

#### C. US key to Middle East peace

Elsner, 13 -- former Reuters chief political correspondent

[Alan, 30-years’ experience in international journalism, former Reuters State Department correspondent, former professor at Princeton, Dartmouth, American and George Washington University, "Conditions Not Perfect for Israeli-Palestinian Peace -- But May Be as Good as They'll Get," Huffington Post, 7-17-13, www.huffingtonpost.com/alan-elsner/israel-palestine-peace-process\_b\_3606126.html, accessed 7-18-13, mss]

To those who argue that Israel should not make peace with Arab nations because they are insufficiently democratic, the obvious response is that precisely the reverse is true. Only through peace treaties, endorsed and enshrined by the international community, can Israel hope to achieve security and predictability in its relations with its neighbors. Some of the same doubters who bring up Egypt also argue that Kerry is misspending his time in pursuing an Israeli-Palestinians peace deal because there are so many other issues that are more important clamoring for his attention. They are also dead wrong for many reasons. As Kerry realizes, solving this conflict is a prime U.S. national security interest because it is used by our enemies worldwide as a recruiting tool for terrorists and to stoke anti-American feeling and because it undermines our efforts to champion political rights and the cause of democracy and self-determination around the world. Unlike Egypt and Syria, this is the one issue where the U.S. has the leverage and ability to actually play a constructive role. The civil war in Syria and unrest in Egypt are both very important -- but it is not clear what the U.S. can or should do and how much influence it can exert. However, on Israel-Palestine, the U.S. remains the indispensible broker with enormous influence on both parties and a clear policy -- namely the two-state solution. Securing Israeli-Palestinian peace would inject some stability into an unstable region. It would strengthen moderates, bolster the vulnerable government of Jordan, a key U.S. strategic ally, weaken Iran and its allies and proxies and pave the way for relations between Israel and the important Gulf States. It would springboard the Palestinian economy and act as a driver for economic activity throughout the Middle East, eventually boosting Egypt too. Without viable peace talks, the status quo could quickly fall apart; instability will grow between Israel and the Palestinians, heightening the threat of violence in the West Bank and a new crisis between Israel and Hamas in Gaza. Now may not be the perfect time -- but tomorrow is likely to be worse and the next day worse still. This may be the best chance we still have. Finally, although it is a tough task, it is not impossible and there are some reasons for cautious optimism. Both Israelis and Palestinians continue to support two states as recent polls have again demonstrated. Kerry's indirect negotiations have been substantive and have narrowed gaps between the parties forming a better framework for talks than in some past efforts. And neither side wants to be blamed for failure. It's easy to find excuses not to make peace but that attitude achieves nothing. Working for peace is harder, no doubt, but the rewards are so great that it would be criminal not to try.

#### D. Mid-east wars cause extinction

Russell, 9 (James A. Russell, Senior Lecturer, National Security Affairs, Naval Postgraduate School, ‘9 (Spring) “Strategic Stability Reconsidered: Prospects for Escalation and Nuclear War in the Middle East” IFRI, Proliferation Papers//, #26, \_\_http://www.ifri.org/downloads/PP26\_Russell\_2009.pdf\_\_)

Strategic stability in the region is thus undermined by various factors: (1) asymmetric interests in the bargaining framework that can introduce unpredictable behavior from actors; (2) the presence of non-state actors that introduce unpredictability into relationships between the antagonists; (3) incompatible assumptions about the structure of the deterrent relationship that makes the bargaining framework strategically unstable; (4) perceptions by Israel and the United States that its window of opportunity for military action is closing, which could prompt a preventive attack; (5) the prospect that Iran’s response to pre-emptive attacks could involve unconventional weapons, which could prompt escalation by Israel and/or the United States; (6) the lack of a communications framework to build trust and cooperation among framework participants. These systemic weaknesses in the coercive bargaining framework all suggest that escalation by any the parties could happen either on purpose or as a result of miscalculation or the pressures of wartime circumstance. Given these factors, it is disturbingly easy to imagine scenarios under which a conflict could quickly escalate in which the regional antagonists would consider the use of chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons. It would be a mistake to believe the nuclear taboo can somehow magically keep nuclear weapons from being used in the context of an unstable strategic framework. Systemic asymmetries between actors in fact suggest a certain increase in the probability of war – a war in which escalation could happen quickly and from a variety of participants. Once such a war starts, events would likely develop a momentum all their own and decision-making would consequently be shaped in unpredictable ways. The international community must take this possibility seriously, and muster every tool at its disposal to prevent such an outcome, which would be an unprecedented disaster for the peoples of the region, with substantial risk for the entire world.

# Block

#### No terrorism impact

Zenko & Cohen 12 – Micah Zenko, Fellow in the Center for Preventive Action at the Council on Foreign Relations; and Michael A. Cohen, Fellow at the Century Foundation, March/April 2012, “Clear and Present Safety,” Foreign Affairs, Vol. 91, No. 2, p. 79-93

Take terrorism. Since 9/11, no security threat has been hyped more. Considering the horrors of that day, that is not surprising. But the result has been a level of fear that is completely out of proportion to both the capabilities of terrorist organizations and the United States' vulnerability. On 9/11, al Qaeda got tragically lucky. Since then, the United States has been preparing for the one percent chance (and likely even less) that it might get lucky again. But al Qaeda lost its safe haven after the U.S.-led invasion of Afghanistan in 2001, and further military, diplomatic, intelligence, and law enforcement efforts have decimated the organization, which has essentially lost whatever ability it once had to seriously threaten the United States.¶ According to U.S. officials, al Qaeda's leadership has been reduced to two top lieutenants: Ayman al-Zawahiri and his second-in-command, Abu Yahya al-Libi. Panetta has even said that the defeat of al Qaeda is "within reach." The near collapse of the original al Qaeda organization is one reason why, in the decade since 9/11, the U.S. homeland has not suffered any large-scale terrorist assaults. All subsequent attempts have failed or been thwarted, owing in part to the incompetence of their perpetrators. Although there are undoubtedly still some terrorists who wish to kill Americans, their dreams will likely continue to be frustrated by their own limitations and by the intelligence and law enforcement agencies of the United States and its allies.

#### Existing CO2 will cause warming for 1,000 years

**Maugh 9** (Thomas H, Los Angeles Times, Study says some global warming now irreversible, January 27, <http://articles.sfgate.com/2009-01-27/news/17198723_1_carbon-dioxide-warming-s-effect-dioxide-emissions/2>)

Even if by some miracle of environmental activism global carbon dioxide levels reverted to pre-industrial levels, it still would take 1,000 years or longer for the climate changes already triggered to be reversed, scientists said Monday. The gas that is already there and the heat that has been absorbed by the ocean will exert their effects for centuries, according to the analysis, published Monday in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Science. Over the long haul, the warming will melt the polar icecaps more than previously had been estimated, raising ocean levels substantially, the report said. And changes in rainfall patterns will bring droughts comparable to those that caused the 1930s Dust Bowl to the American Southwest, southern Europe, northern Africa and western Australia. "People have imagined that if we stopped emitting carbon dioxide, the climate would go back to normal in 100 years, 200 years," lead author Susan Solomon, a senior scientist at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, said in a telephone news conference. "That's not true." The changes will persist until at least the year 3000, said Solomon, who conducted the study with colleagues in Switzerland and France.

#### He’s angry – assassination

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

Venezuelan President Nicolás Maduro lashed out at neighboring Colombia, far-right Venezuelans in Miami and his U.S. counterpart Barack Obama in the wake of an alleged assassination attempt on him.¶ Authorities in Venezuela arrested two foreign nationals who planned to assassinate Maduro in a plot involving former Colombian head of state Alvaro Uribe. Colombian citizens Victor Gueche, 18, and Erik Huertas, 18, were nabbed last Thursday near Caracas carrying rifles "with laser sights," Venezuela's interior minister, Gen. Miguel Angel Rodriguez, told reporters.¶ Also found were munitions and a photo of Maduro posing with the speaker of the Venezuelan National Assembly, Diosdado Cabello.¶ Maduro blasted Obama, claiming that the purported plot was either hatched in the U.S. or involved anti-Chavista Venezuelans residing in places like south Florida. Like his ideological mentor and predecessor, Hugo Chávez, Maduro is a fierce critic of U.S. policy in Latin America.¶ “Is President Obama so weak that decisions are made for him in the United States to kill a Latin American head of state without his knowing it?” Maduro said, according to news agency Agence France Presse..

#### **Powers and Snowden**

Bercovitch 7/21 – Sascha, Reporter for the Venezuela Analysis, (“With “Zero Tolerance to Gringo Aggression,” Maduro Cuts Off Venezuela-U.S. Talks”, <http://venezuelanalysis.com/news/9872>, AW)

“My policy is zero tolerance to gringo aggression against Venezuela. I'm not going to accept any aggression, whether it be verbal, political, or diplomatic. Enough is enough. Stay over there with your empire, don't involve yourselves anymore in Venezuela,” he said.¶ The announcement comes after controversial statements from Samantha Powers, President Barack Obama’s nominee for U.S. envoy to the United Nations, who testified to the U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on Wednesday that she would fight against what she called a “crackdown on civil society being carried out in countries like Cuba, Iran, Russia, and Venezuela.”¶ In a statement written on Friday that marks the last communication between the two countries, Venezuelan Foreign Minister Elias Jaua wrote, “The preoccupation expressed by the U.S. government regarding the supposed repression of civil society in Venezuela is unacceptable and unfounded. To the contrary, Venezuela has amply demonstrated that it possesses a robust system of constitutional guarantees to preserve the unrestricted practice and the respect of fundamental human rights, as the UN has recognized on multiple occasions.”¶ Jaua spoke with US Secretary of State John Kerry in a meeting in Guatemala last month that Kerry described as the “beginning of a good, respectful relationship.”¶ However, relations cooled after Bolivian President Evo Morales’ presidential plane was prevented from entering the airspace of four European countries following false information that U.S. whistleblower Edward Snowden was on board, and Maduro’s subsequent offer of political asylum to Snowden.

#### **Prefer our ev – post dates – electoral pressures and recent statement prove**

Moore 9/16 – Seren, Writer for World Meets US, (“Maduro: 'Two-Faced, Hypocritical, Liars' Seek OAS Backing”, <http://worldmeets.us/correodelcaroni000003.shtml#axzz2f6xMuUbJ>, AW)

Maduro said that the Commission is under the control of the United States, and for that reason, it believes it is a "supranational" power.¶ ¶ "We have to react. It believes itself to be a supranational power, a power above the legitimate governments of the continent. Its time has passed. Now they feign ignorance of Venezuela's electoral system. What does the Commission have to do with the sovereign and autonomous operation of Venezuelan electoral authority? What are they looking for? Do they want this agency to say that I am not president to justify an invasion?, " the president said at a press conference at the seat of government [the Miraflores Palace].¶ ¶ He added that his government would proceed with the steps necessary to withdraw from the Convention [American Convention on Human Rights] in order to leave the Commission, which will be implemented in the coming days [reportedly on Tuesday, Sept. 16].¶ ¶ The president questioned the fact that a Capriles delegate, lawyer Ramón José Medina, had filed a complaint with the Commission [in Washington] about the April elections, the victory of which was narrowly attributed to Maduro.¶ ¶ "He (Medina) is the right-hand man of the biggest fascist of all (Capriles), which relates him to dangerous things. So now he goes to the headquarters of the Commission, to submit a document saying there is a fraudulent electoral system in Venezuela," Maduro said.¶ '¶ "They [the opposition] are registering candidates, and releasing a document to the world saying that fraud has been committed here. In other words, following that logic, a fraud will be committed on the 8th of December," he said. He also accused the opposition of maintaining a "brutal war" on the economy, in order that, "when we reach [the next election period in] October, November, we're in a dire situation."¶ ¶ "They are two-faced, hypocritical, liars and perverts," Maduro declared.

#### They used ableist language – that’s a voting issue

Anna 10 (disabled feminist, 24 May, “Ableist Word Profile: Why I write about ableist language”, <http://disabledfeminists.com/2010/05/24/ableist-word-profile-why-i-write-about-ableist-language/>,)

I talk about ableist language for a variety of reasons. The most obvious, I think, is to challenge ableist ideas that center the experiences of non-disabled people. When someone proudly assures me that words like “lame” and “dumb” and “r#tarded” are never used to describe actual people with disabilities, I’m fairly certain I’m talking to one of the currently non-disabled. Currently non-disabled readers, I’m here to tell you: those words, and any similar words you think are “archaic” and not used anymore, are used all the time, as taunts and insults towards people with disabilities, and in some cases as official diagnoses. Some of them are also used in reclamatory ways by some disabled people, but certainly not all. But it’s more than that. Part of why I challenge ableist ideas and ableist language is because I would like more Social Justice bloggers to think “Oh, yeah. People with disabilities also read social justice blogs! I should remember that more often when I’m writing.” [I also like to challenge it in other places, which is why I occasionally go through spaces like Wikipedia & TVTropes and re-write every instance of "wheelchair bound".] There’s a strong tendency to assume that disability-related issues are somehow a separate thing, as though there’s a Disability Silo and things like reproductive justice, racism, heterosexism, anti-immigration, transphobia, classism, and misogyny, etc, don’t actually enter into that silo. As though no one with a disability is interested in reading about these topics, or is affected by them in any way, or is an activist on the topic, or wants to be more of one.

#### Maduro is seen as a Castro puppet- sparks backlash

Sullivan 4-9 (Mark P. Sullivan - Specialist in Latin American Affairs, “Hugo Chávez’s Death: Implications for Venezuela and U.S. Relations”, April 9th, 2013, <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R42989.pdf>)

Some observers have criticized the Obama Administration for making overtures to engage with Maduro, contending that U.S. policy should focus on attempting to ensure that the upcoming election is free and fair. A Washington Post editorial from early March 2013 contended that “further wooing of Mr. Maduro should wait until he survives the scrum in his own party, wins a free vote and demonstrates that he is more than a Castro puppet.”19 While it is likely that any improvement in relations will remain on hold during the election process, some analysts maintain that it is important for U.S. policymakers to remember that taking sides in Venezuela’s internal politics can be counter-productive. According to Cynthia Arnson of the Woodrow Wilson Center: “Supporting broad principles such as internal dialogue to overcome polarization for the rule of law is not the same as promoting a particular political outcome, an approach that is destined to only backfire.”20 Other analysts maintain that it is important for U.S. policymakers to recognize the level of popular support in Venezuela for President Chávez. While there was considerable controversy over past elections in which Chávez’s campaign unfairly utilized state resources and broadcast media, the margins of his electoral victories in four elections over the years left no doubt that he had won those elections. His death, at least in the short to medium term, could deepen popular support for the PSUV. In the aftermath of the presidential election, there could be an opportunity for U.S.-Venezuelan relations to get back on track. An important aspect of this could be restoring ambassadors in order to augment engagement on critical bilateral issues, not only on anti-drug, terrorism, and democracy concerns, but on trade, investment issues, and other commercial matters. With Chávez’s death and an upcoming presidential election, the 113th Congress is likely to maintain its strong oversight on the status of human rights and democracy in Venezuela as well as drug trafficking and terrorism concerns, including the extent of Venezuela’s relations with Iran.

#### Republicans backlash

Ros-Lehtinen 13 (Rep. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Florida Republican, is chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa. “ROS-LEHTINEN: Venezuela after Chavez: What comes next?”, March 14th, 2013, <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2013/mar/14/venezuela-after-chavez-what-comes-next/>)

Last year, it was reported that the Obama administration was seeking to exchange ambassadors in an attempt to normalize relations between the countries. The U.S. State Department’s approach was extremely premature, and it, unfortunately, legitimized Mr. Maduro without even questioning whether the Venezuelan Constitution was being upheld. The Obama administration continued to send mixed messages and to undermine the opposition by sending a delegation to attend Chavez’s funeral services last week, alongside enemies of the United States, such as Iranian leader Mahmoud Ahmadinejad. Words matter, but actions matter more, and this decision not only sends mixed signals to the people of Venezuela, but reiterates the failed policy of attempting to re-establish diplomatic relations. It is in our best interest if political and economic reforms come to Venezuela, but all signs currently point to the contrary. As the leader of the Chavista movement, Mr. Maduro could potentially be worse for the Venezuelan people and for U.S. national security interests. Mr. Maduro still controls all branches of government, stifles free speech and was indoctrinated with socialist ideology. He has traveled to Tehran and has strong ties with Iran, supports the Assad regime in Syria and has become a lap dog for Cuba’s Castro brothers.

**Plan’s unpopular for a laundry list of reasons, and it’s a flip flop for Obama**

Sullivan 1/10 – Specialist in Latin American Affairs (Mark P., 01/10/13, “Venezuela: Issues for Congress,” <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R40938.pdf>)

U.S. Policy The United States traditionally has had close relations with Venezuela, a major supplier of foreign oil to the United States, but there has been significant friction with the Chávez government. For several years, U.S. officials have expressed concerns about human rights, Venezuela’s military arms purchases (largely from Russia), its relations with Cuba and Iran, its efforts to export its brand of populism to other Latin American countries, and the use of Venezuelan territory by Colombian guerrilla and paramilitary forces. Declining Venezuelan cooperation on antidrug and antiterrorism efforts also has been a U.S. concern. Since 2005, Venezuela has been designated annually (by President Bush and President Obama) as a country that has failed to adhere to its international anti-drug obligations. Since 2006, the Department of State has prohibited the sale of defense articles and services to Venezuela because of lack of cooperation on antiterrorism efforts.

**Flip-flops wreck political capital**

**Cohen 97** Jeffrey E. Cohen, professor of political science at Fordham University, 1997(Presidential Responsiveness and Public Policy Making, p. 123)

A president cannot, without good reason, alter his policy stance. And even if he has good reason to change his policy position on an issue, he may have to bear some costs from doing so. The public and other political elites may view him as waffling, indecisive, weak, uncommitted, and/or duplicitous. This seems very much to be one of the major charges against Bill Clinton’s presidency. After abandoning his campaign promise of a middle-class tax cut because of budget deficit pressures, Clinton reoffered a tax cut in the wake of the devastating 1994 midterm elections, in which his party lost control of Congress. From being publicly cool toward the North American Free Trade pact during his presidential election campaign, he became an ardent promoter of that policy once in the Oval Office. From these, and many other occasions, Clinton has developed an image of a waffling politician, one who is forever changing his mind, perennially trying to stake out the most popular position with the public and not necessarily a president who is able to lead.

#### 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.