### 1NC CP—Gitmo

#### The United States federal government should close its naval base on Guantanamo Bay and relocate terrorist suspects to federal prisons in the United States.

#### Closing GITMO solves human rights and relations

Perez 10 J.D. Yale Law School. Working with Koh former Dean of Yale Law and Legal Advisor to the State Department [David A. Perez, America's Cuba Policy: The Way Forward: A Policy Recommendation for the U.S. State Department, Spring, 2010, Harvard Latino Law Review, 13 Harv. Latino L. Rev. 187]

(5B) Offer to Discuss the Status of Guantanamo Bay

The United States could also offer to renegotiate its open-ended lease of its naval base at Guantanamo Bay, which sits on a parcel of land that is formally still part of Cuba. The U.S. secured a permanent lease on the land in 1903 after the Americans expelled the Spanish from the island in the Spanish-American war of 1898. n70 Over the years the U.S. has consistently stoked Cuban nationalism, while the Cuban regime has been particularly adept at exploiting nationalistic fears and translating them into domestic support. Offering to renegotiate the status of Guantanamo Bay would be a clear demonstration that the U.S. is committed to respecting Cuban nationalism and sovereignty.

Closing Guantanamo Bay would have reverberating effects, not just in Cuba and Latin America, but also throughout the world. Guantanamo Bay has come to "represent the image of an intolerant, abusive, unjust America." n71 Its "very existence undermines America's ability to carry forth a message of principled optimism and hope." n72 Closing the base will not be easy, but if the United States were to put the option of ceding the land back to Cuba on the table, it could buy time and more effectively turn the page on a base that long ago became a major political liability. n73

### 1NC Cuba Democracy DA

#### Cuban democracy is emerging organically now --- lifting the embargo would empower the regime.

Ron Radosh, 3/18/2013.  PJ Media columnist and Adjunct Fellow at the Hudson Institute. “  
The Time to Help Cuba’s Brave Dissidents Is Now: Why the Embargo Must Not be Lifted,” PJ Media, http://pjmedia.com/ronradosh/2013/03/18/the-time-to-help-cubas-brave-dissidents-is-now-why-the-embargo-must-not-be-lifted/?singlepage=true.

The presence this week in the United States of dissident Cuban blogger Yoani Sanchez, the most well-known of Cuba’s brave dissident community, has again brought to the forefront the reality of the situation facing the Cuban people in the Castro brothers’ prison state.

Last week, Sanchez spoke at both Columbia University and New York University, where she [recalled](http://www.miamiherald.com/2013/03/18/3292371/cuban-blogger-yoani-sanchez-recalls.html#storylink=cpy) how different things were a decade ago during what Cubans refer to as the “Black Spring,” when independent journalists were given a summary trial and large jail sentences. It was the arrest of these opponents of the regime that led to the Ladies in White, the wives and mothers of prisoners who regularly marched in silence in front of government buildings each week.

Ten years ago, Sanchez pointed out, there was no access to the internet for anyone in Cuba, it barely existed, and there were no flash drives to record information and no social networking sites to spread the word about the state’s repression. Now, bloggers like Sanchez — who gains access to tourist hotels, posing as a Westerner so she can use their internet facilities — have managed to get past the regime’s ban on use of the internet and to freely reveal to the world the reality of life in Cuba.

“Many independent journalists and peaceful activists who began their work precariously have now resorted to blogs, for example, as a format to circulate information about programs and initiatives to collect signatures,” Sánchez said. She and others have done just that, getting signatures on petitions to demand the release in particular of one well-known Cuban journalist. In addition, Sanchez is circulating a petition known as “the Citizens’ Demand” to pressure the Cuban regime to ratify the UN political rights agreements signed in 2008. The signers are calling for a legal and political framework for a full debate of all ideas relevant to the internal crisis facing the Cuban people on the island.

In effect, this demand for democracy is nothing less than a call for creation of a political democracy that would, if implemented, lead to the collapse of the edifice of the Communist one-party state.

As Sanchez put it: “It is important to have initiatives for transforming the law and demand concrete public spaces within the country.” Since a totalitarian state does not allow for such space and prohibits a real civil society from emerging, the actions of the dissidents are a mechanism for forcing such change from below. They are fighting what her fellow blogger Orlando Luis Pardo Lazo called a “culture of fear over the civil society” that the secret police seek to enforce.

For liberals and leftists in the United States, the main demand they always raise is to “lift the embargo.” According to the argument they regularly make, the embargo has to be lifted for the following reasons: 1) it is not effective; 2) it gives the regime the excuse to argue to the Cuban people that the poverty they suffer is the result of not being able to trade with the United States and other nations honoring the embargo; 3) lifting the embargo would hence deprive Fidel and Raul Castro from their main propaganda argument, revealing that the reasons for a collapsed economy are the regime’s own policies; and 4) trade and travel from the United States would expose Cubans to Americans and others who live in freedom, help curb anti-Americanism, and eventually lead to slow reform of the system.

What these liberals and leftists leave out is that this demand — lifting the embargo — is also the number one desire of the Cuban Communists.

In making it the key demand, these well-meaning (at least some of them) liberals echo precisely the propaganda of the Cuban government, thereby doing the Castro brothers’ work for them here in the United States. And, as we know, many of those who call for this actually believe that the Cuban government is on the side of the people, and favor the Cuban Revolution which they see as a positive role model for the region. They have always believed, since the 1960s of their youth, that socialism in Cuba has pointed the way forward to development and liberty based on the kind of socialist society they wish could exist in the United States.

Another brave group of Cuban opponents of the regime has actually taped a television interview filmed illegally in Havana. “Young Cuban democracy leader Antonio Rodiles,” an American support group called [Capitol Hill Cubans](http://www.capitolhillcubans.com/2013/03/cuban-democracy-leaders-stress.html) has reported, “has just released the latest episode of his civil society project Estado de Sats (filmed within Cuba), where he discusses the importance U.S. sanctions policy with two of Cuba’s most renowned opposition activists and former political prisoners, Guillermo Fariñas and Jose Daniel Ferrer.”

The argument they present is aimed directly at those on the left in the United States, some of whom think they are helping democracy in Cuba by calling for an end to the embargo. In strong and clear language, the two dissidents say the following:

If at this time, the [economic] need of the Cuban government is satisfied through financial credits and the lifting of the embargo, repression would increase, it would allow for a continuation of the Castro’s society, totalitarianism would strengthen its hold and philosophically, it would just be immoral … If you did an opinion poll among Cuban opposition activists, the majority would be in favor of not lifting the embargo.

Next, they nail the claim that travel without restrictions by citizens of our country to Cuba would help spread freedom. The men respond:

In a cost-benefit analysis, travel to Cuba by Americans would be of greatest benefit to the Castro regime, while the Cuban people would be the least to benefit. With all of the controls and the totalitarian system of the government, it would be perfectly able to control such travel.

We know this, as I [reported](http://http//pjmedia.com/ronradosh/2012/08/15/graduate-of-my-commie-high-school-goes-to-cuba/)a few months ago, about how a group of Americans taking the usual state-controlled Potemkin village tour came back raving about how wonderful and free Cuba is, and how Cuban socialism works.

Finally, the two former prisoners made this point about lifting the embargo:

To lift the embargo at this time would be very prejudicial to us. The government prioritizes all of the institutions that guarantee its hold on power. The regime’s political police and its jailers receive a much higher salary and privileges than a doctor or engineer, or than any other worker that benefits society. We’ve all seen municipalities with no fuel for an ambulance, yet with 10, 15, 20, 50 cars full of fuel ready to go repress peaceful human rights activists.

Indeed, just this past week, more evidence came out substantiating how the secret police killed Cuba’s leading political opponent Oswaldo Paya, and sought to blame it on a car crash for which he and those with him were responsible. Last week, [the Washington Post](http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/obama-administration-should-urge-a-probe-of-oswaldo-paya-death/2013/03/13/34f2a0fe-8b7e-11e2-b63f-f53fb9f2fcb4_story.html) in a tough editorial made the point:

Mr. Payá, who pioneered the Varela Project, a petition drive in 2002 seeking the guarantee of political freedom in Cuba, was killed in a car wreck July 22, along with a youth activist, Harold Cepero. The driver of the vehicle, Ángel Carromero, a Spaniard, was convicted and imprisoned on charges of vehicular homicide; in December, he was released to Spain. He told us in an interview published on the opposite page last week that the car carrying Mr. Payá was rammed from behind by a vehicle with government license plates. His recollections suggest that Mr. Payá died not from reckless driving but from a purposeful attempt to silence him — forever.

This is the kind of treatment effective opponents of the regime get from Cuba’s secret police, measures taken upon orders of Raul Castro, whom useful idiots like Danny Glover and Sean Penn regularly visit. They fawn at his feet and those of his ailing brother, Fidel Castro.

This week, Sanchez and her colleague come to testify before Congress. They will speak as well at a public forum today, Tuesday, at the Cato Institute. You can watch on a live stream at 12:30 p.m. on the organization’s [website](http://www.cato.org/events/future-freedom-cuba).

The Cuban people have suffered long enough at the hands of a regime that came into power promising freedom and democracy, and instead inflicted on the Cuban people a totalitarian government modeled on that of the old Soviet Union. Cuba is finally on the verge of change, and it is time the people of our country give whatever support we can to those within Cuba bravely working for the creation of a real democracy in Cuba, and an end to the decades of rule by the Castro brothers.

#### The Cuban opposition movement is creating a model for economic democracy --- success will spread it globally.

[Keith Harrington](http://truth-out.org/author/itemlist/user/44903), 1/17/2013. Former Maryland and Washington D.C. Field Director for the [Chesapeake Climate Action Network](http://www.chesapeakeclimate.org/" \t "_blank), currently pursuing a master’s degree in economics and leading NEI's Campus Network affiliate group at the New School for Social Research in Manhattan, and is a contributing writer on climate, energy and the new-economy at several publications including Truthout, Grist.org, Alternet, and the Huffington Post. “New Cuba: Beachhead for Economic Democracy Beyond Capitalism,” Truthout, http://truth-out.org/opinion/item/13918-the-new-cuba-a-beachhead-for-economic-democracy-we-should-support.

The year 2012 may have been the United Nation's [International Year of Cooperatives](http://social.un.org/coopsyear/" \t "_blank), but 2013 may turn out to be the more historic year for worker-ownership if the Cubans have anything to say about it.

To listen to the mainstream American media, however, you'd never know it. As a video supplement to a recent [New York Times article](http://www.nytimes.com/2012/12/09/world/americas/changes-to-agriculture-highlight-cubas-problems.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0" \t "_blank)  makes clear, the corporate press has already made up its mind on how the story of Cuba's economic liberalization is bound to end:

"In a state defined by all-consuming communism for the past 50 years,capitalist change comes in fits and starts, and only at the pace that the government is willing to allow."[Emphasis added]

In other words, Cuba's post-communist story ends just like China's - in capitalism, because according to orthodox dogma, there's nowhere else to go. Trapped by the limited possibilities of this dichotomist capitalism-or-communism mentality, mainstream commentators lack the perspective needed to appreciate (much less inform others) that a transition away from a state-dominated command economy might conceivably lead to a type of market that is very distinct from our elite-shareholder-dominated and profit-fixated capitalist model.

But that is precisely the [nuanced story](http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/cifamerica/2010/sep/10/fidel-castro-cuba-communist" \t "_blank) we find in Cuba when we dig just below the surface and consider the very guidelines the Cuban government has adopted to steer the transition process. Since the state unveiled its nuevos lineamientos or new guidelines for economic development in 2010, the easing of government restrictions on private entrepreneurial activity has only constituted a single aspect of a much broader picture of change. Unfortunately, The New York Times and its ilk have gotten so hung up on the privatization shift, that they've left out crucial details about the types of private enterprises the Cuban government is attempting to foster.

Specifically, the government is placing high priority on the development of [worker-owned-and-managed firms](http://www.socialistproject.ca/bullet/667.php" \t "_blank) and has recently passed a [law](http://cubantriangle.blogspot.com/2012/12/the-new-cooperatives-law.html" \t "_blank) intended to launch an experimental cadre of 200 such firms. Under the law, workers - rather than government bureaucrats or elite boards of directors - will democratically run the businesses, set their own competitive prices, determine wages and salaries and decide what to do with the profits they generate. In other words, Cuba's new worker cooperatives will operate pretty much along the same lines as their successful cousins in the capitalist world, including Spain's [Mondragon Cooperative Corporation](http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2012/jun/24/alternative-capitalism-mondragon" \t "_blank).

But what sets the Cuban cooperative experiment apart and renders it such an incredible opportunity for the global worker-cooperative movement, is its occurrence in a political-economic milieu that is currently free from the distorting effects of capitalist competition. This is significant because while cooperatives have proven just as [competitive](http://www.educationevolving.org/pdf/Worker-Democracy-Productivity.pdf" \t "_blank) as capitalist firms in a capitalist context, when capitalist profits and growth assume top priority, worker-owned firms may be compelled to act more like capitalist firms and subordinate core objectives such as worker empowerment and well-being, community development and environmental sustainability. Indeed, as cooperatives grow, even the percentage of actual worker owners in their ranks has been known to decline, as we've seen with Mondragon.

In short, the worker-ownership movement could greatly benefit from a national-scale economic environment that will allow cooperative enterprises to develop according to their own particular democratic nature and exhibit their true potential, free from the profit-above-all dictates of capitalism. No country bears as much promise in this respect than contemporary Cuba.

Nevertheless, for Cuba's experiment to work, all efforts should be made to steer the economy and the behavior of the country's emergent private entrepreneurial class in a direction that comports with the ethos and objectives of economic democracy. Above all, this would likely require severe restrictions, if not an outright ban, on the entry of large foreign capitalist firms or the establishment of large domestic capitalist firms. For, as economists such as Jamee Moudud of Sarah Lawrence University and many structuralist thinkers have pointed out, as jobs and tax revenues become dependent on the success of capitalist firms, societies [become constrained](http://www.gpia.info/files/u706/Moudud_2011-10.pdf" \t "_blank) in their ability to pursue developmental paths that do not prioritize capitalist accumulation. Accordingly, during the early years of the cooperative experiment, Cuba should seek to limit foreign direct investment to cooperative or [triple-bottom-line](http://www.bcorporation.net/" \t "_blank) firms as much as possible, facilitate joint-ventures between such firms and its own cooperatives and continue to seek industrial loans largely from committed social democratic partners such as Venezuela, and other "pink-tide" trade partners.

#### Economic democracy is key to human survival through sustainable degrowth.

[Shann Turnbull, 1/20/2013.](http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/cf_dev/AbsByAuth.cfm?per_id=26239" \t "_blank" \o "View other papers by this author) International Institute for Self-Governance; Sustainable Money Working Group. “Sustaining Society with Economic Democracy,” 2013 International Conference on Economics and Social Science (ICESS 2013), Holiday Inn, Melbourne, http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=2220072.

Economic democracy provides an efficient way for sustaining both humanity and the environment. Besides injustices, economic inequality also increases exploitation of the environment to provide luxury for a few instead of survival for the many.

This situation arises because a decrease in the current global population is required to allow both the environment and the existence of humanity to become sustainable. Trainer [1] points out that “De-growth is not enough”. Sustainability of humanity then becomes dependent on economic democracy to allow natureʼs resources to be widely shared. Importantly economic democracy can also makes de-growth more economically and politically feasible as discussed in the concluding section.

Already seventy countries have declining populations with twenty being advanced economies [2]. This is partly explained by affluent nations providing education about birth control as well as providing the means to control reproduction. Another reason for declining population is that welfare support in affluent societies removes the need for couples to have more children to support them in their old age.

A fundamental requirement for naturally reducing the global population is for nations to provide income security for all citizens. On way of achieving this is through a Universal Guaranteed Income (UGI). A UGI can be provided with capitalism, socialism or communism. For the purpose of considering economic democracy, socialism and communism are similar as the distribution of a UGI becomes dependent upon the government whether it is democratically elected or if it is a dictatorship.

Even the former Premier of the Peoples Republic of China (PRC), Zhao Ziyang, recognized that dictatorships are incompatible with economic democracy. The Premier stated on a visit to Australia in 1983 that economic democracy was not possible without political democracy [3]. Economic democracy had been promoted in the PRC since the 1980ʼs by Beijing based Professor Jiang Yiwei [4]. As a member of Law Committee of the National Peopleʼs Congress he published a book From Enterprise-Based Economy To Economic Democracy. Jiang states (p. 191) “Comrade Zhao Ziyang pointed out the essential difference between socialist and capitalist commodity economies lies in their different ownerships”.

2. Democratizing ownership

Jiang recommended (p. 231) that enterprises should be “encouraging workers and staff to buy shares and increase their individual accumulation”. This is a step towards capitalism. However, the spread of share ownership in the US was not achieved by workers/citizens buying shares but through inheritance and/or by tax incentives for firms to grant shares to their employees and/or other citizens.

In 1991, the State Commission for the Reform of the Economic System in the PRC invited a foreign faculty to contribute their knowledge on techniques for democratizing ownership. The faculty was led by Jeff Gates who had been the legal counsel to Senator Russell Long, chairman of the US Senate Committee on Finance. Senator Long was instrumental in introducing tax incentives to promote Employee Ownership Share Ownership Plans (ESOPs). A San Francisco based attorney, Louis Kelso [5][6] invented ESOPs in 1957. Kelso introduced Senator Long to ESOPs in 1973.

From 1980 to 1987 Gates crafted US tax laws to provide incentives that resulted in over 12,000 mainly private US firms issuing shares to 12 percent of the US work force through ESOPs. The tax incentives could also be used to include suppliers, customers and other citizens to create Universal Share Ownership Plans (USOPs).

Gates had been invited to Eastern Europe in 1990 to introduce ESOPs as a technique for privatization. However, Gates found that ESOPs had little relevance in communist societies that lacked a developed banking or tax system. For this reason he invited your author to join him in Beijing. My complementary proposals for distributing ownership from the bottom-up by changing corporate charters are described in my book Democratising the Wealth of Nations [7]. A third member of our faculty was Paul Kouris, the legal counsel of Science Applications International Corporation, then one of the largest US employee owned firms.

In 1983 Jiang had visited Yugoslavia to study the economic democracy initiatives introduced in the 1950ʼs by “Comrade Tito”. Jiang reported (p. 229) the impressive results in increasing living standards from firms adopting “self-determination” practices. However, Jiang expressed two concerns. First, self-determination had gone too far without sufficient co-ordination from the central government, and second, workers did not obtain shares. Share values provide feedback information for guiding business operations and so co-coordinating the activities of firms. However, share and/or product price data is far too lean to be capable of providing qualitative feedback information on how to make firms competitive.

Harvard Professor Michael Porter reported that US firms lacked competitiveness because they relied mainly on price signal feedback. Porter [8] identified how Japanese and European firms obtained additional qualitative feedback information from network relationships with suppliers, employees, customers and other stakeholders. Porter stated (p.3) that Americans are “trapped in a system in which all are acting rationally but none are satisfied”.

### 1NC Politics Disad

#### Immigration Reform will pass in the House and Senate now – there will be heated debates. Obama is actively lobbying to get it done.

Werner 6 – 11 – 13 AP Staff [Erica Werner, House Speaker John Boehner: Congress can do immigration this year, <http://www.news-sentinel.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20130611/NEWS/130619933/1006>]

With the Senate ready to cast the first floor votes on a landmark immigration bill, House Speaker John Boehner said Tuesday he thinks there's a good chance the legislation can be signed into law "by the end of the year."

Ahead of Tuesday afternoon's procedural votes to officially allow debate to move forward, senators were readying amendments on contentious issues including border security, back taxes and health care coverage. Some Republicans said they were seeking to strengthen enforcement provisions so that they could be comfortable voting for the bill.

Other GOP measures were already being dismissed by Democrats as attempts to kill the bill by striking at the fragile compromises at its core.

Boehner said in a nationally broadcast interview he still has concerns about aspects of the bill pertaining to border security. But the Ohio Republican also said he has sought to create an environment in the House where both parties can work together on the measure, which could eventually lead to full citizenship for millions of people currently living in the United States illegally.

"I think, no question, by the end of the year we could have a bill. No question," the speaker said in an interview on ABC's "Good Morning America."

In the Senate, the bill's supporters were working to determine which measures they could accept to lock down more "yes" votes from the GOP side without losing Democratic backing. They are aiming for a resounding show of support from the Democratic-led Senate that could pressure the Republican-led House to act.

President Barack Obama, who's made overhauling immigration laws a top second-term priority, was to speak at a midmorning event with advocates at the White House to praise the Senate's efforts and renew his calls for reform.

The two votes scheduled for Tuesday afternoon were on procedural measures to officially allow debate to move forward on the far-reaching bill. Both votes were expected to succeed by comfortable margins, because even some senators with deep misgivings about the immigration bill said the issue deserved a Senate debate.

The real fights will come in the following days and weeks as Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid, D-Nev., aims to push the bill to final Senate passage before July 4.

Even if that happens, the outlook in the House remains unsettled. Boehner indicated earlier that he'd like to see a bill through his chamber before August.

The Senate bill would stiffen border security and require all employers to check their workers' legal status, as well as initiate new or expanded visa programs for high-skilled and lower-skilled workers and the agriculture sector. At its core is its most contentious element, a 13-year path to citizenship for some 11 million immigrants now here illegally.

"Given the impact the broken system has on our economy and our families, we cannot afford delay," Senate Judiciary Chairman Patrick Leahy, D-Vt., said Monday on the Senate floor. "This is a measure the Senate should come together to consider and pass."

"Unfortunately the bill before us repeats our past mistakes," said the Judiciary Committee's top Republican, Sen. Chuck Grassley of Iowa. "Nobody disputes this is a bill that legalizes first and enforces later."

Heated debate is anticipated on the border security elements of the bill. The bill sets up a system wherein immigrants may only begin taking steps toward citizenship once certain border security requirements are met. But opponents say those "triggers" aren't strong enough, and one of the bill's authors, Sen. Marco Rubio, R-Fla., has argued that the border security elements of the bill must be strengthened if it's to make it through Congress.

#### Obama’s political capital and avoiding controversial actions will be vital to insuring final passage of the bill.

Bloomberg 5 – 23 – 13 [Obama Probes Create Immigration Magic as Bill Advances, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-05-23/obama-probes-create-immigration-magic-as-bill-advances.html]

The measure’s critics are still pressing to prevent that from happening, and seeking to use the negative attention focused on Obama’s administration as a means of doing so.

Tea Party Opposition

A coalition of Republican-aligned commentators and small-government Tea Party groups released a letter on May 21 urging opposition to the bill, writing that it suffers from “fundamental design flaws that make it unsalvageable,” including that it “cedes excessive control over immigration law to an administration that has repeatedly proven itself to be untrustworthy, even duplicitous.”

Should the measure pass the Democratic-controlled Senate, its initial reception will be chilly in the House, where Republicans hold the majority.

The bill won’t accomplish the goal of ending “illegal immigration for once and for all,” said House Judiciary Committee Chairman Bob Goodlatte, a Virginia Republican who will be a key player in determining its fate.

“The Senate bill is unlikely to secure the border,” Goodlatte said at a hearing he convened yesterday in Washington to examine the legislation.

In other criticisms, he said the measure takes too long -- as much as seven years -- to implement an electronic employment verification system, known as e-verify.

Credibility Issue

His comments underscore the congressional hurdles that loom for revising immigration laws -- obstacles that Republican strategist Ron Bonjean said will be harder for Obama to surmount if the scandals continue to undercut his credibility.

“It may help them now that people aren’t paying as much attention” to the debate on the immigration bill because of the investigations, “but long-term it’s a big problem,” Bonjean said. “The president’s political capital diminishes as these crises continue, and eventually he’s going to have to cash in that capital to get people to cast tough votes and push this thing through.”

#### Lifting the embargo will be a massive fight – strong groups will rally against it.

Spadoni & Sagebien 13 a. assistant professor in the Department of Political Science at Augusta State b. associate professor at the School of Business Administration and an adjunct professor in the International Development Studies program in the College of Sustainability at Dalhousie University, Canada [Paolo Spadoni & Julia Sagebien, Will They Still Love Us Tomorrow? Canada-Cuba Business Relations and the End of the US Embargo, Thunderbird International Business Review, Volume 55, Issue 1, pages 77–93, January/February 2013, http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/tie.21524/full]

Although Fidel Castro's definitive exit from the scene, and a Cuban government led by someone other than Raúl Castro, would speed up a relaxation of the embargo, such process will mostly depend on US domestic dynamics. The embargo has survived the end of the Cold War primarily as a domestic electoral issue linked to the role the US-based Cuban exile community has played in helping determine the electoral outcome of important swing states such as Florida and New Jersey. Cuban-American lobbying and hefty campaign contributions were additional key factors (Eckstein, 2009, pp. 127–132; Haney & Vanderbush, 2005, p. 72; Rich Kaplowitz, 1998, p. 134). What Cuban-Americans think and feel matters. They were relatively receptive or at least not outright hostile to Obama's early remarks on Cuba and welcomed the lifting of restrictions on their travel and money transfers to the island. The Cuban American National Foundation (CANF) fully supported the president's decision to increase this kind of people-to-people exchange (CANF, 2009). Moreover, US opinion polls show considerable backing for a further easing of sanctions that are considered anachronistic and ineffective, even by many Cuban-Americans.4 Washington's Cuba policy has recently been going through a strident debate in Congress, where a series of bipartisan legislative proposals aimed to chip away at various aspects of the embargo are under consideration. Yet, pro-embargo forces, among them Cuban-American legislators and other members of the congressional group Cuba Democracy Caucus, will not go down without a fight, as demonstrated by their strenuous opposition to the aforementioned bills and their attempts to set rules for travel and remittances to Cuba back to what they were under former President George W. Bush.5

#### Immigration is key to maintaining economic growth

Center for American Progress 10 [How Immigration Reform Would Help the Economy, p. <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/immigration/news/2010/01/14/7130/how-immigration-reform-would-help-the-economy/>]

A new report, “Raising the Floor for American Workers: The Economic Benefits of Comprehensive Immigration Reform,” by Dr. Raúl Hinojosa-Ojeda, finds that comprehensive immigration reform that includes a legalization program for unauthorized immigrants and enables a future flow of legal workers would result in a large economic benefit—a cumulative $1.5 trillion in added U.S. gross domestic product over 10 years. In stark contrast, a deportation- only policy would result in a loss of $2.6 trillion in GDP over 10 years. Hinojosa uses a computable general equilibrium model based on the historical experience of the 1986 legalization program, and finds that: Comprehensive immigration reform that includes a legalization program for unauthorized immigrants would stimulate the U.S. economy. Immigration reform would increase U.S. GDP by at least 0.84 percent. This would translate into at least a $1.5 trillion cumulative increase in GDP over 10 years, which includes approximately $1.2 trillion in consumption and $256 billion in investment. The benefits of additional GDP growth would be spread broadly throughout the U.S. economy, but immigrant-heavy sectors such as textiles, electronic equipment, and construction would see particularly large increases. The higher earning power of newly legalized workers would mean increased tax revenues of $4.5 billion to $5.4 billion in the first three years. Higher personal income would also generate increased consumer spending—enough to support 750,000 to 900,000 jobs in the United States. Experience shows that legalized workers open bank accounts, buy homes, and start businesses, further stimulating the U.S. economy. Comprehensive immigration reform increases all workers’ wages. The real wages of less-skilled newly legalized workers would increase by roughly $4,405 per year, while higher-skilled workers would see their income increase $6,185 per year. The wages of native-born high-skill and low-skill U.S. workers also increase modestly under comprehensive immigration reform because the “wage floor” rises for all workers. Legalized workers invest more in their human capital, including education, job training, and English-language skills, making them even more productive workers and higher earners. Mass deportation is costly, lowers wages, and harms the U.S. economy. Mass deportation would reduce U.S. GDP by 1.46 percent, amounting to a cumulative $2.6 trillion loss in GDP over 10 years, not including the actual costs of deportation. The Center for American Progress has estimated that mass deportation would cost $206 billion to $230 billion over five years. Wages would rise for less-skilled native-born workers under a mass deportation scenario, but higher-skilled natives’ wages would decrease, and there would be widespread job loss. Studies from various researchers with divergent political perspectives confirm these findings. A report by the libertarian CATO Institute using a similar CGE model came to startlingly similar conclusions. CATO found that legalization would yield significant income gains for American workers and households. Legalization would boost the incomes of U.S. households by $180 billion in 2019. CATO also concluded that tighter restrictions and a reduction in less-skilled immigration would impose large costs on native-born Americans by shrinking the overall economy and lowering worker productivity.

#### Economic decline risks multiple global nuclear wars

O’Hanlon 12 Kenneth G. Lieberthal, Director of the John L. Thornton China Center and Senior Fellow in Foreign Policy and Global Economy and Development at the Brookings Institution, former Professor at the University of Michigan [“The Real National Security Threat: America's Debt,” Los Angeles Times, July 10th, [http://www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/2012/07/10-economy-foreign-policy-lieberthal-ohanlon](http://www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/2012/07/10-economy-foreign-policy-lieberthal-ohanlon" \t "_blank)]

Alas, globalization and automation trends of the last generation have increasingly called the American dream into question for the working classes. Another decade of underinvestment in what is required to remedy this situation will make an isolationist or populist president far more likely because much of the country will question whether an internationalist role makes sense for America — especially if it costs us well over half a trillion dollars in defense spending annually yet seems correlated with more job losses. Lastly, American economic weakness undercuts U.S. leadership abroad. Other countries sense our weakness and wonder about our purport 7ed decline. If this perception becomes more widespread, and the case that we are in decline becomes more persuasive, countries will begin to take actions that reflect their skepticism about America's future. Allies and friendswill doubt our commitment and may pursue nuclear weapons for their own security, for example; adversaries will sense opportunity and be less restrainedin throwing around their weight in their own neighborhoods. The crucial Persian Gulf and Western Pacific regions will likely become less stable. Major war will become more likely. When running for president last time, Obama eloquently articulated big foreign policy visions: healing America's breach with the Muslim world, controlling global climate change, dramatically curbing globalpoverty through development aid, **moving toward a world free of** nuclear weapons. These were, and remain, worthy if elusive goals. However, for Obama or his successor, there is now amuchmore urgent big-pictureissue:restoring U.S. economic strength.Nothing else isreallypossibleif thatfundamentalprerequisite toeffectiveforeign policyis not reestablished.

### 1NC Human Rights Frontline

#### 1. Too much too fast causes instability—going too fast risks civil war

Perez 10 J.D. Yale Law School. Working with Koh former Dean of Yale Law and Legal Advisor to the State Department [David A. Perez, America's Cuba Policy: The Way Forward: A Policy Recommendation for the U.S. State Department, Spring, 2010, Harvard Latino Law Review, 13 Harv. Latino L. Rev. 187]

Policymakers in Washington must realize that Cubans will not wake up the day after Fidel Castro dies and experience broad-based attitudinal changes. Therefore, while economic reform is sure to preface political reform, the Cuban government will have to move slowly on the former so as not to alienate the population, which would truncate the latter. At first, a successor regime may think that choosing between Castroism and economic liberalization is a Faustian choice: economic doldrums with continuity versus economic revitalization with instability. Indeed, continuing Castroism embraces the history and normative values attached to the Revolution, but would forestall any economic recovery. On the other hand, liberalizing the economy by adopting market reforms would promote economic growth, but could also alienate large segments of the population still enamored by Castro's revolutionary zeal. For example, one possible market reform would be to lay off the excess workforce that has cluttered the state-controlled enterprises and rendered them inefficient and virtually useless. Embracing deep cuts in the public employment might be efficient, but it certainly will not be popular. For decades Cubans have enjoyed job security, universal education, and universal healthcare. If market reforms are interpreted as a wholesale rejection of the normative and ideological underpinnings that have dominated Cuban discourse for the last fifty years, they will no doubt alienate influential ideologues in the Communist Party, the military, the Ministry of the Interior, and many others in the general population.

When a state takes control of the economy, it also takes responsibility for it when it performs poorly. A strong state could surely implement these reforms and survive the ensuing backlash; but to do so would require deft political maneuvering, and a careful patience to not try to change everything all at once. A poorly managed state-led economic opening can quickly become unmanageable, and create instability. Given these concerns, a slow and methodical economic transition, rather than an overnight toppling of the [\*210] state-sector, would be a far more pragmatic approach for the Cuban government.

China and Vietnam have both introduced market reforms that dwarf any that the Cuban regime has introduced so far. Given that China has been on the path of liberalization for over thirty years yet the state still controls wide swaths of the economy, one might expect Cuba's economic transformation to also move lethargically—especially at first. The stronger the parallel with Asia becomes, the more methodical Cuba's opening will be. Expectations that assume a quick economic turnaround should be correspondingly adjusted. Thus, the United States should recognize that the Cuban government has little choice but to move at a relatively glacial speed, and instead work assiduously to make the economic transition as smooth as possible. To that end, it is absolutely crucial that our policies not be used as a way to settle political grudges. For example, if America moves to regain the properties taken by the Cuban government fifty years ago as a way to "encourage" market reforms, the entire effort will be short-circuited before it takes off the ground.

Some will argue that focusing on market liberalization, while putting political reforms to the side, endangers Cuba's long-term prospects for liberty and freedom. This is a valid concern. Nevertheless, in normative terms, market reforms will vastly improve the lives of the Cuban people. The improved living conditions will give fringe groups with few resources the ability to focus their own efforts on political reform from within. Improved economic conditions, if used as a prerequisite to political reform, may also prevent a costly civil war during the inevitably painful transition.

**2. No impact**—the plan does not resolve human rights abuses occurring in other places in the world, such as North Korea and Russia, which is resulting in the oppression of millions.

#### 3. Embargo is good—close to causing a democratic revolution

Sadowski 12 Managing Editor of Production of the Journal of International Business and Law, Hoftra [Sadowski, Richard. "Cuban Offshore Drilling: Preparation and Prevention within the Framework of the United States’ Embargo." Sustainable Development Law & Policy 12.1 (2012): 10.]

Conclusion

Since its inception, the Cuban embargo has ebbed and flowed in severity and support. While the measure seems to be increasingly unpopular, it takes legitimate aim at a Cuban regime characterized by intolerance and oppression. Though the Castros utilize the embargo as a scapegoat upon which to blame Cuba’s failures,94 recent changes suggest the embargo is indeed close to accomplishing its goals.95 Despite this, critics, including U.S. oil producers, want the embargo dropped. Regardless of criticism, the embargo must remain in place until its goals are met. Environmental fears can be effectively countered through bilateral response and preparation agreements with Cuba. Also, economic and energy needs are more properly addressed through drilling U.S. resources. Ultimately, with the aid of legislation such as Buchanan’s bill, the United States should exercise its political and economic power to pressure foreign companies to avoid offshore drilling in Cuba. The United States can dissuade foreign investment without compromising the embargo. It appears an end to oppressive communist rule in Cuba is nearing. Now is the time for the United States to both reject offshore drilling in Cuba and demonstrate resolve in meeting the goals of the economic embargo.

**4. No solvency**—the government holds control over the majority of the economy. Lifting the embargo would funnel more money into the government, allowing them to abuse their people more.

**5. No solvency**—trade will not help the Cubans more autonomy. The government is trading with the Netherlands now and still do not have access to necessary medical supplies.

#### 6. Alt causes to human rights abuses—war on terror and cyber war policies—plan can’t solve

Greenwald 12—Glenn Greenwald is an American political journalist, lawyer, columnist, blogger, and author [June 25, 2012, “Collapsing U.S. credibility,” http://www.salon.com/2012/06/25/collapsing\_u\_s\_credibility/]

Two Op-Eds in The New York Times this morning both warn of the precipitous decline of American credibility on matters of human rights and peace ushered in by the Obama presidency. Taken together, they explain much of why I’ve been writing what I’ve been writing over the last three years. The first is from Columbia Professor and cyber expert Misha Glenny, who explains the significance of the first ever deployment of cyberwarfare — by the U.S. (first under Bush and accelerated under Obama), along with Israel, against Iran:

THE decision by the United States and Israel to develop and then deploy the Stuxnet computer worm against an Iranian nuclear facility late in George W. Bush’s presidency marked a significant and dangerous turning point in the gradual militarization of the Internet. Washington has begun to cross the Rubicon. If it continues, contemporary warfare will change fundamentally as we move into hazardous and uncharted territory.

It is one thing to write viruses and lock them away safely for future use should circumstances dictate it. It is quite another to deploy them in peacetime. Stuxnet has effectively fired the starting gun in a new arms race that is very likely to lead to the spread of similar and still more powerful offensive cyberweaponry across the Internet. Unlike nuclear or chemical weapons, however, countries are developing cyberweapons outside any regulatory framework. . . .

Stuxnet was originally deployed with the specific aim of infecting the Natanz uranium enrichment facility in Iran. This required sneaking a memory stick into the plant to introduce the virus to its private and secure “offline” network. But despite Natanz’s isolation, Stuxnet somehow escaped into the cyberwild, eventually affecting hundreds of thousands of systems worldwide.

This is one of the frightening dangers of an uncontrolled arms race in cyberspace; once released, virus developers generally lose control of their inventions, which will inevitably seek out and attack the networks of innocent parties. Moreover, all countries that possess an offensive cyber capability will be tempted to use it now that the first shot has been fired. . . .

The United States has long been a commendable leader in combating the spread of malicious computer code, known as malware, that pranksters, criminals, intelligence services and terrorist organizations have been using to further their own ends. But by introducing such pernicious viruses as Stuxnet and Flame, America has severely undermined its moral and political credibility.

He also explains that the Obama administration opposes any treaties to regulate all of this in part because it “might undermine its presumed superiority in the field of cyberweaponry and robotics,” and because it claims Russia and China (but not, of course, the U.S.) would attempt to exploit such treaties to control the Internet.

In case anyone thinks he’s being melodramatic in his warnings, the original New York Times article by David Sanger that confirmed U.S. responsibility for the cyber attack included this passage: “Mr. Obama, according to participants in the many Situation Room meetings on Olympic Games, was acutely aware that with every attack he was pushing the United States into new territory, much as his predecessors had with the first use of atomic weapons in the 1940s, of intercontinental missiles in the 1950s and of drones in the past decade.” It also explained that America’s maiden use of this new form of warfare “could enable other countries, terrorists or hackers to justify their own attacks.”

The second is from former U.S. President Jimmy Carter, an actually meritorious Nobel Peace Prize winner, who describes the record of his fellow Nobel laureate, the current President, in an Op-Ed entitled “A Cruel and Unusual Record“:

Revelations that top officials are targeting people to be assassinated abroad, including American citizens, are only the most recent, disturbing proof of how far our nation’s violation of human rights has extended. This development began after the terrorist attacks of Sept. 11, 2001, and has been sanctioned and escalated by bipartisan executive and legislative actions, without dissent from the general public. As a result, our country can no longer speak with moral authority on these critical issues. . . . .

It is disturbing that, instead of strengthening these principles, our government’s counterterrorism policies are now clearly violating at least 10 of the [Declaration on Human Rights'] 30 articles, including the prohibition against “cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.”

Recent legislation has made legal the president’s right to detain a person indefinitely on suspicion of affiliation with terrorist organizations or “associated forces,” a broad, vague power that can be abused without meaningful oversight from the courts or Congress (the law is currently being blocked by a federal judge). This law violates the right to freedom of expression and to be presumed innocent until proved guilty, two other rights enshrined in the declaration.

In addition to American citizens’ being targeted for assassination or indefinite detention, recent laws have canceled the restraints in the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to allow unprecedented violations of our rights to privacy through warrantless wiretapping and government mining of our electronic communications. . . .

Despite an arbitrary rule that any man killed by drones is declared an enemy terrorist, the death of nearby innocent women and children is accepted as inevitable. After more than 30 airstrikes on civilian homes this year in Afghanistan, President Hamid Karzai has demanded that such attacks end, but the practice continues in areas of Pakistan, Somalia and Yemen that are not in any war zone. We don’t know how many hundreds of innocent civilians have been killed in these attacks, each one approved by the highest authorities in Washington. This would have been unthinkable in previous times.

These policies clearly affect American foreign policy. Top intelligence and military officials, as well as rights defenders in targeted areas, affirm that the great escalation in drone attacks has turned aggrieved families toward terrorist organizations, aroused civilian populations against us and permitted repressive governments to cite such actions to justify their own despotic behavior. . . .

At a time when popular revolutions are sweeping the globe, the United States should be strengthening, not weakening, basic rules of law and principles of justice enumerated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. But instead of making the world safer, America’s violation of international human rights abets our enemies and alienates our friends.

One can reasonably object to Carter’s Op-Ed on the ground that it romanticizes a non-existent American past (systematic human rights abuses are hardly a new development in the post-9/11 world), but what cannot be reasonably disputed is the trend he denounces. Note that the most egregious examples he cites — assassinating U.S. citizens without due process, civilian-killing drone attacks, the indefinite detention provisions of the NDAA — had some genesis under Bush but are hallmarks of Obama policy (his other example, the rapid erosion of constraints on government domestic surveillance, took place under both, with the full support of Obama). It’s a remarkably scathing denunciation of the record of his own political party and its current leader.

#### 7. Sanctions aren’t inherently human rights violations

Marks 99 Frangois-Xavier Bagnoud Professor of Health and Human Rights, Harvard School of Public Health [Stephen P. Marks, Economic Sanctions as Human Rights Violations: Reconciling Political and Public Health Imperatives, American Journal of Public Health, October 1999, Vol. 89, No. 10]

This tension between the sound conclusions of public health surveys of countries targeted by sanctions and the uncertain attribution of responsibility for human rights violations underscores the need for more reflection on the relationship between health and human rights. There can be no doubt that the civilian populations in targeted countries are victims of human rights violations. The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights authoritatively declared that "the inhabitants of a given country do not forfeit their basic economic, social and cultural rights by virtue of any determination that their leaders have violated norms relating to international peace and security."42 While it is necessarily true that violations are committed by perpetrators, the principles of accountability for the human rights violations resulting from sanctions do not clearly identify the perpetrators or the consequences they should bear. Therefore, a more fruitful avenue is reform of sanctions to avoid such violations.

### 1NC Relations Frontline

#### 1. Incompatible political views impede relations—lifting the embargo won’t solve

Hanson and Lee 13—Stephanie Hanson is associate director and coordinating editor at CFR.org. She manages the editorial production of the website and covers economic and political development in Africa and Latin America. Brianna Lee is Senior Production Editor at CFR [January 31, 2013, “U.S.-Cuba Relations,” http://www.cfr.org/cuba/us-cuba-relations/p11113]

What is the main obstacle in U.S.-Cuban relations?

A fundamental incompatibility of political views stands in the way of improving U.S.-Cuban relations, experts say. While experts say the United States wants regime change, "the most important objective of the Cuban government is to remain in power at all costs," says Felix Martin, an assistant professor at Florida International University's Cuban Research Institute. Fidel Castro has been an inspiration for Latin American leftists such as Venezuelan President Hugo Chávez and Bolivian President Evo Morales, who have challenged U.S. policy in the region.

**2. No internal link**—Cuba is not the lynchpin of relations because it is politically and demographically different from other Latin American countries. Trade with Brazil and Mexico will help keep the alliance together.

#### 3. Alt causes to good relations with Cuba

Hanson and Lee 13—Stephanie Hanson is associate director and coordinating editor at CFR.org. She manages the editorial production of the website and covers economic and political development in Africa and Latin America. Brianna Lee is Senior Production Editor at CFR [January 31, 2013, “U.S.-Cuba Relations,” http://www.cfr.org/cuba/us-cuba-relations/p11113]

What are the issues preventing normalization of U.S.-Cuba relations?

Experts say these issues include:

Human rights violations. In March 2003, the Cuban government arrested seventy-five dissidents and journalists, sentencing them to prison terms of up to twenty-eight years on charges of conspiring with the United States to overthrow the state. The Cuban Commission for Human Rights and National Reconciliation, a Havana-based nongovernmental group, reports that the government has in recent years resorted to other tactics besides prison --such as firings from state jobs and intimidation on the street-- to silence opposition figures. A 2005 UN Human Rights Commission vote condemned Cuba's human rights record, but the country was elected to the new UN Human Rights Council in 2006.

Guantanamo Bay. Cuba indicated after 9/11 that it would not object if the United States brought prisoners to Guantanamo Bay. However, experts such as Sweig say Cuban officials have since seized on the U.S. prison camp--where hundreds of terror suspects have been detained--as a "symbol of solidarity" with the rest of the world against the United States. Although Obama ordered Guantanamo to be closed by January 22, 2010, the facility remains open as of January 2013, and many analysts say it is likely to stay in operation for an extended period.

Cuban exile community. The Cuban-American community in southern Florida traditionally has heavily influenced U.S. policy with Cuba. Both political parties fear alienating a strong voting bloc in an important swing state in presidential elections.

**4. No internal link**—Relations with Latin American will not spillover to resolve issues of Iran or North Korean nuclearization.

**5. No impact**—Latin American countries do know possess the know how or materials required to assemble and detonate a nuclear weapon.

#### 6. No widespread prolif

Hymans 12—Jacques E. C. Hymans is Associate Professor of IR at USC [April 16, 2012, “North Korea's Lessons for (Not) Building an Atomic Bomb,” *Foreign Affairs*, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/137408/jacques-e-c-hymans/north-koreas-lessons-for-not-building-an-atomic-bomb?page=show]

Washington's miscalculation is not just a product of the difficulties of seeing inside the Hermit Kingdom. It is also a result of the broader tendency to overestimate the pace of global proliferation. For decades, Very Serious People have predicted that strategic weapons are about to spread to every corner of the earth. Such warnings have routinely proved wrong -- for instance, the intelligence assessments that led to the 2003 invasion of Iraq -- but they continue to be issued. In reality, despite the diffusion of the relevant technology and the knowledge for building nuclear weapons, the world has been experiencing a great proliferation slowdown. Nuclear weapons programs around the world are taking much longer to get off the ground -- and their failure rate is much higher -- than they did during the first 25 years of the nuclear age.

As I explain in my article "Botching the Bomb" in the upcoming issue of Foreign Affairs, the key reason for the great proliferation slowdown is the absence of strong cultures of scientific professionalism in most of the recent crop of would-be nuclear states, which in turn is a consequence of their poorly built political institutions. In such dysfunctional states, the quality of technical workmanship is low, there is little coordination across different technical teams, and technical mistakes lead not to productive learning but instead to finger-pointing and recrimination. These problems are debilitating, and they cannot be fixed simply by bringing in more imported parts through illicit supply networks. In short, as a struggling proliferator, North Korea has a lot of company.

**7. No impact**—relations cannot resolve carbon emissions from china or india.

#### 8. Relations won’t solve warming

Washington Times 11—a full-service, general interest daily newspaper in the nation's capital, it has a reputation for hard-hitting investigative reporting and thorough coverage of politics and policy [2/7/11, “Global warming a hard sell,” available online at http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2011/feb/7/global-warming-a-hard-sell/]

Former Vice President Al Gore said on his website recently that the reason for the particularly harsh and snowy winter we’ve been experiencing this season was because of “man-made global warming” (“Snow job,” Comment & Analysis, Jan. 28). According to Mr. Gore, “scientists have been warning for at least two decades that global warming could make snowstorms more severe.” So just to recap, whether there’s a week-long heat wave or the exact opposite—a frigid winter—the cause is always the same: global warming. In 1992, Mr. Gore wrote his comprehensive “the sky is falling” environmental book, “Earth in the Balance,” (Rodale Books, 1992), which catapulted him to the top of Bill Clinton‘s list of potential running mates. The two would run on what was dubbed the “environmental ticket” that same year. With all his encyclopedic knowledge on the pending apocalyptic environmental calamity awaiting mankind, why did he wait so long to do something about it? For eight years, Mr. Gore was at the seat of power in the United States and this controversial environmental crisis didn’t seem to be all that much of an emergency to him then. Even if Mr. Gore were eventually proved right, there’s no political solution to global warming. Does anyone really think that China, India or any other budding industrial powerhouse is ever going to alter its economic policies because of a flimflam argument that even the godfather of the cause didn’t do anything about when he could have?

#### 9. Soft power doesn’t solve—increases resentment for the “uncivilized”

Gray 11—Professor of International Politics and Strategic Studies at the University of Reading, England [Colin S., April, “HARD POWER AND SOFT POWER: THE UTILITY OF MILITARY FORCE AS AN INSTRUMENT OF POLICY IN THE 21ST CENTURY,” Published by Strategic Studies Institute]

An inherent and unavoidable problem with a country’s soft power is that it is near certain to be misassessed by the politicians who attempt to govern soft power’s societal owners and carriers. Few thoroughly encultured Americans are likely to undervalue “the American way” in many of its aspects as a potent source of friendly self-co-option abroad. Often, this self-flattering appreciation will be well justified in reality. But as an already existing instrument of American policy, the soft power of ideas and practical example is fraught with the perils of self-delusion. If one adheres to an ideology that is a heady mixture of Christian ethics (“one nation, under God . . .”), democratic principles, and free market orthodoxy, and if one is an American, which is to say if one is a citizen of a somewhat hegemonic world power that undeniably has enjoyed a notably successful historical passage to date, then it is natural to confuse the national ideology with a universal creed. Such confusion is only partial, but nonetheless it is sufficiently damaging as to be a danger to national strategy. Since it is fallacious to assume that American values truly are universal, the domain of high relevance and scope for American soft power to be influential is distinctly limited. If one places major policy weight on the putative value for policy of American soft power, one needs to be acutely alert to the dangers of an under-recognized ethnocentrism born of cultural ignorance. This ignorance breeds an arrogant disdain for evidence of foreigners’ lack of interest in being coopted to join American civilization. The result of such arrogance predictably is political and even military strategic counterreaction. It is a case of good intentions gone bad when they are pursued with indifference toward the local cultural context. Some people have difficulty grasping the unpalatable fact that much of the world is not receptive to any American soft power that attempts to woo it to the side of American interests. Not all rivalries are resolvable by ideas, formulas, or “deals” that seem fair and equitable to us. There are conflicts wherein the struggle is the message, to misquote Marshal MacLuhan, with value in the eyes of local belligerents. Not all local conflicts around the world are amenable to the calming effect of American soft power. True militarists of left and right, secular and religious, find intrinsic value in struggle and warfare, as A. J. Coates has explained all too clearly. The self-fulfilment and self-satisfaction that war generates derive in part from the religious or ideological significance attributed to it and from the resultant sense of participating in some grand design. It may be, however, that the experience of war comes to be prized for its own sake and not just for the great ends that it serves or promotes. For many, the excitement unique to war makes pacific pursuits seem insipid by comparison. This understanding and experience of moral, psychological, and emotional self-fulfillment increase our tolerance for war and threaten its moral regulation. It transforms war from an instrumental into an expressive activity.49 It is foolish to believe that every conflict contains the seeds of its own resolution, merely awaiting suitable watering through co-option by soft power. To be fair, similarly unreasonable faith in the disciplinary value of (American) military force is also to be deplored.

#### 10. US decline will not spark wars.

MacDonald & Parent 11—Professor of Political Science at Williams College & Professor of Political Science at University of Miami [Paul K. MacDonald & Joseph M. Parent, “Graceful Decline? The Surprising Success of Great Power Retrenchment,” International Security, Vol. 35, No. 4 (Spring 2011), pp. 7–44]

Our findings are directly relevant to what appears to be an impending great power transition between China and the United States. Estimates of economic performance vary, but most observers expect Chinese GDP to surpass U.S. GDP sometime in the next decade or two. 91 This prospect has generated considerable concern. Many scholars foresee major conflict during a Sino-U.S. ordinal transition. Echoing Gilpin and Copeland, John Mearsheimer sees the crux of the issue as irreconcilable goals: China wants to be America’s superior and the United States wants no peer competitors. In his words, “[N]o amount of goodwill can ameliorate the intense security competition that sets in when an aspiring hegemon appears in Eurasia.” 92

Contrary to these predictions, our analysis suggests some grounds for optimism. Based on the historical track record of great powers facing acute relative decline, the United States should be able to retrench in the coming decades. In the next few years, the United States is ripe to overhaul its military, shift burdens to its allies, and work to decrease costly international commitments. It is likely to initiate and become embroiled in fewer militarized disputes than the average great power and to settle these disputes more amicably. Some might view this prospect with apprehension, fearing the steady erosion of U.S. credibility. Yet our analysis suggests that retrenchment need not signal weakness. Holding on to exposed and expensive commitments simply for the sake of one’s reputation is a greater geopolitical gamble than withdrawing to cheaper, more defensible frontiers.

Some observers might dispute our conclusions, arguing that hegemonic transitions are more conflict prone than other moments of acute relative decline. We counter that there are deductive and empirical reasons to doubt this argument. Theoretically, hegemonic powers should actually find it easier to manage acute relative decline. Fallen hegemons still have formidable capability, which threatens grave harm to any state that tries to cross them. Further, they are no longer the top target for balancing coalitions, and recovering hegemons may be influential because they can play a pivotal role in alliance formation. In addition, hegemonic powers, almost by definition, possess more extensive overseas commitments; they should be able to more readily identify and eliminate extraneous burdens without exposing vulnerabilities or exciting domestic populations.

We believe the empirical record supports these conclusions. In particular, periods of hegemonic transition do not appear more conflict prone than those of acute decline. The last reversal at the pinnacle of power was the AngloAmerican transition, which took place around 1872 and was resolved without armed confrontation. The tenor of that transition may have been influenced by a number of factors: both states were democratic maritime empires, the United States was slowly emerging from the Civil War, and Great Britain could likely coast on a large lead in domestic capital stock. Although China and the United States differ in regime type, similar factors may work to cushion the impending Sino-American transition. Both are large, relatively secure continental great powers, a fact that mitigates potential geopolitical competition. 93 China faces a variety of domestic political challenges, including strains among rival regions, which may complicate its ability to sustain its economic performance or engage in foreign policy adventurism. 94

Most important, the United States is not in free fall. Extrapolating the data into the future, we anticipate the United States will experience a “moderate” decline, losing from 2 to 4 percent of its share of great power GDP in the five years after being surpassed by China sometime in the next decade or two. 95 Given the relatively gradual rate of U.S. decline relative to China, the incentives for either side to run risks by courting conflict are minimal. The United States would still possess upwards of a third of the share of great power GDP, and would have little to gain from provoking a crisis over a peripheral issue. Conversely, China has few incentives to exploit U.S. weakness. 96 Given the importance of the U.S. market to the Chinese economy, in addition to the critical role played by the dollar as a global reserve currency, it is unclear how Beijing could hope to consolidate or expand its increasingly advantageous position through direct confrontation. In short, the United States should be able to reduce its foreign policy commitments in East Asia in the coming decades without inviting Chinese expansionism. Indeed, there is evidence that a policy of retrenchment could reap potential benefits. The drawdown and repositioning of U.S. troops in South Korea, for example, rather than fostering instability, has resulted in an improvement in the occasionally strained relationship between Washington and Seoul. 97 U.S. moderation on Taiwan, rather than encouraging hard-liners in Beijing, resulted in an improvement in cross-strait relations and reassured U.S. allies that Washington would not inadvertently drag them into a Sino-U.S. conflict. 98 Moreover, Washington’s support for the development of multilateral security institutions, rather than harming bilateral alliances, could work to enhance U.S. prestige while embedding China within a more transparent regional order. 99 A policy of gradual retrenchment need not undermine the credibility of U.S. alliance commitments or unleash destabilizing regional security dilemmas. Indeed, even if Beijing harbored revisionist intent, it is unclear that China will have the force projection capabilities necessary to take and hold additional territory. 100 By incrementally shifting burdens to regional allies and multilateral institutions, the United States can strengthen the credibility of its core commitments while accommodating the interests of a rising China. Not least among the benefits of retrenchment is that it helps alleviate an unsustainable financial position. Immense forward deployments will only exacerbate U.S. grand strategic problems and risk unnecessary clashes. 101