### 1NC

#### Tea Party candidates will lose in 2014 now

Steven J. Gulitti, 10/22/13, Capitol Hill Blue, The Tea Party and the G.O.P.: From Rescue to Wreck, http://readerrant.capitolhillblue.com/ubbthreads.php?ubb=showflat&Number=264245

In the political “Danse Macabre” that is political obstruction the government shutdown left ample room for both sides to posture and politic until that fateful moment during the second week of October when the reality of the Republican mistake came more clearly into focus. During that week the political poll numbers showed that, despite the public’s disgust with Washington in general, their dismay with the Republican Party specifically and more specifically with the Tea Party was just too much to be ignored. Citing a NBC/Wall Street Journal Poll: “By a 22-point margin (53 percent to 31 percent), the public blames the Republican Party more for the shutdown than President Barack Obama… Just 24 percent of respondents have a favorable opinion about the GOP, and only 21 percent have a favorable view of the Tea Party, which are both at all-time lows in the history of poll… Yet what is perhaps even more worrisome for the GOP is the “boomerang” effect: As the party has used the shutdown and fiscal fight to campaign against the nation’s health-care law and for limited government, the poll shows those efforts have backfired.” The net effect of these poll findings is that President Obama’s ratings went up as did support for the A.C.A. In fact, Obamacare was seen to be more popular than both the G.O.P. and the Tea Party. Disapproval of the Republican Party topped 70 percent vice 59 percent for the Democrats and 48 percent for the president. The sinking popularity of the Tea Party was replicated in other polling results: “A Pew Research Center poll released this week showed public favorability for the Tea Party dropped to its lowest level since driving the Republican takeover of the House in the 2010 elections. An AP-Gfk poll showed that 70 percent now hold unfavorable views of the Tea Party.” The Gallup findings, which replicate other polling further found that there is a growing ambivalance among Republicans for the Tea Party that was supposed to be it’s savior. Whereas three years ago when two thirds of Republicans supported the Tea Party today it’s down to 38 percent as per the latest Gallup Poll. The agony of public opinion would turn out to be too much to bear for the Republican esthablishment and it’s media supporters. Gone were the usual defelective commentary about an “oversampling” of “progressives” of the usual allegations about a liberal bias in the polling. A good barometer of how things are going within the conservative movement is Fox News and the arrival ot this disquieting news led to a distinct change in the commentary on that channel. Conservative stalwarts like Charles Krauthammer, Jonah Goldberg, Stephen Hays and Kristen Powers went from the usual scathing criticisms of Obama and the Democrats to publicly bemoaning the self destruction of the House Republicans to a veiled appeal to Obama himself not to rub their noses in defeat by spiking the ball in the end zone and dancing when compromise was finally in view.

#### Plan’s a wedge issue that causes Tea Party success in the midterms as rank-and-file GOP voters rebel against establishment candidates

Silver, ’13 [Nathaniel Read "Nate" Silver is an American statistician and writer who analyzes in-game baseball activity and elections. He is currently the editor-in-chief of ESPN's FiveThirtyEight blog and a Special Correspondent for ABC News. June 11, 2013, 538 – NYT, Domestic Surveillance Could Create a Divide in the 2016 Primaries, <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2013/06/11/domestic-surveillance-could-create-a-divide-in-the-2016-primaries/?_r=0>, jj]

A poll released on Monday by the Pew Research Center and The Washington Post found a partisan shift in the way Americans view the National Security Agency’s domestic surveillance programs. In the survey, slightly more Democrats than Republicans said they found it acceptable for the N.S.A. to track Americans’ phone records and e-mails if the goal is to prevent terrorism. By comparison, when Pew Research asked a similar question in 2006, Republicans were about twice as likely as Democrats to support the N.S.A.’s activities. The poll is a reminder that many Americans do not hold especially firm views on some issues and instead may adapt them depending on which party controls the executive branch. When it comes to domestic surveillance, a considerable number of Democrats seem willing to support actions under President Obama that they deemed unacceptable under George W. Bush, while some Republicans have shifted in the opposite direction. What may be just as significant is the way in which attitudes toward the security state could split voters and elected officials within each party — possibly creating a wedge issue in both party primaries in 2016. Politicians who are normally associated with being on the far left and the far right may find common cause with grass-roots voters in their objection to domestic surveillance programs, fighting against a party establishment that is inclined to support them. Take, for example, the House’s vote in May 2011 to extend certain provisions of the Patriot Act — including the so-called library records provision that the government has used to defend the legality of sweeping searches of telephone and e-mail records. The bill passed with 250 yes votes in the House against 153 no votes, receiving more of its support from Republicans. (In the Senate, the bill passed, 72-23, winning majority support from both parties.) However, the House vote was not well described by a traditional left-right political spectrum. In the chart below, I’ve sorted the 403 members of the House who voted on the bill from left to right in order of their overall degree of liberalism or conservatism, as determined by the statistical system DW-Nominate. Members of the House who voted for the bill are represented with a yellow stripe in the chart, while those who voted against it are represented in black. The no votes are concentrated at the two ends of the spectrum. The 49 most liberal members of the House (all Democrats) who voted on the bill each voted against it. But so did 14 of the 21 Republicans deemed to be the most conservative by DW-Nominate. By contrast, 46 of the 50 most moderate Republicans voted for the Patriot Act extension, as did 38 of the 50 most moderate Democrats. Perhaps, you might object, a one-dimensional spectrum doesn’t do a very good job of capturing all the nuances of what it means to be liberal or conservative in America today. In considering the surveillance state, for example, Republicans must weigh their traditional support for aggressive antiterrorism policies against their distrust of government, while Democrats must weigh their trust of Mr. Obama, who so far has been unapologetic for the N.S.A.’s actions, against their concern about civil liberties violations. Or more broadly, what about libertarians who take conservative views on economic policy but liberal views on social policy — or conservative Democrats who support the welfare state but not policies like gay marriage? Where are they represented on the spectrum? I am sympathetic toward these objections as a theoretical matter. Without making this too much of an editorial comment, I find the platforms of both parties to be lacking in philosophical cohesion — why, for example, should views on abortion have much to do with preferences on tax policy? But when it comes to American political parties and their representatives in Congress, partisanship tends to dominate all other considerations. National Journal has a different system for ranking members of Congress from liberal to conservative. It is somewhat less statistically rigorous than DW-Nominate’s system, but it does have the advantage of breaking votes down into three categories: those on economic, social and foreign policy. The correlations between the three policy areas are very high (specifically, they are about 0.9, where 1 would represent a perfect correlation). Members of Congress who take conservative views on economic policy tend almost always to take conservative views on social policy and foreign policy as well, while members who are liberal on one set of issues tend to cast liberal votes on almost all other issues. This does leave the question of how liberal and conservative policy stances are defined. (Support for gun rights, for example, is generally seen as socially conservative rather than socially liberal, even though socially liberal stances are often thought of as promoting the rights of individuals against communities or governments.) Nevertheless, for members of Congress today, a vote on any one issue is highly predictable based upon his votes on other issues. There are extremely few mavericks in Congress who vote on each issue on an independent and nonpartisan basis. DW-Nominate uses a different method to classify Congressional votes. Instead of assigning a subjective definition to each vote as liberal or conservative, it instead uses an automated process called optimal classification. The goal of this process is essentially to explain the highest number of Congressional votes based on a one-dimensional scale, regardless of the content of the legislation that comprises it. Whichever votes are not well explained by this first dimension are then explained by additional dimensions. The process is more intuitive than it might sound. For example, during the 1960s, Congressional votes on civil rights policy toward African-Americans were not very strongly correlated with votes on other types of political issues. (For instance, Southern Democrats were often staunchly opposed to civil rights for blacks while casting very liberal votes on the welfare state.) Thus, you needed at least two dimensions to describe Congressional voting patterns in a reasonably comprehensive way. In recent years, however, this has been much less of a problem: the one-dimensional spectrum explains about 95 percent of Congressional voting, and votes on economic, social and foreign policy are highly correlated. But a few votes still fall outside of the spectrum — the 2011 vote on the Patriot Act among them. If the second dimension no longer represents a distinction between economic and social policy, then what does it reflect? The authors of DW-Nominate are interpreting it to measure a distinction between what they call “establishment” members of Congress and “outsiders.” Here at FiveThirtyEight, I have sometimes used the same labels when describing the ideological space occupied by different candidates during the presidential primaries. Some candidates, like Mitt Romney, run as insider or establishment politicians, offering some iteration of what they say are tried-and-true solutions, while others run as insurgents or outsiders, submitting a more profound critique of politics as usual and claiming they will topple an unacceptable status quo. In general, those politicians who rate as insurgents or outsiders are on the wings of the liberal-conservative scale. The Tea Party, Occupy Wall Street and Ron Paul movements probably all fit into the outsider or insurgent category, for example, even though they inhabit vastly different spaces on the traditional left-right political spectrum. Conversely, moderates in both parties tend to score as establishment politicians. There aren’t very many “radical centrist” members of Congress who offer a pronounced critique of the status quo while also coming down somewhere in the middle on most policy issues. In the case of the Patriot Act vote, the establishment-outsider axis makes nearly as much difference as the liberal-conservative or Democratic-Republican scales. Among the so-called establishment members of the House who voted on the bill, 78 percent voted to extend the Patriot Act, while only 41 percent of the so-called outsiders did, according to DW-Nominate’s classifications. You can find similar patterns in certain votes on policy toward the financial sector — for example, during the various bailout votes that were cast toward the end of 2008. More recently, votes on the federal debt ceiling have taken on some of the same contours. What is the link between the financial votes and those on the surveillance state? In both cases, members of Congress were asked to trust the assertions of elites that significant harms would result if the bills were not enacted: terrorist acts in the event that the Patriot Act was not extended, or financial calamity in the event that the bailout was not passed or the debt ceiling was not raised. As a matter of practice (but not necessarily theory), convincing someone that a future crisis must be averted requires a higher level of persuasion than making the case for a policy that is claimed to ameliorate some extant problem. Members of Congress who are members of their party establishments might be more inclined to trust testimony from financial or national security elites, and therefore might have been easier to pitch on these bills. We should be careful about extrapolating the voting behavior of Congress to policy views among the general public. But as I have suggested, the establishment-outsider divide can loom large in presidential primaries. Particularly within the Republican Party, rank-and-file voters have increasingly lukewarm views of the party leadership. But Democrats will also face a primary after Mr. Obama’s tenure in office. Highly liberal, activist voters who might ordinarily be inclined to critique the status quo could face some awkward questions given that the status quo has featured a Democratic president. Debates on domestic surveillance could serve as proxy battles for these intraparty factions. Senator Rand Paul of Kentucky, perhaps along with other Republican candidates, could use his opposition to surveillance programs to help consolidate the support of libertarian and Tea Party voters, at the risk of alienating national security conservatives. Democratic candidates who criticize the Patriot Act or the N.S.A.’s actions will be finding fault with policies that Mr. Obama has defended – and Mr. Obama will very likely remain quite popular among Democrats three years from now.

#### This costs GOP moderates their seats and swings the election to the Tea Party

PDT 8/7-’13 [Pakistan Daily Times, Republican rift seeping into US foreign policy, <http://www.dailytimes.com.pk/default.asp?page=2013%5C08%5C07%5Cstory_7-8-2013_pg4_7>, jj]

Old-guard Republicans like Senator John McCain hew to the traditional line that the exertion of American power is the primary force of good in a chaotic world. They advocate supplying weapons to rebels in Syria, aiding Egypt despite the turmoil of the recent military coup, and using all tools at US disposal, including the surveillance of hundreds of millions of citizens, to keep America safe. But insurgent conservatives, led by libertarian-leaning Senators Rand Paul and Ted Cruz, are challenging that orthodoxy, and their influence has become difficult to ignore. A case in point came before the Senate late last week when Paul introduced a measure that would block $1.5 billion in aid to Egypt. His amendment was handily defeated, but not before heated debate between him and McCain over the role of the United States abroad. Notably voting with Paul and 11 other core conservatives was Mitch McConnell, the Senate’s top Republican. Together their vote bucked the position of AIPAC, the pro-Israel lobby that often finds Republican support in Washington. Earlier this year McCain derisively called Cruz and Paul “wacko birds” on the Senate floor, citing their procedural opposition to virtually anything supported by President Barack Obama, including the US budget, immigration reform, drone use, the national health law and foreign aid. “There may be more wacko birds in the Senate than is suspected,” Cruz, 42, sniped back at the 2008 Republican presidential nominee who is 34 years his senior. Cruz passed a big test last month in Iowa, where he was warmly received by several hundred evangelical pastors, a group that carries huge influence over the outcome of the first-in-the-nation primaries. Paul became a hero for many in March when he launched a 13-hour filibuster in the Senate to demand the Obama administration clarify its position on domestic use of drones. Political observers see a test brewing ahead of the presidential race in 2016 and even the mid-term elections in 2014, when voters will be confronted with what appears to be two divergent Republican strains. Michael Steele, a former chairman of the Republican National Committee, said recent ideological clashes have highlighted the “fracturing within the party.” “The question is will the John McCain view prevail ultimately going into 2014, or will the Ted Cruz view prevail?” he told MSNBC. The establishment’s growing unease with the upstarts, Paul led the Republican field in a recent PPP poll on the 2016 race, is likely what fueled a very public war of words late last month between two likely Republican contenders for the White House. New Jersey Governor Chris Christie blasted Paul’s position on domestic surveillance, and House of Representatives lawmakers who nearly de-funded the intelligence program that scoops up telephone records on millions of Americans. “This strain of libertarianism that’s going through both parties right now and making big headlines, I think, is a very dangerous thought,” Christie said at a mayoral panel. Paul shot back that “spying without warrants is unconstitutional.” The two carried on their bickering for days until reaching an uneasy truce. Congressman Peter King, the New York Republican who has chaired the House Homeland Security Committee, warned that the Tea Party favorites could threaten GOP aspirations for taking back the White House, especially if they were running against former secretary of state Hillary Clinton. “I think she’s very strong on foreign policy, and I think that if we nominate someone from our isolationist wing of the party, she’ll destroy them,” King told ABC News, adding that their pushing of the national debate is “harmful to the country.” Conservative columnist Charles Krauthammer argued in his Friday column that the return of conservative isolationism “was utterly predictable.” After years of war in Afghanistan and Iraq, debate over countless drone strikes and the revelations of mass surveillance by the National Security Agency, “the natural tension between isolationist and internationalist tendencies has resurfaced,” he wrote. Thomas Mann, a veteran congressional expert at the Brookings Institution, told AFP that while the Republican Party has largely accommodated the “economic libertarianism” of the Tea Party faithful in Congress,” true isolationists have little support among Republicans in office. “With Americans weary of war, this could begin to change but it would presage a real crackup of the GOP,” he said. afp

#### Continued tea party influence blocks Obama’s climate agenda—electing moderates is key

Huq, ’13 [Saleemul Huq, irector, International Centre for Climate Change and Development, Independent University, Bangladesh, Dhaka, Responding to Climate Change, Comment: the US looks like it’s getting serious on climate change, <http://www.rtcc.org/2013/08/07/comment-the-us-looks-like-its-getting-serious-on-climate-change/>, jj]

It is very clear that President Obama and his team of senior advisers all accept the scale of the climate change problem and recognise the US’s responsibilities. This is in stark contrast to his predecessor President Bush who refused to take any significant action for eight years. During President Obama’s first term of office he tried to bring Congress on board towards a national response to tackling climate change, which proved to be unsuccessful. So in his second term he has decided to take whatever action he can by executive order and without requiring Congressional approval. While I have criticised his Climate Action Plan as being too little too late (when compared to the scale of the problem that has to be tackled), I must acknowledge that it is indeed a significant step forward compared to the past. State leverage The second important personality that is involved is the new Secretary of State (and former Senator) John Kerry who has a long and honourable history of engagement on this issue both at national as well as international levels. Unlike his predecessor, Hilary Clinton, he is very interested in this topic and is determined that the US plays a more positive role at the international level. He has already taken personal charge of US international relations on this topic. The most difficult element of the political landscape in the US on the topic of climate change has always been, and continues to be, the Republican Party, who control the House of Representatives in Congress (and thus can, and do, block any attempts to bring legislation to tackle climate change). Within the Republican Party the climate change denying tendency is led by the Tea Party wing of the party and a handful of Congressmen and Senators. However, even here there is a growing awareness amongst more sensible Republicans that they cannot continue to deny the reality of climate change. An example is the recent article in the New York Times, jointly authored by three former Republican heads of the US Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), arguing for the Party to take sensible actions to tackle climate change.

#### Obama action on climate solves extinction

Ashok Khosla 9, IUCN President, International Union for Conservation of Nature, A new President for the United States: We have a dream, 1-29-09, http://cms.iucn.org/news\_events/?uNewsID=2595

A rejuvenated America, with a renewed purpose, commitment and energy to make its contribution once again towards a better world could well be the turning point that can reverse the current decline in the state of the global economy, the health of its life support systems and the morale of people everywhere. This extraordinary change in regime brings with it the promise of a deep change in attitudes and aspirations of Americans, a change that will lead, hopefully, to new directions in their nation’s policies and action. In particular, we can hope that from being a very reluctant partner in global discussions, especially on issues relating to environment and sustainable development, the United States will become an active leader in international efforts to address the Millennial threats now confronting civilization and even the survival of the human species. For the conservation of biodiversity, so essential to maintaining life on Earth, this promise of change has come not a moment too soon. It would be a mistake to put all of our hopes on the shoulder of one young man, however capable he might be. The environmental challenges the world is facing cannot be addressed by one country, let alone by one man. At the same time, an inspired US President guided by competent people, who does not shy away from exercising the true responsibilities and leadership his country is capable of, could do a lot to spur the international community into action. To paraphrase one of his illustrious predecessors, “the world asks for action and action now.” What was true in President Roosevelt’s America 77 years ago is even more appropriate today. From IUCN’s perspective, the first signals are encouraging. The US has seriously begun to discuss constructive engagement in climate change debates. With Copenhagen a mere 11 months away, this commitment is long overdue and certainly very welcome. Many governments still worry that if they set tough standards to control carbon emissions, their industry and agriculture will become uncompetitive, a fear that leads to a foot-dragging “you go first” attitude that is blocking progress. A positive intervention by the United States could provide the vital catalyst that moves the basis of the present negotiations beyond the narrowly defined national interests that lie at the heart of the current impasse. The logjam in international negotiations on climate change should not be difficult to break if the US were to lead the industrialized countries to agree that much of their wealth has been acquired at the expense of the environment (in this case greenhouse gases emitted over the past two hundred years) and that with the some of the benefits that this wealth has brought, comes the obligation to deal with the problems that have resulted as side-effects. With equitable entitlement to the common resources of the planet, an agreement that is fair and acceptable to all nations should be easy enough to achieve. Caps on emissions and sharing of energy efficient technologies are simply in the interest of everyone, rich or poor. And both rich and poor must now be ready to adopt less destructive technologies – based on renewables, efficiency and sustainability – both as a goal with intrinsic merit and also as an example to others. But climate is not the only critical global environmental issue that this new administration will have to deal with. Conservation of biodiversity, a crucial prerequisite for the wellbeing of all humanity, no less America, needs as much attention, and just as urgently. The United States’ self-interest in conserving living natural resources strongly converges with the global common good in every sphere: in the oceans, by arresting the precipitate decline of fish stocks and the alarming rise of acidification; on land, by regenerating the health of our soils, forests and rivers; and in the atmosphere by reducing the massive emission of pollutants from our wasteful industries, construction, agriculture and transport systems.

### 1NR – Climate Impact EXT

#### Disad outweighs on magnitude—Tea Party influence blocks Obama’s climate agenda—the rest of the GOP is open to pragmatic action that would reduce emissions—that’s key to solve a litany of scenarios for extinction—Obama needs to assert leadership on climate issues to spur international action that addresses warming, bio-diversity, ocean health, soil erosion and pollution. That’s Huq and Khosla

***Warming outweighs nuclear war –***

1. ***Certainty***

* Intervening actors

**Hanson et al, ‘7** [J (Goddard Institute for Space Studies), “Dangerous human-made interference with climate,” <http://www.atmos-chem-phys.net/7/2287/2007/acp-7-2287-2007.pdf>]

These stark conclusions about…, Europe also has a large responsibility), **requires only inaction in the face of clear scientific evidence of the danger**.

***b. Magnitude***

**Hunter, ‘3** [Bob, Founder of Greenpeace, *Thermageddon: Countdown to 2030*, p. 58-9]

Even though, from the beginning, Rachel Carson had warned of worldwide chemical fallout

AND

out into space. Good luck making the final crew list, Dexter.

***c. Reversibility***

**Dunpont, ‘8** [Alan, Professor of International Security at U-Sydney, Jun, “The Strategic Implications of Climate Change,” Survival, Volume 50, Issue 3]

**War has customarily been considered the main threat to international security because of the large**

**AND**

**military conflict. They may also be more difficult to reverse or repair.**

### 1NR – turns alliances

#### Tea Party driven crisis politics collapses leadership and causes allies to doubt our commitments

Zakheim, 10/21-’13 [Dov Zakheim served as the undersecretary of defense (comptroller) and chief financial officer for the U.S. Department of Defense from 2001–2004 and as the deputy undersecretary of defense (planning and resources) from 1985-1987. He also served as DoD's civilian coordinator for Afghan reconstruction from 2002–2004. He is a member of The National Interest's advisory council. The National Interest, The Tea Party and National Security, <http://nationalinterest.org/commentary/the-tea-party-national-security-9264>, jj]

Much is being said and written about the impact of the government closure and debt

AND

as the leader of the Free World that it will be beyond repair.

### 1NR – turns ikenberry

#### Continued Tea Party influence kills ikenberry impact

Mead 11 – Professor of Foreign Affairs and the Humanities @ Bard College [Walter Russell Mead, “The Tea Party and American Foreign Policy: What Populism Means for Globalism,” Foreign Affairs, March/April 2011Volume 9o • Number 2

On other issues, Paulites and Palinites are united in their dislike for liberal internationalism —the attempt to conduct international relations through multilateral institutions under an ever-tightening web of international laws and treaties. From climate change to the International Criminal Court to the treatment of enemy combatants captured in unconventional conflicts, both wings of the Tea Party reject liberal internationalist ideas and will continue to do so. The U.S. Senate, in which each state is allotted two senators regardless of the state’s population, heavily favors the less populated states, where Jacksonian sentiment is often strongest. The United States is unlikely to ratify many new treaties written in the spirit of liberal internationalism for some time to come.

The new era in U.S. politics could see foreign policy elites struggling

AND

, and even hostile to, the interests and values of Jacksonian America.

Concern about China has been growing for some time in American opinion, and the Jacksonian surge makes it more likely that the simmering anger and resentment will come to a boil. Free trade is an issue that has historically divided populists in the United States (agrarians have tended to like it; manufacturing workers have not); even though Jacksonians like to buy cheap goods at Walmart, common sense largely leads them to believe that the first job of trade negotiators ought to be to preserve U.S. jobs rather than embrace visionary “win-win” global schemes. Pg. 42-43

#### GO BACK TO TOP OF FLOW

### A2: Too Soon/Can’t Predict

#### Not too soon—primary season kicking off within months

Brustein, 10/23 [Joshua Brustein is a writer for Businessweek.com in New York, Bloomberg Businessweek, Mark Zuckerberg Flexes Silicon Valley's Political Muscles on Immigration, <http://www.businessweek.com/articles/2013-10-23/mark-zuckerberg-flexes-silicon-valleys-political-muscles-on-immigration>, jj]

If not now, when? The window for change could be relatively small:

AND

as-yet unanswered question of whether Congress can do anything at all.

#### And, FYI:

#### The first primary election happens this March in Texas.

[http://www.thegreenpapers.com/G14/events.phtml?format=chronological]

[FROM: ]2014 Primary and Runoff Elections

for Statewide offices and Congress

Chronologically

Tuesday 4 March 2014 Texas - Primary

#### Prefer issue specific uniqueness—it’s not too soon to predict tea party losses in the status quo

Dave Rogers 10/10, October 10, 2013, My Bay City – Michigan, SHUTDOWN WOES: Government Turmoil May Affect 2014 Congress Races, <http://www.mybaycity.com/scripts/p3_v2/P3V3-0200.cfm?P3_ArticleID=8464>, jj

The Republican role in the federal government shutdown may hurt the reelection chances of three

AND

, as the rise of the Tea Party powered the Republicans to victory.

### \*\*\*2NC Link Wall – Top Level

#### Plan lets them pivot towards their popular national security policies—that saves them in the midterm

Friedersdorf, 10-11-’13 [Conor Friedersdorf is a staff writer at The Atlantic, where he focuses on politics and national affairs. 10-11-’13, The Atlantic, The Tea Party Is Damaging Its Credibility in the Way It Can Least Afford, <http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2013/10/the-tea-party-is-damaging-its-credibility-in-the-way-it-can-least-afford/280500/>, jj]

The Tea Party ought to be able to do better. "Rand Paul is

AND

Street, warmongering, and a liberty-destroying national-security state.

#### Plan will cause GOP voters to pick Tea Party candidates over moderates—restricting the president is extremely popular

Lawrence 10/17-’13 [Jill Lawrence is a national correspondent at National Journal. Her previous positions have included managing editor for politics at National Journal, senior correspondent and columnist for Politics Daily, national political correspondent for USA Today, and national political writer for The Associated Press. She has also written about politics and policy for The Daily Beast, The Atlantic, The Washington Post, The Boston Globe, The Atlanta Journal-Constitution and other publications. Lawrence has covered every presidential campaign since 1988 and many other historic events, including the Three Mile Island nuclear accident; the 1994 Republican takeover of Congress; the Clinton impeachment; the Florida recount, and the 1993 and 2009 battles over health reform. Lawrence has won national recognition for her work, most recently a Sigma Delta Chi award from the Society of Professional Journalists in 2010 for her Politics Daily columns. In 2004, Columbia Journalism Review named her one of the top 10 campaign reporters in the country. Her deep, detailed reporting for "One Nation, Divided," a multi-part series published in USA Today in 2002, was featured in the IRE Journal. Lawrence has taught journalism at American University and has appeared at other universities as a guest lecturer and panelist. She is a University of Michigan graduate and has a master's degree in journalism from New York University. National Journal, The Truthiness of Rand Paul, <http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/the-truthiness-of-rand-paul-20131017>, jj]

But it's on foreign policy and national security that Paul could transform the GOP.

AND

there was "no clear national security connection" to the United States.

#### Turnout is key to moderate Republicans

B.M.G, 10/18-’13 [Blue Massachusetts Group, most widely read independent political blog in New England, Tea Party Could See Influence Grow After Latest Washington Debacle, <https://bluemassgroup.com/2013/10/tea-party-could-see-influence-grow-after-latest-washington-debacle/>, jj]

Of course, merely having your supporters turnout to the polls means nothing, if

AND

historically been low, and will likely remain so throughout the 2014 primaries.

#### 2014 is a referendum on Tea Party incompetence now—plan shifts that

Lauren Fox, 10/21/13, US News, Republicans Hope Obamacare Glitches Shape 2014 Senate Races, <http://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2013/10/21/republicans-hope-obamacare-glitches-shape-2014-senate-races>, jj

"2014 is shaping up to be a referendum on the badly damaged Republican brand that's gotten worse in recent months after nearly every Republican senate candidate supported a reckless and irresponsible shutdown championed by NRSC Vice Chair Ted Cruz," Barasky said in an emailed statement.

#### Restoring congressional war power is a win for the Tea Party

James, 8/30-’13 [Frank James joined NPR News in April 2009 to launch the blog, "The Two-Way," with co-blogger Mark Memmott. "The Two-Way" is the place where NPR.org gives readers breaking news and analysis — and engages users in conversations ("two-ways") about the most compelling stories being reported by NPR News and other news media. James came to NPR from the Chicago Tribune, where he worked for 20 years. In 2006, James created "The Swamp," the paper's successful politics and policy news blog whose readership climbed to a peak of 3 million page-views a month. Before that, James covered homeland security, technology and privacy and economics in the Tribune's Washington Bureau. He also reported for the Tribune from South Africa and covered politics and higher education. James also reported for The Wall Street Journal for nearly 10 years. James received a bachelor of arts degree in English from Dickinson College and now serves on its board of trustees. August 30, 2013, NPR, 6 Things To Keep In Mind As Obama Confronts Syria, <http://www.npr.org/blogs/itsallpolitics/2013/08/30/217312197/six-things-to-keep-in-mind-as-obama-confronts-syria>, jj]

Tea Party/libertarians — The debate over the constitutional powers of the president versus

AND

involvement abroad, making them heirs to the isolationists of the past century.

### A2: CIR thumper

#### That doesn’t turn out the tea party --- no ev that it does

#### GOP doesn’t need new outreach—base is key

Brownstein, ’13 [Ronald Brownstein, a two-time finalist for the Pulitzer Prize for his coverage of presidential campaigns, is Atlantic Media's Editorial Director for Strategic Partnerships, in charge of long-term editorial strategy. He also writes a weekly column and regularly contributes other pieces for the National Journal, contributes to Quartz, and The Atlantic, and coordinates political coverage and activities across publications produced by Atlantic Media. 6-6-’13, National Journal, Why Republicans Can Get Away With Ignoring Their Problems, <http://www.nationaljournal.com/columns/political-connections/why-republicans-can-get-away-with-ignoring-their-problems-20130606>, jj]

Over time, minorities and the millennial generation will continue to grow as a share

AND

as the parties are displaying ever-less ability to make it work.

#### And you can cross-apply the first 2 cards on CIR from the 2ac --- it’s a non-issue because Obama won’t push

#### GO BACK TO FLOW!!

### A2: Can’t Solve Globally

#### US action generates global emissions frameworks

Morgan 1/29/13 – Jennifer Morgan, Director, Climate and Energy Program, World Resources Institute, 1-29-13, Addressing Climate on Multiple Fronts, <http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2013/01/how-should-washington-address.php?mrefid=site_search>, jj

3) The President, working with the expected new Secretary of State, John

AND

carbon trajectory and work with the international community to achieve a safer future.¶